

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY.

— — —
No. CIX.—MARCH 1886.

*THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF IRELAND
TO GREAT BRITAIN.*

THAT one of the roots of mischief in Ireland is economic, everybody agrees. The curse of Ireland is its poverty. The hunger for land which is so unintelligible to English feeling is at the bottom of outrages of every kind, and is played upon by political agitators. It is not, however, generally understood how the weakness of Ireland affects the whole aspect of the Irish political difficulty.

I have thought it worth while, therefore, when the notion of splitting partnership is in the air, to bring together some notes as to the economic position of Ireland, relatively to Great Britain, from the point of view of a statesman in Great Britain looking at the suggested proposal to part company as a mere matter of business—as he would look, in fact, at the analogous suggestion of union with a State which was seeking partnership with us. The statesman, of course, must weigh moral and political considerations as well as economic, and the various questions involved are necessarily intermixed; but it is expedient nevertheless to separate the economic from the other elements. We shall know better what we are doing or going to do in Ireland if the business loss or gain is clear.

The first point to notice in such a question is population. The people of Ireland are rather less than five millions, as compared with nearly thirty-one and a half millions in Great Britain. If Great

Britain were to be offered a partnership of about five millions of people of equal character and resources to those of Great Britain themselves, the addition to the strength of the empire would be as five to thirty-one and a half. The population thus to be added would constitute in the new State somewhat less than a seventh of the whole. Equally the deduction of a people of this magnitude from the existing Union would be the deduction of rather less than a seventh.

A change of this description would be a very considerable one. But, apart from what it might lead to, it cannot be described as in itself formidable. With the loss of a seventh, the United Kingdom would be as great a Power as it was in 1870, and in fact a much greater Power, because the remaining six-sevenths are richer and stronger individually than the population of 1870. Their condition in the interval has enormously improved.

Of course, if by any arrangement the splitting of partnership were only to be partial—if we retained Ulster, while permitting to the rest of Ireland more or less complete separation—the deduction from the United Kingdom would be materially less. The disaffected parts of Ireland are not more than three-fifths of the whole, or three millions. In losing the three millions we should only lose one-twelfth of our numbers, or less than the growth of our population every decade.

Looking at the matter historically, we must come to the conclusion that the problem of disaffection in Ireland is mitigated in its intensity by the changes of population which have occurred. Down to about 1845, from the beginning of the century, the people of Ireland were about half those of Great Britain—about a third of the whole population of the United Kingdom. The population of the disaffected parts of Ireland was also nearly three-fourths of the whole of that country, and consequently about a fourth of that of the United Kingdom. The change from such proportions to those of about one-seventh for the proportion of Ireland itself to the United Kingdom, and one-twelfth for the proportion of the disaffected parts of Ireland, requires no comment. Disaffection in Ireland is obviously not what it was in relation to the United Kingdom as a whole.

I have called attention to this point for some years past as necessarily altering our entire conception of the Irish difficulty. It is dealt with in *Essays in Finance* (first series), in an essay on the *Taxation and Representation of Ireland*, which was first published in 1876, and I have introduced the same topic in two essays in the second series of *Essays in Finance*—viz. an essay on the Utility of Common Statistics, and another on Some General Uses of Statistical Knowledge. I doubt if the full force of this consideration is properly appreciated even yet. Relatively Ireland is still losing ground most rapidly, not so much because Irish

population diminishes, as because that of Great Britain increases. We grow a new people in Great Britain equal to the whole disaffected part of Ireland at the present time every ten years. In a few generations, at this rate, Ireland must become relatively to Great Britain very little more than a somewhat larger Isle of Man or Channel Islands. To let Ireland split partnership would differ in no way in kind, and comparatively little in degree, as far as business is concerned, from letting the Isle of Man remain a separate State.

The second point is even more important. The people of Ireland are not equal in industrial character and resources to those of the United Kingdom. They are very far from being equal. Great Britain, in adding to itself an Ireland, would add a community having only a twentieth part of the income of the United Kingdom; the United Kingdom, in losing an Ireland, would only lose a small percentage of its strength.

It is very difficult, of course, dealing with questions of the aggregate income of different communities; but, practically, we need have little doubt of the proportions stated.

In the assessments to the Income-tax the proportion of Ireland is as 1 to 17—viz. United Kingdom (including Ireland), 629,000,000*l.* sterling; Ireland, 37,000,000*l.* sterling. This is more than five per cent., but not very much more. And there is reason to believe that Ireland is more strictly valued than Great Britain, and that it is over-valued.

At any rate, when it comes to be a question of the whole aggregate income of the different communities, there can be little doubt that other sources of income, outside of the Income-tax, are larger in Great Britain than in Ireland. In dealing with the subject lately in *Further Notes on the Progress of the Working Classes* I put down the whole income of Great Britain as about 1,200,000,000*l.*, and that of Ireland as just over 70,000,000*l.* But I have a strong feeling that these figures were based very much on what Mr. Dudley I had done, I gave too little to Great Britain.

With regard to Ireland the income cannot be very large. The population employs in round figures about 1,290,000 males of twenty years of age, according to the census. Of these, 1,000,000 were engaged in agriculture, while the remainder, there were 290,000 labourers, among whom 100,000 were engaged in agriculture. The rest must never be taken. In other words, they depend on agriculture.

engaged in that occupation. And this means that, all told, the average income of these three millions, including those who receive rent, as well as farmers and labourers, is not more than about 13*l.* or 14*l.* per head. The gross produce of the crops of Ireland, according to the latest returns, is about 33,000,000*l.* only, from five million acres, of which about 10,000,000*l.* are from cereal crops, 10,000,000*l.* from potatoes, and the remainder mainly from hay and green crops, which latter, of course, along with a large part of the cereal crops themselves, are not in their final form when thus valued. Making a deduction from the 33,000,000*l.* on this account, and making an estimate for the value of cattle, sheep, and pigs sold, and for dairy produce, the gross produce of pasture-land being, of course, much less than that of cereal or other crops, it seems impossible to arrive at a larger figure than about forty to forty-five millions as the value of the agricultural produce of Ireland, deducting seed, manures, and expenses of that nature. On this forty to forty-five millions, three millions of people have to live, which gives about 14*l.* per head; or less than 60*l.* for a family of four persons.

Deducting a total rent of just under 10,000,000*l.* according to the Income-tax returns, with practically no deduction from the numbers of people on the other side, we should leave about 11*l.* per head only for farmers and labourers and their families. And if we take the rent at a less figure, as I believe we ought to do—say at about eight millions sterling only—we should still make the income of the Irish agricultural classes, farmers and labourers together, only 12*l.* per head; or under 50*l.* for a family of four persons. Comparing this with England, it would appear that the tenant-farmers and labourers of Ireland are not so well off as the average of the English agricultural labourers, which implies that very many must be far below that level.

On this basis, also, we may calculate the aggregate income of Ireland. Assuming the income per head of the rest of the people of Ireland to be one-third more than the income per head of those engaged in agriculture, and one-third more than the income per head of those engaged in other occupations, we should still arrive at an aggregate income of 100 millions only as the total income of Ireland.

If we take the income generally, the average income also comes out as one-third more than the average of the rest of the people.

And, relative capital of Great Britain and Ireland, the Irish capital later on, is about one-third of the total capital of the country. There can be no doubt that the total capital of the country is to estimate at not less than 300 millions, yet on a similar basis now, it is only 100 millions. In other words,

Irish capital is only a twenty-fourth part of that of the United Kingdom. And, whatever doubt there may be about the figures, which are necessarily very wide, and which assume that a nation can be valued as a going business concern, it is at least certain that no emendation would sensibly alter the proportions. An addition to Irish capital and a deduction from English capital that would both be large, would leave the proportions much the same.

It is easy to see, then, how little the gain of an Ireland would add to the resources of Great Britain, or the loss of it would deduct from those resources. The taxable income of Ireland must bear a still smaller proportion to the taxable income of Great Britain than does its gross income or capital to the gross income or capital of Great Britain. The taxable income is the income remaining after allowance for the minimum necessary to maintain a population upon a given standard of living. In this sense, giving the people of Great Britain an average of 12*l.* per head as the minimum, they have a taxable income of about 800,000,000*l.* sterling annually.¹ On the same scale, five millions of people in Ireland would absorb sixty out of, say, seventy-five millions gross income, leaving a taxable income of 15,000,000*l.* sterling only. Even allowing that the standard in Ireland is necessarily lower, the taxable income would not be much increased. As a partner with so rich a State as Great Britain, Ireland must therefore be considered strictly as entirely insignificant. It hardly counts one way or the other.

Of course the practical taxable income of Great Britain is not so much as 800,000,000*l.* The State could not levy 800,000,000*l.*, or anything like that sum, without reducing many classes in the scale of living. There would be a revolution if any such levy were attempted. But, limiting the 800,000,000*l.* as we may, there would still be a vast amount to compare with the taxable income of Ireland, where the practical taxable income must be very small indeed.

Here again, as with regard to the population of Great Britain, it is quite true that Ireland is becoming less and less a part of Great Britain. At the beginning of the century, Ireland was used for an expectation that was never fulfilled, and she participated in the burdens of the United Kingdom. With a third of the population of Great Britain, Ireland, it was calculated, contributed an eighth to joint objects, and man for man, was not half as much as a man in Great Britain. an extreme calculation, and Ireland has since that time, there is no question that

¹ Thirty-two millions, multiplied by 25, leaves rather than 1,200 millions leaves rather

being two to seventeen, are less than one to seventeen. Its numbers are relatively to Great Britain not half what they were, and the distance between the average incomes per head of the two communities continues very great. The taxable income and capital of Great Britain have increased enormously, and those of Ireland hardly at all.

To put the matter shortly, and in the roundest figures—there can, of course, be no exact figures of income and capital—Ireland in population has sunk from one-third to less than one-seventh; in gross income, from two-seventeenths to less than one-seventeenths; in capital, from a proportion that was material to about one-twenty-fourth only; in taxable resources, from a proportion that was also material, being perhaps about one-tenth, to a proportion that is almost inappreciable—the proportion of only one to fifty. In resources, Ireland has no doubt increased absolutely. The Irish people are much better off individually, partly because there are fewer people than there were fifty years ago, but with much the same resources; but as a community in relation to Great Britain there is an immense decline.

The relative decrease of the disaffected part of Ireland only is quite as remarkable. From being about one-tenth of the United Kingdom in resources, it has become about one-fortieth or less. As regards taxable income, the proportion of the whole of Ireland to the United Kingdom being only about one to fifty, that of the disaffected part of Ireland only must be about one to a hundred!

How small the proportion of Ireland is will also be impressed on us more if we consider for a moment the economic relations of Great Britain with other British dependencies. Compared with Ireland, our interests in India, where we have invested over 200,000,000*l.*, and in Australia, where we have invested over 100,000,000*l.*, are enormous. And our trade with India figures up as 66,000,000*l.* annually, and with Australia as 55,000,000*l.* annually, as compared with 10,000,000*l.* with Ireland, imports and exports of Indian and Australian trades also give a proportion in proportion than that of Ireland. Australia imposes on us any more than Ireland does, to derive, as a community,

will be interesting to go
le more closely. Great
tnership for over eighty
gards government and
rse?

It is obvious, to begin with, that Ireland has not helped as the framers of the Union expected. According to the Act of Union, Ireland was expected to contribute to the joint expenditure of Great Britain and Ireland in the proportion of two-seventeenths. In point of fact, Ireland could not do so under the strain of the enormous outlay at the beginning of the century. Under that arrangement between 1800 and 1815 Irish debt increased rapidly—viz. from 24,000,000*l.* to 128,000,000*l.*—although Irish taxation was enormously increased, viz. from three and a half to nearly seven millions. In 1816, the amalgamation of the exchequers and indiscriminate taxation were recommended, because it was quite impossible for Ireland to bear two-seventeenths of the joint burdens.

Actually at the present moment Ireland is no gain to the exchequer of Great Britain. The facts are as follows:—Ireland's gross contributions from Customs, Excise, and Inland Revenue generally are put down in Thom's Almanac as about 7,700,000*l.*; but of course no such account shows exactly what Ireland's proper contribution is. Duties are paid in Ireland on spirits consumed in England, and duties are paid in England on tobacco and tea consumed in Ireland. An exact account is impossible. It seems to be believed, however, according to the return No. 36, session 1884, that, after corrections are made on this head, about 6,700,000*l.* represents the contributions of Ireland to imperial purposes, exclusive of Post Office, &c., the contributions of Great Britain being nearly ten times that amount. In other words, Ireland, while constituting only about a twentieth part of the United Kingdom in resources, nevertheless pays a tenth or eleventh of the taxes. Ireland ought to pay about 3,500,000*l.* and it pays nearly 7,000,000*l.* To the extent of the difference Great Britain is better off in the partnership than could have been expected beforehand.

This is only a part of the account. When we look at the other side—viz. the disposal of the taxes—we shall see that Great Britain does not gain so much as would appear from the revenue side only. But I ought to explain in passing that it is not surprising, considering the nature of our imperial taxes, that Ireland should contribute more than its proper share, although the taxes are not merely indiscriminate, but Ireland is really exempted from some of them. The reason is that imperial taxes fall so much on the common luxuries of the poor—on spirits, tobacco, and tea. Nearly the whole cost of the first two articles to the consumer is a tax, and the *ad valorem* tax on tea is also very high. The poor, if they are to have these common luxuries at all, must contribute disproportionately to the exchequer. Ireland as a poor country is disproportionately taxed, although the taxes of the United Kingdom are technically indiscriminate.

Turning to the other side of the account, what we find is that

the Imperial Government has, first, to garrison Ireland to a degree unnecessary in Great Britain; and, second, to pay disproportionately for the local government of Ireland. If the home troops were to be stationed in Ireland in proportion to the population, the troops in Ireland would be about 12,000 only; if in proportion to resources, about 5,000 only. Actually Ireland has at least 24,000 troops, sometimes more,² an excess on the first basis of 12,000 troops, and on the second basis of nearly 20,000. At 150*l.* per man, which is the cost of the British standing army, we thus spend in Ireland on the first basis 1,800,000*l.* which we might save; and on the second basis nearly 3,000,000*l.*

Next, the Imperial Government spends a certain amount of money on the internal administration of different parts of the United Kingdom—the Civil Service expenditure. Altogether it spends in this way the sums shown in the following table (the particulars being extracted from the last finance and revenue accounts):

Statement of Charges on Imperial Revenues for Local Administration in Great Britain and Ireland compared. From the Finance and Revenue Accounts, 1884-85. [In thousands of pounds—000's omitted]

	Total	Great Britain	Ireland
	£	£	£
Pensions for judicial services, pp. 52-60	127	103	24
Salaries and allowances, pp. 63-65	84 ³	42	42
Courts of Justice salaries, pp. 66-79	506	392	114
Civil Service, Class I.—Public Works and Buildings (less spent abroad)	1,662	1,457	205
Civil Service, Class II. (Civil Departments)	2,397	2,109 ⁴	288
" Class III. (Law and Justice)	6,341	4,101	2,239
" Class IV. (Education)	5,135	4,368	767
" Class VI. (Non-effective)	1,193	1,078	115
Total	17,445	13,650	3,794

In addition there have been numerous grants of loans to Ireland in the last forty years which have never been repaid.

It is easy to see that, on any hypothesis, the Imperial Government spends on Ireland more than its proper share, whether measured by its resources, its population, or its actual contributions to imperial revenues. Out of a sum of 17,500,000*l.* spent out of imperial revenues for the internal administration of Great Britain and Ireland, it obtains very nearly a fourth. The following compares what Ireland would be entitled to on these different hypotheses with what it actually receives out of this sum of 17,500,000*l.* :—

² In 1884 the numbers were 24,400, out of a total of 90,000 at home

³ Including salary of Lord-Lieutenant and Queen's Colleges. I have only included salaries and allowances special to Great Britain and Ireland.

⁴ Ireland gets the benefit of part of this sum.

		Sum due to Ireland from Imperial Revenues	Sum actually received by Ireland	Excess of actual Receipts
Proportion to resources	Proportion $\frac{1}{10}$ th	£ 872,000	£ 3,800,000	£ 2,928,000
„ population	$\frac{1}{7}$ th	2,492,000	3,800,000	1,308,000
„ contributions	$\frac{1}{10}$ th	1,744,000	3,800,000	2,056,000

In any case Ireland gets more than is due to it, assuming in the last two cases that a contribution according to population or on the present scale is just. In these two ways, then, partly through excessive military expenditure, and partly through excessive civil expenditure, Great Britain spends upon Ireland a disproportionate sum. Taking the resources as a measure, the account would balance as follows:—

Overspent for British troops in Ireland	£	3,000,000
„ local administration		2,928,000
Deduct excess of receipts from Ireland in proportion to its resources		5,928,000
		3,200,000
Deficit		2,728,000

The English Government is thus a loser by Ireland to the extent of about 2,750,000*l.* per annum, although it receives from Ireland over 3,000,000*l.* more revenue than Ireland, on any fair computation, ought to pay. If Ireland only paid a fair contribution for imperial purposes, we should be out of pocket by this 3,200,000*l.* more, or nearly 6,000,000*l.* Actually, it is beyond question, we lose as a government nearly 3,000,000*l.*, while taxing Ireland over 3,000,000*l.* more than it ought to be taxed.

Of course it may be said that we do not lose by the army expenditure; that the troops being in Ireland are available, to a certain extent, for the miscellaneous purposes of the United Kingdom. Unfortunately, it is beyond question that the troops are not available. The extra 12,000 or 20,000 troops that are in Ireland, beyond what is necessary to garrison it in proportion to Great Britain, are lost to us for imperial purposes. The expenditure is pure waste.

So much for the balance of the account as far as the Government is concerned. The question remains as to the account of the community as a whole.

English capital, it may be said, is invested in Ireland, and there is a large profit to the community, if not to the Government. I am sorry to say I can find little foundation for this impression. There is some profit, but not a large profit.

The whole capital of Ireland must be inconsiderable—probably not over 400,000,000*l.*—the principal items being:—

Value of land (160,000,000 <i>l.</i>) and houses (40,000,000 <i>l.</i>)	£ 200,000,000
Tenants' capital	80,000,000
Railways	36,000,000
Furniture of houses and other movable property	20,000,000
Other capital (say)	64,000,000
Total	400,000,000

What banking capital there is I include in other capital, as part of it at least is no doubt invested by loan or otherwise in agriculture, railways, &c., and it ought not to be counted twice over. The 400,000,000*l.* is probably over the mark.

And most of this capital must be held locally. The trading and farming capital is so held. The banking capital is so held; out of the 40,000,000*l.* of resources of the Irish banks, capital and deposits together, the share owned by English people must be very small, for the deposits are necessarily those of the locality, and Irish bank shares, I know, are held locally. Part of these resources finds its way to London, and is invested in London. Irish railway shares are also, for the most part, held in Ireland. There remains only the real property, which is said to be mortgaged largely to English insurance companies, and so on. But English insurance companies only hold a little over 70,000,000*l.* of mortgages altogether, and I should doubt if a fifth part of these mortgages are in Ireland. The mortgages there, all told, can hardly exceed 50,000,000*l.*, of which only a part would be held in England. There are, of course, the landlords who reside in England. *Per contra*, however, residents in Ireland hold English securities, not inconsiderably, I believe, in proportion to the resources of Ireland, and this holding, putting the two communities against each other, is a set-off to Irish securities held in England.

Ireland, as a field for English capital, does not seem, therefore, to count for much. But, if we allow that even a sum equal to a fourth part of the *nominal* agricultural rent of Ireland, which appears to be under 10,000,000*l.*, finds its way to England on balance in the shape of mortgage interest, &c., deducting what is received in Ireland on similar account from Great Britain, the English community as a whole, Government and people together, would still have very little out of Ireland. The gain to the community, whatever it is, would be balanced, *pro tanto*, by the deficit on Government account. If Ireland were only to be taxed according to its resources, there would be a very large deficit.

It is quite clear, it may be added, that, as compared with the enormous capital and income from capital which the community of Great Britain enjoys, the share due to the Irish connection, even if the whole nominal rental of Ireland were to be remitted to Great Britain, would be inconsiderable. Our income from capital is over 400,000,000*l.* annually, to which a contribution of 10,000,000*l.* would not be very material. What has been said above as to the superior

importance to us of India and Australia has a bearing on this point. There are many parts of the world which are more important, economically, to Great Britain than Ireland is.

Next, it may be said, we gain by the trade of Ireland. Ireland is a good customer of Great Britain, and we get conveniently from Ireland much of what we require. It will follow, however, from what has been said, that, as the income of Ireland altogether is about 75,000,000*l.* only, the trade with Ireland must be limited (1) by the surplus which Ireland can afford to export out of that sum, and (2) by the proportion of that surplus which Ireland can afford to spend on the produce and manufactures of Great Britain.

The total exportable surplus of Ireland cannot be very large. The exports and export value of cattle, sheep, and pigs, valuing them at about the average given by 'Thom' for Irish live stock in general in 1884⁵ are as follows (average of three years 1881-3):—

		Value per head	
Cattle	630,000	£12	£7,560,000
Sheep	530,000	£2 3s.	1,220,000
Pigs	450,000	£3.	1,350,000
Total			10,130,000

And the export of butter and cheese, allowing that the produce available for export from each milch cow is about 4*l.* per head, would not be more than about 6,000,000*l.*

Adding these two sums together, the total agricultural exports of Ireland would be about 16,000,000*l.* only; of course at lower prices the exports would be less.

In addition, there are the exports of the linen manufacture, the Belfast shipbuilding trade, the spirits and porter of Dublin and Belfast, the produce of Irish fisheries, and other miscellaneous productions, amounting in all, I should say, to about other 5,000,000*l.*—total 21,000,000*l.* The calculation is necessarily very rough.

The imports on the other side would more than balance, I think, but they are largely of articles which are not the produce and manufactures of England. Grain of different kinds is a principal item. There are no returns of imports now, but in 1874 they amounted from foreign countries only, principally grain and flour, to 10,000,000*l.* At recent prices the same quantity of imports would of course be of less value.

Ireland in addition takes sugar, tea, and other articles of tropical produce, principally imported from Great Britain, probably to the amount of 5,000,000*l.*, giving a much smaller quantity of tea and sugar per head than is consumed in the United Kingdom generally.

Adding these two amounts together, the total is 15,000,000*l.*, and the difference between this sum and the total required to balance the estimated exports only amounts to 6,000,000*l.* Ireland probably imports somewhat more; the particulars I cannot give, except for coal, of

⁵ *Thom's Almanac* for 1885, pp 692-94.

which Ireland imports 3,000,000 tons, worth, say, including freight, rather more than 2,000,000*l.* The other articles which Ireland must import, including textiles, would necessarily contain a large amount of raw material. Altogether, it may be doubted whether Ireland is a customer for British labour to the extent of more than a few millions per annum.

When it is considered that even complete separation need not involve loss of trade, and partial separation, by which I mean any tolerably comprehensive scheme of local self-government, would not involve loss of trade at all, except through Ireland falling into anarchy, it cannot be said that the risk to our trade is a very serious element in the question of the loss or gain which the separation of Ireland, and *à fortiori* a mere alteration of the form of the political connection, would involve.

I have been looking at the question exclusively from the British point of view. The view presented, when looked at from an Irish standpoint, is somewhat different. The precise interest of Ireland in the connection requires a little explanation.

1. On the direct Government account, Ireland would probably gain by separation or by a revisal of present arrangements. It would have about 7,000,000*l.* of revenue to dispose of, which it now contributes to the Imperial exchequer, and out of the difference between this sum and the sum of 3,800,000*l.* it gets back from the Imperial Treasury for internal administration, it would have to defray its army and navy, if any, its share of the Imperial debt, and any expenses of that sort. Assuming economy in spending for the purposes on which the 3,800,000*l.* is now spent, Ireland might get on very well, the scale of expenditure all round being lower than in Great Britain. For less than a million a year Ireland could have a very tolerable force to maintain internal order; its share of the imperial debt, proportioning that share to its resources, would not cost more than 1,500,000*l.* per annum; there would remain over 4,000,000*l.* for all the miscellaneous purposes of internal administration, which is more than what is now spent. Ireland would thus gain by the severance; while Great Britain, which loses now, although extracting over three millions more from Ireland than its proper share of taxation, would decidedly gain. Both sides would gain, assuming no political danger to arise, because the present government of Ireland by England involves very serious waste.

2. Ireland would lose indirectly by the withdrawal of English troops. English army expenditure in Ireland now recoups a part of the loss inflicted on Ireland by disproportionate taxation.

3. Separation, if it should bring about an interruption of trade between Ireland and Great Britain, would be disastrous to Ireland. The 20,000,000*l.* which Ireland exports find almost their sole

market in Great Britain. If more capital is to be invested in Ireland, the capital must come from England. In this respect Great Britain is indispensable to Ireland.

On balance the direct advantages to Ireland from complete or partial separation are apparently so little that they cannot compensate the danger involved in anything like complete separation. Of course in isolation and hostility to Great Britain, Ireland would be lost. It is utterly without resources to maintain such an attitude. On the other hand, the advantage to Ireland of a partial separation, involving a settlement of the direct accounts, and leaving to it all the advantage of forming part of the United Kingdom, would be enormous.

I have thus answered the question with which I started, or nearly so. The conclusion is that Great Britain has not much to lose in dissolving partnership, while Ireland has.

The only point I have left untouched is the question of the indirect political danger in separation and the loss it may involve. This is almost too remote a speculation for such an inquiry as I have been making. It is obvious, however, still keeping strictly to the economic question, that the sum of 2,750,000*l.*, the amount of the deficit we now incur on account of Ireland, would go some way towards the expense of extra military and naval preparation which the presence of a hostile Ireland near us might involve. I should like further to ask the question why a State like Ireland beside us, if completely separate, should add sensibly to the dangers we incur from States like Belgium and Holland, which are just about as populous and much richer, and almost equally near. The question is one of military strategy; but, without being dogmatic, I would suggest that the experience of past times, when France tried to use Ireland against us, does not wholly apply. In past times Ireland was useful positively to Great Britain, because of the relative magnitude of its resources in both men and wealth. The loss of it would have been a great loss to Great Britain in the life-and-death struggles in which it was engaged. Further, Ireland hostile might in former times have been a real danger to England for two reasons—the first, its relative magnitude, already referred to; and next, the necessity or convenience, in the days of sailin ships, of using as the basis of hostile operations against a State which was to be reached by sea a place near to that state, so that a Power like France might have gained something by ‘enveloping’ Great Britain. Now all the circumstances have changed. Ireland is so poor in resources that the loss of it positively would hardly count. Even as a recruiting ground it is no longer required, because a State like Great Britain with 31½ millions of men, not to speak of its colonial reserves, can have as many men for soldiering as its finances can afford out of its own numbers. Negatively also we can keep military possession of

Ireland much more easily than was formerly the case; it is an easier task than it was in proportion to our resources; and just because it is easier, it is less worth the while of an opponent to seek to overcome us through Ireland. In these days of steam also a great Power meaning to attack us could do so as easily, or nearly as easily, from Antwerp or Hamburg or Havre, or even Cadiz, as from Dublin or Belfast; to attempt to reach us through Ireland would not be worth while. To guard against accidents, it is prudent and best for both countries that we should keep military hold of Ireland; but it would seem to be conceivable that Ireland, even if disposed to be hostile, would not 'count' when separate, if we were only to put forth our strength. If we lose command of the sea, we shall be liable to be assailed directly by a military Power; if we keep the command, Ireland will not count.

There is less need, however, to discuss a point like the last, because there is no question, under any scheme of local self-government or Home Rule that I have seen, of permitting to Irish local authorities an army or a navy. Many of those who are in favour of Home Rule appear to admit as a possibility that the Irish local authorities may attempt illegally and covertly to raise a military force. But the cost of guarding against such a risk, which is the economic aspect of the question, ought not to be very material. Would it conceivably be necessary to keep more troops in Ireland than we now do? I consider myself precluded from fully discussing the latter question. It involves those moral and political considerations from which I have endeavoured to disentangle the economic problem. But it would seem just at least to notice, economically, that Ireland, even if separate, would have overwhelming motives to be on good terms with Great Britain.

I propose to leave the question of the economic value of Ireland to Great Britain at this point. As I have stated at the beginning, and as I have just been repeating, there are moral and political considerations to be taken into account after the economic aspect of the question has been studied. For historical reasons, for the sake of the connection between Ulster specially and Great Britain, for the sake of a minority who have been encouraged to trust to English law administered by an English Parliament, neither separation nor any form of Home Rule for Ireland may be desirable or possible. To discuss all these matters would take me into regions which, for many reasons, even if I desired to do so, I must avoid. I may venture to express the hope, however, that the facts I have stated are of a tendency to mitigate apprehensions which are generally entertained. If Ireland in a business view hardly counts in a question of force against Great Britain, we can afford to arrange its destinies and its relations to Great Britain in any way that may be politically

found expedient. Having practically omnipotent power, we should discuss with reasonable coolness how Ireland is to be governed.

I shall only, then, permit myself one or two remarks appearing to verge on politics, because they arise directly out of a consideration of the economic and business aspects of the Irish problem.]

The first of these remarks is that all claim of Ireland to be represented in Parliament, if it really contributes nothing material to the strength of the empire when properly taxed, is taken away. At present it is unprofitable to us, because, though it is overtaxed, the circumstances are such that it absorbs the surplus taxation. If it were to be taxed properly, and the present system of government were to continue, it would be still more unprofitable. It appears then to be an intolerable anomaly that such a State should be represented in the Imperial Parliament, helping to vote the taxes which another community pays, and meddling in all the affairs of that community. The anomaly might be endurable if the representatives returned happened to be friendly or to be sensible of deriving advantage from the imperial connection. But to admit into the Imperial Parliament representatives of a State which can be no contributory to imperial needs; which could not bear the strain of an imperial emergency; which requires for its own internal administration all the taxable income it can spare, and which, moreover, sends representatives avowedly hostile, with no other mission than to make imperial government impossible, is nothing less than the *reductio ad absurdum* of Parliamentary government. The affairs of an empire like that of England cannot possibly go on upon such conditions. The enormous reduction or absolute extinction of the Irish representation in the Imperial Parliament, with or without terms of Home Rule for Ireland, is a measure on which both parties in Great Britain might justifiably unite.

Another remark I have to make is with reference to a certain scheme which appeared in the *Statist* newspaper, and which became known as 'Economist's' plan of settling the Land and Home Rule questions in Ireland. There is no reason why I should not assume responsibility for a suggestion which I was encouraged to ventilate, when I first put it forward in conversation, by official and political friends, although for obvious reasons I am most anxious to keep out of political controversy, and could take no part, either in my own name or anonymously, in the incessant discussions of the last few months. What I should like to point out is that the idea of buying out Irish landlords at the expense of the imperial exchequer, and of handing over a rent-charge to Irish local authorities in lieu of the present imperial payments for the internal administration of Ireland, is closely related to the view of Ireland's economic position which I have set forth in this paper. It is all based on the notion that Ireland is a comparatively small State which has gained

a footing in the imperial system of Great Britain to which it is not entitled, and for which, therefore, another system, excluding Irish representatives wholly, or nearly so, from the Imperial Parliament, must be devised. If Irish local authorities can be set up amicably, and with the consent of Ireland's representatives, so much the better; if no such authorities can be set up, then it will be necessary still to exclude hostile Irish representatives from the Imperial Parliament, and set up local authorities of a non-popular kind. As far as I can see, there is no getting out from between the horns of this dilemma. In either case a settlement of the land question seems expedient, in order to give the new authorities a chance, and in order to disentangle the imperial and Irish exchequers. No merely Irish authorities could buy out the landlords, because they would not have credit enough. If the exchequers are not disentangled, the Irish people would have the apparent grievance of being taxed without representation, whereas in some form or other they could be represented in local councils. It is, therefore, expedient at the same time at once to buy out Irish landlords effectively, which can be done by the imperial exchequer, and to give the new local authorities a revenue which they could collect and administer themselves, and which would be the *equivalent* of the contributions to the imperial exchequer they would continue to make under existing taxes, deducting a certain fixed proportion as due from them for the imperial protection. Subject to the condition that the Imperial Parliament imposed no new taxes on Ireland, which it is not worth while doing, there would be no injustice in such an arrangement, and the Irish people could not then say they were taxed without representation. But the existing intolerable anomaly would be got rid of, and Great Britain would cease to be governed in a large degree by a hostile faction deriving from a country which contributes nothing to imperial strength.

I desire, likewise, to call special attention to the fact which has come out incidentally, that Ireland is overtaxed in comparison with Great Britain. It contributes twice its proper share, if not more, to the Imperial Exchequer. The taxation in one view is not reprehensible; it is levied in the shape of indirect taxes, mainly on spirits and tobacco. The Irish masses could untax themselves by the simple expedient of consuming less spirits and tobacco. This is the easy view which has often been acted upon when the subject has come up in the Imperial Parliament. Long ago, in 1864, when there was a Committee on Irish Taxation, Mr. Lowe embarrassed an able witness, Mr. E. Senior, a Poor-law Inspector in Ireland and well acquainted with Irish poverty, by putting this very point (see No. 513, Session 1864). But it is not the right view. How much of the expenditure of the Irish people on spirits and tobacco is really wasteful is not certainly known. People who have so little taxable income have at any

rate a claim to have the money thus taken from them by the Government applied for their special benefit. At present, nearly the whole taxable income of the Irish people is, in fact, absorbed by the State. The taxable income being about 15,000,000*l.* only, the Imperial Government, as we have seen, takes nearly 7,000,000*l.*, and the local taxes are over 3,000,000*l.* more, or about 10,000,000*l.* in all. So large a proportion of taxation to taxable income would be a serious fact for any country, and there can be little accumulation in Ireland under such conditions. Considerations like these, which are so material, have however made no impression in the Imperial Parliament hitherto, and that this has been the case is one reason, among many others, why on this side of St. George's Changel we should speak with some modesty of the Imperial Parliament being capable of dealing with Irish affairs. Here is certainly a matter on which, with no intention to be unjust, with an apparent willingness to be more than fair to Ireland, as is shown by the exemption of Ireland specially from certain taxes, we have nevertheless acted unjustly and to the injury of Ireland. I may commend Mr. Senior's evidence on this head, in the Blue Book of 1864 already referred to, to those who care to study the subject. Surely the whole blunder clearly suggests the expediency of devising some form of government for Ireland, under which the special needs and circumstances of the country and people would receive more and better attention than they do under present arrangements, although the attention which they do get disturbs and disorganises the management of Imperial affairs themselves.

ROBERT GIFFEN.

THE EVOLUTION OF THEOLOGY:

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDY.

I CONCEIVE that the origin, the growth, the decline, and the fall of those speculations respecting the existence, the powers, and the dispositions of beings analogous to men, but more or less devoid of corporeal qualities, which may be broadly included under the head of theology, are phenomena the study of which legitimately falls within the province of the anthropologist. And it is purely as a question of anthropology (a department of biology to which I have at various times given a good deal of attention) that I propose to treat of the evolution of theology in the following pages.

With theology as a code of dogmas which are to be believed, or at any rate repeated, under penalty of present or future punishment, or as a storehouse of anæsthetics for those who find the pains of life too hard to bear, I have nothing to do; and, so far as it may be possible, I shall avoid the expression of any opinion as to the objective truth or falsehood of the systems of theological speculation of which I may find occasion to speak. From my present point of view, theology is regarded as a natural product of the operations of the human mind, under the conditions of its existence, just as any other branch of science, or the arts of architecture, or music, or painting are such products. Like them, theology has a history. Like them also, it is to be met with in certain simple and rudimentary forms; and these can be connected by a multitude of gradations, which exist or have existed, among people of various ages and races, with the most highly developed theologies of past and present times. It is not my object to interfere, even in the slightest degree, with beliefs which anybody holds sacred; or to alter the conviction of any one who is of opinion that, in dealing with theology, we ought to be guided by considerations different from those which would be thought appropriate, if the problem lay in the province of chemistry or of mineralogy. And if people of these ways of thinking choose to read beyond the present paragraph, the responsibility for meeting with anything they may dislike rests with them and not with me.

We are all likely to be more familiar with the theological history of the Israelites than with that of any other nation. We may therefore fitly make it the first object of our studies; and it will be convenient to commence with that period which lies between the invasion

of Canaan and the early days of the monarchy, and answers to the eleventh and twelfth centuries B.C. or thereabouts. The evidence on which any conclusion as to the nature of Israelitic theology in those days must be based is wholly contained in the Hebrew Scriptures—an agglomeration of documents which certainly belong to very different ages, but of the exact dates and authorship of any one of which (except perhaps one or two of the prophetic writings) there is no evidence, either internal or external, so far as I can discover, of such a nature as to justify more than a confession of ignorance or, at most, an approximate conclusion. In this venerable record of ancient life, miscalled a book, when it is really a library comparable to a selection of works from English literature between the times of Beda and those of Milton, we have the stratified deposits (often confused and even with their natural order inverted) left by the stream of the intellectual and moral life of Israel during many centuries. Imbedded in these strata, there are numerous remains of forms of thought which once lived, and which, though often unfortunately mere fragments, are of priceless value to the anthropologist. Our task is to rescue these from their relatively unimportant surroundings, and by careful comparison with existing forms of theology to make the dead world which they record live again. In other words, our problem is palæontological, and the method pursued must be the same as that employed in dealing with other fossil remains.

Among the richest of the fossiliferous strata to which I have alluded are the books of Judges and Samuel.¹ It has often been observed that these writings stand out in marked relief from those which precede and follow them, in virtue of a certain archaic freshness and of a greater freedom from traces of late interpolation and editorial trimming. Jephthah, Gideon, and Samson are men of old heroic stamp, who would look as much in place in a Norse Saga as where they are; and if the varnish-brush of later respectability has passed over these memoirs of the mighty men of a wild age, here and there, it has not succeeded in effacing, or even in seriously obscuring, the essential characteristics of the theology traditionally ascribed to their epoch.

There is nothing that I have met with in the results of biblical criticism inconsistent with the conviction that these books give us a fairly trustworthy account of Israelitic life and thought in the times which they cover; and, as such, apart from the great literary merit of many of their episodes, they possess the interest of being perhaps

¹ Even the most sturdy believers in the popular theory that the proper or titular names attached to the books of the Bible are those of their authors will hardly be prepared to maintain that Jephthah, Gideon, and their colleagues wrote the book of Judges. Nor is it easily admissible that Samuel wrote the two books which pass under his name, one of which deals entirely with events which took place after his death. In fact, no one knows who wrote either Judges or Samuel, nor when, within the range of 100 years, their present form was given to these books.

the oldest genuine history, as apart from mere chronicles on the one hand and mere legends on the other, at present accessible to us

But it is often said with exultation by writers of one party, and often admitted more or less unwillingly by their opponents, that these books are untrustworthy, by reason of being full of obviously un-historic tales. And, as a notable example, the narrative of Saul's visit to the so-called 'witch of Endor' is often cited. As I have already intimated, I have nothing to do with theological partisanship either heterodox or orthodox, nor, for my present purpose, does it matter very much whether the story is historically true, or whether it merely shows what the writer believed; but, looking at the matter solely from the point of view of an anthropologist, I beg leave to express the opinion that the account of Saul's necromantic expedition is quite consistent with probability. That is to say, I see no reason whatever to doubt, firstly, that Saul made such a visit; and, secondly, that he and all who were present, including the wise-woman of Endor herself, would have given, with entire sincerity, very much the same account of the business as that which we now read in the twenty-eighth chapter of the first book of Samuel; and I am further of opinion that this story is one of the most important of those fossils to which I have referred in the material which it offers for the reconstruction of the theology of the time. Let us therefore study it attentively—not merely as a narrative which, in the dramatic force of its gruesome simplicity, is not surpassed, if it is equalled, by the witch scenes in *Macbeth*—but as a piece of evidence bearing on an important anthropological problem.

We are told (1 Sam. xxviii.) that Saul, encamped at Gilboa, became alarmed by the strength of the Philistine army gathered at Shunem. He therefore 'inquired of Jahveh,' but 'Jahveh answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets.'² Thus deserted by Jahveh, Saul, in his extremity, bethought him of 'those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards,' whom he is said, at some previous time, to have 'put out of the land;' but who seem, nevertheless, to have been very imperfectly banished, since Saul's servants, in answer to his command to seek him a woman 'that hath a familiar spirit,' reply without a sign of hesitation or of fear, 'Behold, there is a woman that hath a familiar spirit at Endor;' just as, in some parts of England, a countryman might tell any one who did not look like a magistrate or a policeman, where a 'wise-woman' was to be met with. Saul goes to this woman, who, after being assured of immunity, asks, 'Whom shall I bring up to thee?' whereupon Saul says, 'Bring me up Samuel.' The woman immediately sees an apparition. But to Saul nothing is visible, for he asks, 'What seest thou?' And the woman replies, 'I see Elohim coming up out of the earth.' Still the spectre remains invisible to Saul, for he asks, 'What form is he of?' And

² My citations are taken from the Revised Version; but for LORD and GOD I have substituted *Jahveh* and *Elohim*.

she replies, 'An old man cometh up, and he is covered with a robe.' So far, therefore, the wise-woman unquestionably plays the part of a 'medium,' and Saul is dependent upon her version of what happens.

The account continues:—

And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he bowed with his face to the ground and did obeisance. And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed for the Philistines make war against me, and Elohim is departed from me and answereth me no more, neither by prophets nor by dreams, therefore I have called thee that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do. And Samuel said, Wherefore then dost thou ask of me, seeing that Jahveh is departed from thee and is become thine adversary? And Jahveh hath wrought for himself, as he spake by me, and Jahveh hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand and given it to thy neighbour, even to David. Because thou obeyedst not the voice of Jahveh and didst not execute his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath Jahveh done this thing unto thee this day. Moreover, Jahveh will deliver Israel also with thee into the hand of the Philistines; and to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me. Jahveh shall deliver the host of Israel also into the hand of the Philistines. Then Saul fell straightway his full length upon the earth and was sore afraid because of the words of Samuel. . . . (v. 14-20).

The statement that Saul 'perceived' that it was Samuel is not to be taken to imply that, even now, Saul actually saw the shade of the prophet, but only that the woman's allusion to the prophetic mantle and to the aged appearance of the spectre convinced him that it was Samuel. Reuss³ in fact translates the passage 'Alors Saul reconnut que c'était Samuel.' Nor does the dialogue between Saul and Samuel necessarily, or probably, signify that Samuel spoke otherwise than by the voice of the wise-woman—the Septuagint does not hesitate to call her *ηγαστριμβος*, that is to say a ventriloquist, implying that it was she who spoke—and this view of the matter is in harmony with the fact that the exact sense of the Hebrew words which are translated as 'a woman that hath a familiar spirit' is 'a woman mistress of *Ob*.' *Ob* means primitively a leather bottle, such as a wine-skin, and is applied alike to the necromancer and to the spirit evoked. Its use in these senses appears to have been suggested by the likeness of the hollow sound emitted by a half-empty bottle of this kind, when struck, to the sepulchral tones in which the oracles of the evoked spirits were uttered by the medium. It is most probable that, in accordance with the general theory of spiritual influences which obtained among the old Israelites, the spirit of Samuel was conceived to pass into the body of the wise-woman, and to use her vocal organs to speak in his own name—for I cannot discover that they drew any clear distinction between possession and inspiration.

³ I need hardly say that I depend upon authoritative Biblical critics, whenever a question of interpretation of the text arises. As Reuss appears to me to be one of the most learned, acute, and fair-minded of those whose works I have studied, I have made most use of the commentary and dissertations in his splendid French edition of the Bible. But I have also had recourse to the works of Dillman, Kalisch, Kuenen, Thienus, Tuch, and others, in cases in which another opinion seemed desirable.

If the story of Saul's consultation of the occult powers is to be regarded as an authentic narrative, or, at any rate, as a statement which is perfectly veracious so far as the intention of the narrator goes—and, as I have said, I see no reason for refusing it this character—it will be found, on further consideration, to throw a flood of light, both directly and indirectly, on the theology of Saul's countrymen—that is to say upon their beliefs respecting the nature and ways of spiritual beings.

Even without the confirmation of other abundant evidences to the same effect, it leaves no doubt as to the existence among them of the fundamental doctrine that man consists of a body and of a spirit, which last, after the death of the body, continues to exist as a ghost. At the time of Saul's visit to Endor, Samuel was dead and buried; but that his spirit would be believed to continue to exist in Sheol may be concluded from the well-known passage in the song attributed to Hannah, his mother:—

Jahveh killeth and maketh alive,
He bringeth down to Sheol and bringeth up. (1 Sam. ii 6.)

And it is obvious that this Sheol was thought to be a place underground in which Samuel's spirit had been disturbed by the necromancer's summons, and in which, after his return thither, he would be joined by the spirits of Saul and his sons when they had met with their bodily death on the hill of Gilboa. It is further to be observed that the spirit, or ghost, of the dead man presents itself as the image of the man himself—it is the man not merely in his ordinary corporeal presentment (even down to the prophet's mantle) but in his moral and intellectual characteristics. Samuel, who had begun as Saul's friend and ended as his bitter enemy, gives it to be understood that he is annoyed at Saul's presumption in disturbing him; and that, in Sheol, he is as much the devoted servant of Jahveh, and as much empowered to speak in Jahveh's name, as he was during his sojourn in the upper air.

It appears now to be universally admitted that, before the exile, the Israelites had no belief in rewards and punishments after death, or in anything similar to the christian heaven and hell; but our story proves that it would be an error to suppose that they did not believe in the continuance of individual existence after death by a ghostly simulacrum of life. Nay, I think it would be very hard to produce conclusive evidence that they disbelieved in immortality; for I am not aware that there is anything to show that they thought the existence of the souls of the dead in Sheol ever came to an end. But they do not seem to have conceived that the condition of the souls in Sheol was in any way affected by their conduct in life. If there was immortality, there was no state of retribution in their theology. Samuel expects Saul and his sons to come to him in Sheol.

The next circumstance to be remarked is that the name of *Elohim*

is applied to the spirit which the woman sees 'coming up out of the earth,' that is to say from Sheol. The authorised version translates this in its literal sense 'gods.' The revised version gives 'god' with 'gods' in the margin. Reuss renders the word by 'spectre,' remarking in a note that it is not quite exact; but that the word Elohim expresses 'something divine, that is to say superhuman, commanding respect and terror' (*Histoire des Israelites*, p. 321). Tuch, in his commentary on Genesis, and Thenius, in his commentary on Samuel, express substantially the same opinion. Dr. Alexander (in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v. 'God') has the following instructive remarks:—

[*Elohim* is] sometimes used vaguely to describe unseen powers or superhuman beings that are not properly thought of as divine. Thus the witch of Endor saw 'Elohim ascending out of the earth' (1 Sam. xxviii. 13), meaning thereby some beings of an unearthly, superhuman character. So also in Zech. xii 8, it is said 'the house of David shall be as Elohim, as the angel of the Lord,' where, as the transition from Elohim to the angel of the Lord is a *minor ad majus*, we must regard the former as a vague designation of supernatural powers

Dr. Alexander speaks here of 'beings;' but as Elohim, a plural form, is very often used elsewhere with a verb in the singular, there is no reason to suppose that the wise-woman of Endor referred to anything but a solitary spectre, and it is quite clear that Saul understood her in this sense, or he asks, 'What form is HE of?'

This fact that the name of Elohim is applied to a ghost, or disembodied soul, conceived as the image of the body in which it once dwelt, is of no little importance. For it is well known that the same term was employed to denote the gods of the heathen, which were thought to have definite quasi-corporeal forms and to be as much real entities as any other Elohim.⁴ The difference which was supposed to exist between the different Elohim was one of degree, not one of kind. Elohim was, in logical terminology, the genus of which ghosts, Chemosh, Dagon, Baal, and Jahveh were species. The Israelite believed Jahveh to be immeasurably superior to all other kinds of Elohim. The inscription on the Moabite stone shows that King Mesa held Chemosh to be as unquestionably the superior of Jahveh. But if Jahveh was thus supposed to differ only in degree from the undoubtedly zoomorphic or anthropomorphic 'gods of the nations,' why is it to be assumed that he also was not thought of as having a human shape? It is possible for those who forget that the time of the great prophetic writers is at least as remote from that of Saul as our day is from that of Queen Elizabeth, to insist upon interpreting the gross notions, current in the earlier age and among

⁴ See, for example, the message of Jephthah to the King of the Ammonites: 'So now Jahveh, the Elohim of Israel, hath dispossessed the Amorites from before his people Israel, and shouldest thou possess them? Wilt not thou possess that which Chemosh, thy Elohim, giveth thee to possess?' (Judges xi. 23, 24). For Jephthah, Chemosh is obviously as real a personage as Jahveh.

the mass of the people, by the refined conceptions promulgated by a few select spirits centuries later. But if we take the language constantly used concerning the Deity in the books of Genesis, Exodus, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, or Kings, in its natural sense (and I am aware of no valid reason which can be given for taking it in any other sense), there cannot, to my mind, be a doubt that Jahveh was conceived, by those from whom the substance of these books is mainly derived, to possess the appearance and the intellectual and moral attributes of a man, and indeed of a man of just that type with which the Israelites were familiar in their stronger and intellectually abler rulers and leaders. In a well-known passage of Genesis (i. 27) Elohim is said to have 'created man in his own image, in the image of Elohim created he him.' It is 'man' who is here said to be the image of Elohim—not man's soul alone, still less his 'reason,' but the whole man. It is obvious that for those who called a manlike ghost, Elohim, there could be no difficulty in conceiving any other Elohim under the same aspect. And if there could be any doubt on this subject, surely it cannot stand in the face of what we find in the fifth chapter, where, immediately after a repetition of the statement that 'Elohim created man, in the likeness of Elohim made he him,' it is said that Adam begat Seth 'in his own likeness, after his image.' Does this mean that Seth resembled Adam only in a spiritual and figurative sense? And if that interpretation of the third verse of the fifth chapter of Genesis is absurd, why does it become reasonable in the first verse of the same chapter?

But let us go further. Is not the Jahveh who 'walks in the garden in the cool of the day;' from whom one may hope to 'hide oneself among the trees;' of whom it is expressly said that 'Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel,' 'saw the Elohim of Israel' (Exodus xxiv. 9-11); and that, although the seeing Jahveh was understood to be a high crime and misdemeanour, worthy of death, under ordinary circumstances, yet, for this once, he 'laid not his hand on the nobles of Israel;' 'that they beheld Elohim and did eat and drink;' and that afterwards Moses saw his back (Exodus xxxiii. 23)—is not this Deity conceived as manlike in form? Again, is not the Jahveh who eats with Abraham under the oaks at Mamre, who is pleased with the 'sweet savour' of Noah's sacrifice, to whom sacrifices are said to be 'food'^a—is not this Deity depicted as possessed of human appetites? If this were not the current Israelitish idea of Jahveh even in the eighth century B.C., where is the point of Isaiah's scathing admonitions to his countrymen: 'To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith Jahveh: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of

^a For example: 'My oblation, my food for my offerings made by fire, of a sweet savour to me, shall ye observe to offer unto me in their due season' (Numbers xxviii. 2).

he-goats' (Isaiah i. 11). Or of Micah's inquiry, 'Will Jahveh be pleased with thousands of rams or with ten thousands of rivers of oil?' (vi. 7). And, in the innumerable passages in which Jahveh is said to be jealous of other gods, to be angry, to be appeased, and to repent; in which he is represented as casting off Saul because the king does not quite literally execute a command of the most ruthless severity; or as smiting Uzzah to death because the unfortunate man thoughtlessly, but naturally enough, put out his hand to stay the ark from falling—can any one deny that the old Israelites conceived Jahveh not only in the image of a man, but in that of a changeable and, occasionally, violent man? There appears to me, then, to be no reason to doubt that the notion of likeness to man, which was indubitably held of the ghost Elohim, was carried out consistently through the whole series of Elohim, and that Jahveh-Elohim was thought of as a being of the same substantially human nature as the rest, only immeasurably more powerful for good and for evil.

The absence of any real distinction between the Elohim of different ranks is further clearly illustrated by the corresponding absence of any sharp delimitation between the various kinds of people who serve as the media of communication between them and men. The agents through whom the lower Elohim are consulted are called necromancers, wizards, and diviners, and are looked down upon by the prophets and priests of the higher Elohim; but the 'seer' connects the two, and they are all alike in their essential characters of media. The wise-woman of Endor was believed by others, and, I have little doubt, believed herself, to be able to 'bring up' whom she would from Sheol, and to be inspired, whether in virtue of actual possession by the evoked Elohim, or otherwise, with a knowledge of hidden things. I am unable to see that Saul's servant took any really different view of Samuel's powers, though he may have believed that he obtained them by the grace of the higher Elohim. For when Saul fails to find his father's asses, his servant says to him—

Behold now, there is in this city a man of Elohim, and he is a man that is held in honour; all that he saith cometh surely to pass: now let us go thither. peradventure he can tell us concerning our journey whereto we go. Then said Saul to his servant, But behold if we go, what shall we bring the man? for the bread is spent in our vessels and there is not a present to bring to the man of Elohim. What have we? And the servant answered Saul again and said, Behold I have in my hand the fourth part of a shekel of silver: that will I give to the man of Elohim to tell us our way. (Beforetime in Israel when a man went to inquire of Elohim, thus he said, Come and let us go to the seer: for he that is now called a Prophet was beforetime called a Seer.) (1 Samuel ix. 6-10.)

In fact, when, shortly afterwards, Saul accidentally meets Samuel, he says, 'Tell me, I pray thee, where the Seer's house is.' Samuel answers, 'I am the Seer.' Immediately afterwards Samuel informs

* In 2 Samuel xv. 27 David says to Zadok the priest, 'Art thou not a seer?' and Gad is called David's seer.

Saul that the asses are found, though how he obtained his knowledge of the fact is not stated. It will be observed that Samuel is not spoken of here as, in any special sense, a seer or prophet of Jahveh, but as a 'man of Elohim'—that is to say, a Seer having access to the 'spiritual powers,' just as the wise-woman of Endor might have been said to be a 'woman of Elohim'—and the narrator's or editor's explanatory note seems to indicate that 'Prophet' is merely a name introduced later than the time of Samuel for a superior kind of 'Seer,' or 'man of Elohim.'⁷

Another very instructive passage shows that Samuel was not only considered to be diviner, seer, and prophet in one, but that he was also, to all intents and purposes, priest of Jahveh—though, according to his biographer, he was not a member of the tribe of Levi. At the outset of their acquaintance, Samuel says to Saul, 'Go up before me into the high place,' where, as the young maidens of the city had just before told Saul, the Seer was going, 'for the people will not eat until he come, because he doth bless the sacrifice' (1 Sam. ix. 13). The use of the word 'bless' here—as if Samuel were not going to sacrifice, but only to offer a blessing or thanksgiving—is curious. But that Samuel really acted as priest seems plain from what follows. For he not only asks Saul to share in the customary sacrificial feast, but he disposes in Saul's favour of that portion of the victim which the Levitical legislation, doubtless embodying old customs, recognises as the priest's special property.⁸

Although particular persons adopted the profession of media between men and Elohim, there was no limitation of the power, in the view of ancient Israel, to any special class of the population. Saul inquires of Jahveh and builds him altars on his own account; and in the very remarkable story told in the fourteenth chapter of the first book of Samuel (v. 37-46), Saul appears to conduct the whole process of divination, although he has a priest at his elbow. David seems to do the same.

Moreover, Elohim constantly appears in dreams—which in old Israel did not mean that, as we should say, the subject of the appearance 'dreamed he saw the spirit;' but that he veritably saw the Elohim which, as a soul, visited his soul while his body was

⁷ This would at first appear to be inconsistent with the use of the word 'prophetess' for Deborah. But it does not follow because the writer of Judges applies the name to Deborah that it was used in her day.

⁸ Samuel tells the cook, 'Bring the portion which I gave thee, of which I said to thee, Set it by thee'—was therefore Samuel's to give. 'And the cook took up the thigh (or shoulder) and that which was upon it and set it before Saul.' But in the Levitical regulations it is the thigh (or shoulder) which becomes the priest's own property. 'And the right thigh (or shoulder) shall ye give unto the priest for an heave-offering,' which is given along with the wave breast 'unto Aaron the priest and unto his sons as a due for ever from the children of Israel' (Leviticus viii. 31-34). Reuss writes on this passage 'La cuisse n'est point agitée, mais simplement *prélevée* sur ce que les convives mangent.'

asleep. And in the course of the history of Israel Jahveh himself thus appears to all sorts of persons, non-Israelites as well as Israelites. Again, the Elohim possess, or inspire, people against their will, as in the case of Saul and Saul's messengers, and then these people prophesy—that is to say 'rave'—and exhibit the ungoverned gestures attributed by a later age to possession by malignant spirits. Apart from other evidence to be adduced by-and-by, the history of ancient demonology and of modern revivalism does not permit me to doubt that the accounts of these phenomena given in the history of Saul may be perfectly historical.

In the ritual practices of which evidence is to be found in the books of Judges and Samuel, the chief part is played by sacrifices, usually burnt offerings. Whenever the aid of the Elohim of Israel is sought, or thanks are considered due to him, an altar is built, and oxen, sheep, and goats are slaughtered and offered up. Sometimes the entire victim is burnt as a holocaust; more frequently, only certain parts, notably the fat about the kidneys, are burnt on the altar. The rest is properly cooked; and, after the reservation of a part for the priest, is made the foundation of a joyous banquet, in which the sacrificer, his family, and such guests as he thinks fit to invite, participate.⁹ Elohim was supposed to share in the feast; and it has been already shown that the portion which was set apart on the altar or consumed by fire was spoken of as the food of Elohim, who was thought to be influenced in favour of the sacrificer by the costliness, or the pleasant smell, of the sacrifice.

All this bears out the view that, in the mind of the old Israelite, there was no difference save one of degree between one Elohim and another. It is true that there is but little direct evidence to show that the old Israelites shared the widespread belief of their own, and indeed of all, times that the spirits of the dead not only continue to exist, but are capable of a ghostly kind of feeding and are grateful for such aliment as can be assimilated by their attenuated substance and even for clothes, ornaments, and weapons.¹⁰ That they were familiar with this doctrine in the time of the captivity is suggested by the well-known reference of Ezekiel (xxxii. 27) to the 'mighty men that are fallen of the uncircumcised, which are gone down to Sheol with their weapons of war and have laid their swords under their heads.' Perhaps there is a still earlier allusion in the 'giving of food for the dead' spoken of in Deuteronomy (xxvi. 14).¹¹

⁹ See, for example, Elkanah's sacrifice, 1 Sam.

¹⁰ The ghost was not supposed to be capable of devouring the gross, material substance of the offering; but his vaporous body appropriated the smoke of the burnt sacrifice, the visible and odorous exhalations of other offerings. The blood of the victim was particularly useful because it was thought to be the special seat of its soul or life. A West African negro replied to a European sceptic: 'Of course, the spirit cannot eat corporeal food, but he extracts its spiritual part, and, as we see, leaves the material part behind' (Lippert, *Seelenlehre*, p. 16).

¹¹ It is further well worth consideration whether, as Lippert suggests, indications of former ancestor-worship are not to be found in the singular weight attached to the

It must be remembered that the literature of the old Israelites, as it lies before us, has been subjected to the revisal of strictly monotheistic editors, violently opposed to all kinds of idolatry, who are not likely to have selected from the materials at their disposal any obvious evidence, either of the practice under discussion, or of that ancestor-worship which is so closely related to it, for preservation in the permanent records of their people.

The mysterious objects known as *Teraphim*, which are occasionally mentioned in Judges, Samuel, and elsewhere, however, can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as indications of the existence both of ancestor-worship and of image-worship in old Israel. The teraphim were certainly images of family gods, and, as such, in all probability represented deceased ancestors. Laban indignantly demands of his son-in-law 'Wherefore hast thou stolen my Elohim?' which Rachel, who must be assumed to have worshipped Jacob's God, Jahveh, had carried off, obviously because she, like her father, believed in their divinity. It is not suggested that Jacob was in any way scandalised by the idolatrous practices of his favourite wife, whatever he may have thought of her honesty, when the truth came to light; for the teraphim seem to have remained in his camp, at least until he 'hid' his strange gods 'under the oak that was by Shechem' (Genesis xxxv. 4). And, indeed, it is open to question if he got rid of them then, for the subsequent history of Israel renders it more than doubtful whether the teraphim were regarded as 'strange gods' even as late as the eighth century B.C. The writer of the books of Samuel takes it quite as a matter of course that Michal, daughter of one royal Jahveh worshipper and wife of the servant of Jahveh *par excellence*, the pious David, should have her teraphim handy in her and David's chamber, when she dresses them up in their bed into a simulation of her husband, for the purpose of deceiving her father's messengers.

Even one of the early prophets, Hosea, when he threatens that the children of Israel shall abide many days without 'ephod or teraphim' (iii. 4), appears to regard both as equally proper appurtenances of the suspended worship of Jahveh, and equally certain to be restored when that is resumed. When we further take into consideration that, only in the reign of Hezekiah, was the brazen

eneration of parents in the fourth commandment. It is the only positive commandment in addition to those respecting the Deity and that concerning the Sabbath, and the penalties for infringing it were of the same character. In China, a corresponding reverence for parents is part and parcel of ancestor-worship; so in ancient Rome and in Greece (where parents were even called *θεοὶ καὶ ἐπίχριοι θεοί*).—The fifth commandment, as it stands, would be an excellent compromise between ancestor-worship and monotheism. The larger hereditary share allotted by Israelitic law to the eldest son reminds one of the privileges attached to primogeniture in ancient Rome, which were closely connected with ancestor-worship. There is a good deal to be said in favour of the speculation that the ark of the covenant may have been a relic of ancestor-worship; but that topic is too large to be dealt with incidentally in this place.

serpent, preserved in the temple and believed to be the work of Moses, destroyed, and the practice of offering incense to it, that is, worshipping it, abolished—that Jeroboam could set up ‘calves of gold’ for Israel to worship, with apparently none but a political object, and certainly with no notion of creating a schism among the worshippers of Jahveh, or repelling the men of Judah from his standard—it seems obvious, either that the Israelites of the tenth and eleventh centuries B.C. knew not the second commandment, or that they construed it merely as part of the prohibition to worship any supreme god other than Jahveh, which precedes it.

In seeking for information about the teraphim, I lighted upon the following passage in the valuable article on that subject by Canon Farrar, in Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, which is so much to the purpose of my argument, that I venture to quote it in full:—

The main and certain results of this review are that the teraphim were rude human images, that the use of them was an antique Aramaic custom, that there is reason to suppose them to have been images of deceased ancestors, that they were consulted oracularly; that they were not confined to Jews; that their use continued down to the latest period of Jewish history; and lastly, that although the enlightened prophets and strictest later kings regarded them as idolatrous, the priests were much less averse to such images, and their cult was not considered in any way repugnant to the pious worship of Elohim, nay even to the worship of him ‘under the awful title of Jehovah’ In fact, they involved a *monotheistic idolatry very different indeed from polytheism*; and the tolerance of them by priests, as compared with the denunciation of them by the prophets, offers a close analogy to the views of the Roman Catholics respecting pictures and images as compared with the views of Protestants. It was against this use of idolatrous symbols and emblems in a monotheistic worship that the *second* commandment was directed, whereas the first is aimed against the graver sin of direct polytheism. But the whole history of Israel shows how utterly and how early the law must have fallen into desuetude. The worship of the golden calf and of the calves at Dan and Bethel, against which, so far as we know, neither Elijah nor Elisha said a single word, the tolerance of high places, teraphim and betylia; the offering of incense for centuries to the brazen serpent destroyed by Hezekiah, the occasional glimpses of the most startling irregularities sanctioned apparently even in the temple worship itself, prove most decisively that a pure monotheism and an independence of symbols was the result of a slow and painful course of God's disciplinary dealings among the noblest thinkers of a single nation, and not, as is so constantly and erroneously urged, the instinct of the whole Semitic race; in other words, one single branch of the Semites was under God's providence *educated* into pure monotheism only by centuries of misfortune and series of inspired men. (Vol. iii. p. 986.)

It appears to me that the researches of the anthropologist lead him to conclusions identical in substance, if not in terms, with those here enunciated as the result of a careful study of the same subject from a totally different point of view.

There is abundant evidence in the books of Samuel and elsewhere that an article of dress termed an *ephod* was supposed to have a peculiar efficacy in enabling the wearer to exercise divination by means of Jahveh-Elohim. Great and long continued have been the

disputes as to the exact nature of the ephod—whether it always means something to wear, or whether it sometimes means an image. But the probabilities are that it always signifies a kind of waistcoat or broad zone, provided with shoulder-straps, which the person who ‘inquired of Jahveh’ put on. In 1 Samuel xxiii. 2 David appears to have inquired without an ephod, for Abiathar the priest is said to have ‘come down with an ephod in his hand’ only subsequently. And then David asks for it before inquiring of Jahveh whether the men of Keilah would betray him or not. David’s action is obviously divination pure and simple; and it is curious that he seems to have worn the ephod himself and not to have employed Abiathar as a medium. How the answer was given is not clear, though the probability is that it was obtained by casting lots. The *Urim* and *Thummim* seem to have been two such lots of a peculiarly sacred character, which were carried in the pocket of the high-priest’s ‘breast plate.’ This last was worn along with the ephod.

With the exception of one passage (1 Sam. xiv. 18) the Ark is ignored in the history of Saul. But in this place, the Septuagint reads ‘ephod’ for ark, while in 1 Chronicles xiii. 3 David says that ‘we sought not unto it [the Ark] in the days of Saul.’ Nor does Samuel seem to have paid any regard to the ark after its return from Philistia; though, in his childhood, he is said to have slept in ‘the temple of Jahveh where the ark of Elohim was’ (1 Sam. iii. 3) at Shiloh, and there to have been the seer of the earliest apparitions vouchsafed to him by Jahveh. The space between the cherubim, or winged images, on the canopy or cover (*Kapporeth*) of this holy chest was held to be the special seat of Jahveh—the place selected for a temporary residence of the Supreme Elohim who had, after Aaron and Phineas, Eli and his sons for priests and seers. And when the ark was carried to the camp at Eben-ezer there can be no doubt that the Israelites, no less than the Philistines, held that ‘Elohim is come into the camp’ (iv. 7), and that the one as much as the other conceived that the Israelites had summoned to their aid a powerful ally in ‘these (or this) mighty Elohim’—elsewhere called Jahve-Sabaoth, the Jahveh of Hosts. If the ‘temple’ at Shiloh was the Pentateuchal tabernacle, as is suggested by the name of ‘tent of meeting’ given to it in 1 Sam. ii. 22, it was essentially a large tent, though constituted of very expensive and ornate materials; if, on the other hand, it was a different edifice, there can be little doubt that this ‘house of Jahveh’ was built on the model of an ordinary house of the time. But there is not the slightest evidence that, during the reign of Saul, any greater importance attached to this seat of the cult of Jahveh than to others. Sanctuaries, and ‘high places’ for sacrifice, were scattered all over the country from Dan to Beersheba. And as Samuel is said to have gone up to one of these high places to bless the sacrifice, it may be taken for tolerably certain that he knew

nothing of the Levitical laws which severely condemn the high places and those who sacrifice away from the sanctuary hallowed by the presence of the ark.

There is no evidence that during the time of the Judges and of Samuel any one occupied the position of the high-priest of later days. And persons who were neither priests nor Levites sacrificed and divined or 'inquired of Jahveh' when they pleased and where they pleased, without the least indication that they, or any one else in Israel at that time, knew they were doing wrong. There is no allusion to any special observance of the Sabbath; and the references to circumcision are indirect.

Such are the chief articles of the theological creed of the old Israelites, which are made known to us by the direct evidence of the ancient records to which we have had recourse, and they are as remarkable for that which they contain as for that which is absent from them. They reveal a firm conviction that, when death takes place, a something termed a soul, or spirit, leaves the body and continues to exist in Sheol for a period of indefinite duration, even though there is no proof of any belief in absolute immortality; that such spirits can return to earth to possess and inspire the living; that they are, in appearance and in disposition, likenesses of the men to whom they belonged, but that, as spirits, they have larger powers and are freer from physical limitations; that they thus form one of a number of kinds of spiritual existences known as Elohim, of whom Jahveh, the national God of Israel, is one; that, consistently with this view, Jahveh was conceived as a sort of spirit, human in aspect and in senses, and with many human passions, but with immensely greater intelligence and power than any other Elohim, whether human or divine. Further, the evidence proves that this belief was the basis of the Jahveh-worship to which Samuel and his followers were devoted; that there is strong reason for believing, and none for doubting, that idolatry, in the shape of the worship of the family gods, or teraphim, was practised by sincere and devout Jahveh-worshippers; that the ark, with its protective tent or tabernacle, was regarded as a specially but by no means exclusively favoured sanctuary of Jahveh; that an ephod appears to have had a particular value for those who desired to divine by the help of Jahveh; and that divination by lots was practised before Jahveh. On the other hand, there is not the slightest evidence of any belief in retribution after death, but the contrary; ritual obligations have at least as strong sanction as moral; there are clear indications that some of the most stringent of the Levitical laws were unknown even to Samuel; priests often appear to be superseded by laymen, even in the performance of sacrifices and divination; and no line of demarcation can be drawn between necromancer, wizard, seer, prophet, and priest, each of whom

is regarded, like all the rest, as a medium of communication between the world of Elohim and that of living men.

The theological system, thus defined, offers to the anthropologist no feature which is devoid of a parallel in the known theologies of other races of mankind, even of those who inhabit parts of the world most remote from Palestine. And the foundation of the whole, the ghost theory, is exactly that theological speculation which is the most widely spread of all, and the most deeply rooted among uncivilised men. I am able to base this statement, to some extent, on facts within my own knowledge. In December 1848, H.M.S. 'Rattlesnake,' the ship to which I then belonged, was anchored off Mount Ernest, an island in Torres Straits. The people were few and well disposed, and when a friend of mine (whom I will call B.) and I went ashore we made acquaintance with an old native, Paouda by name. In course of time we became quite intimate with the old gentleman, partly by the rendering of mutual good offices, but chiefly because Paouda believed he had discovered that B. was his father-in-law. And his grounds for this singular conviction were very remarkable. We had made a long stay at Cape York hard by, and, in accordance with a theory which is widely held among the Australians, that white men are the re-incarnated spirits of black men, B. was held to be the ghost, or *narki*, of a certain Mount Ernest native, one Antarki, who had lately died, on the ground of some real or fancied resemblance to the latter. Now Paouda had taken to wife a daughter of Antarki's, named Domani, and as soon as B. informed him that he was the ghost of Antarki, Paouda at once admitted the relationship and acted upon it. For as all the women on the island had hidden away in fear of the ship, and we were anxious to see what they were like, B. pleaded pathetically with Paouda that it would be very unkind not to let him see his daughter and grandchildren. After a good deal of hesitation and the exaction of pledges of deep secrecy, Paouda consented to take B., and myself as B.'s friend, to see Domani and the three daughters, by whom B. was received quite as one of the family, while I was courteously welcomed on his account.

This scene made an impression upon me which is not yet effaced. It left no question on my mind of the sincerity of the strange ghost theory of these savages, and of the influence which their belief has on their practical life. I had it in my mind, as well as many a like result of subsequent anthropological studies, when, in 1869,¹² I wrote as follows:—

There are savages without God in any proper sense of the word, but none without ghosts. And the Fetishism, Ancestor-worship, Hero-worship, and Demonology of primitive savages are all, I believe, different manners of expression of their

¹² 'The Scientific Aspects of Positivism,' *Fortnightly Review*, 1869, republished in 'Lay Sermons.'

belief in ghosts, and of the anthropomorphic interpretation of out-of-the-way events which is its concomitant. Witchcraft and sorcery are the practical expressions of these beliefs; and they stand in the same relation to religious worship as the simple anthropomorphism of children or savages does to theology.

I do not quote myself with any intention of making a claim to originality in putting forth this view; for I have since discovered that the same conception is virtually contained in the great *Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle* of Bossuet, now more than two centuries old:—

Le culte des hommes morts faisoit presque tout le fond de l'idolâtrie: presque tous les hommes sacrifioient aux mânes, c'est-à-dire aux âmes des morts. De si anciennes erreurs nous font voir à la vérité combien étoit ancienne la croyance de l'immortalité de l'âme, et nous montrent qu'elle doit être rangée parmi les premières traditions du genre humain. Mais l'homme, qui gâtoit tout, en avoit étrangement abusé, puisqu'elle le portoit à sacrifier aux morts. On alloit même jusqu'à cet excès, de leur sacrifier des hommes vivans on tuoit leurs esclaves, et même leurs femmes, pour les aller servir dans l'autre monde.¹³

Among more modern writers J. G. Muller, in his excellent *Geschichte der amerikanischen Urreligionen* (1855) clearly recognises 'gespensterhafter Geisterglaube' as the foundation of all savage and semicivilised theology, and I need do no more than mention the important developments of the same view which are to be found in Mr. Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, and in the writings of Mr. Herbert Spencer, especially his recently published *Ecclesiastical Institutions*.¹⁴

It is a matter of fact that, whether we direct our attention to the older conditions of civilised societies, in Japan, in China, in Hindostan, in Greece, or in Rome,¹⁵ we find, underlying all other theological notions, the belief in ghosts, with its inevitable concomitant, sorcery; and a primitive cult in the shape of a worship of ancestors, which is essentially an attempt to please, or appease, their ghosts. The same thing is true of old Mexico and Peru, and of every semicivilised or savage people who have developed a definite cult; and in those who, like the natives of Australia, have not even a cult, the belief in, and fear of, ghosts is as strong as anywhere else. One of the most clearly demonstrable articles of the theology of the Israelites in the eleventh and twelfth centuries B.C. is therefore simply the article which is to be found in all primitive theologies; namely, the belief that a man has a soul which continues to exist

¹³ *Œuvres de Bossuet*, ed. 1808, t. xxxv. p. 282.

¹⁴ I should like further to add the expression of my indebtedness to two works by Herr Julius Lippert, *Der Seelencult in seinen Beziehungen zur alt-hebraischen Religion*, and *Die Religionen der europäischen Kulturvölker*, both published in 1881. I have found them full of valuable suggestions.

¹⁵ See among others the remarkable work of Fustel de Coulanges, *La cité antique*, in which the social importance of the old Roman ancestor-worship is brought out with great clearness.

after death for a longer or shorter time, and may return, as a ghost, with a divine or, at least, demonic character, to influence for good or evil (and usually for evil) the affairs of the living. But the correspondence between the old Israelitic and other archaic forms of theology extends to details. If, in order to avoid all chance of direct communication, we compare the former with the theology of semi-civilised people, separated by the greatest possible distance and by every conceivable barrier from the inhabitants of Palestine, such as the Polynesian Islanders, we shall find, not merely that all the features of old-Israelitic theology which are shown in the records cited are found among them, but that extant information as to the inner mind of these people tends to remove many of the difficulties which those who have not studied anthropology find in the Hebrew narrative.

One of the best sources, if not the best source, of information on these topics is Mariner's *Tonga Islands*, which tells us of the condition of Cook's Friendly Islanders eighty years ago, before European influence was sensibly felt among them. Mariner, a youth of fair education and of no inconsiderable natural ability (as the work which was drawn up from the materials he furnished shows), was about fifteen years of age when his ship was attacked and plundered by the Tongans; he remained four years in the islands, familiarized himself with the language, lived the life of the people, became intimate with many of them, and had every opportunity of acquainting himself with their opinions as well as with their habits and customs. He seems to have been devoid of prejudices, theological or other, and the impression of strict accuracy which his statements convey has been justified by all the knowledge of Polynesian life which has been subsequently acquired.

It is desirable, therefore, to pay close attention to that which Mariner tells us about the theological views of these people:—

The human soul,¹⁶ after its separation from the body, is termed a *hotooa* (a god or spirit), and is believed to exist in the shape of the body; to have the same propensities as during life, but to be corrected by a more enlightened understanding by which it readily distinguishes good from evil, truth from falsehood, right from wrong; having the same attributes as the original gods but in a minor degree, and having its dwelling for ever in the happy regions of Bolotoo, holding the same rank in regard to other souls as during this life; it has, however, the power of returning to Tonga to inspire priests, relations, or others, or to appear in dreams to those it wishes to admonish; and sometimes to the external eye in the form of a ghost or apparition; but this power of reappearance at Tonga particularly belongs to the souls of chiefs rather than of matabooles. (Vol. ii. p. 130.)

The word 'hotooa' is the same as that which is usually spelt 'atua' by Polynesian philologues, and it will be convenient to adopt

¹⁶ Supposed to be 'the finer or more aciform part of the body,' standing in 'the same relation to the body as the perfume and the more essential qualities of a flower do to the more solid substances.' (Mariner, ii. p. 127.)

this spelling. Now under this head of 'Atuas or supernatural intelligent beings' the Tongans included—

1. The original Gods. 2. The souls of nobles that have all attributes in common with the first but inferior in degree. 3. The souls of matabooles¹⁷ that are still inferior, and have not the power as the two first have of coming back to Tonga to inspire the priests, though they are supposed to have the power of appearing to their relatives. 4. The original attendants or servants, as it were, of the gods, who, although they had their origin and have ever since existed in Bolotoo, are still inferior to the third class. 5. The *Atua pow* or mischievous gods. 6. *Moon*, or the god that supports the earth and does not belong to Bolotoo. (Vol. ii. pp. 103-4)

From this it appears that the 'Atuas' of the Polynesian are exactly equivalent to the 'Elohim' of the old Israelite.¹⁸ They comprise everything spiritual, from a ghost to a god, and from 'the merely tutelary gods to particular private families' (vol. ii. p. 104), to Tâ-li-y-Toobô, who was the national god of Tonga. The Tongans had no doubt that these Atuas daily and hourly influenced their destinies and could conversely be influenced by them. Hence their 'piety,' the incessant acts of sacrificial worship which occupied their lives, and their belief in omens and charms. Moreover, the Atuas were believed to visit particular persons—their own priests in the case of the higher gods, but apparently anybody in that of the lower—and to inspire them by a process which was conceived to involve the actual residence of the god, for the time being, in the person inspired, who was thus rendered capable of prophesying (vol. ii. p. 100). For the Tongan, therefore, inspiration indubitably was possession.

When one of the higher gods was invoked through his priest by a chief who wished to consult the oracle, or, in old Israelitic phraseology, to 'inquire of,' the god, a hog was killed and cooked over night, and, together with plantains, yams, and the materials for making the peculiar drink *kava* (of which the Tongans were very fond) was carried next day to the priest. A circle, as for an ordinary *kava*-drinking entertainment, was then formed; but the priest, as the representative of the god, took the highest place, while the chiefs sat outside the circle, as an expression of humility calculated to please the god.

As soon as they are all seated the priest is considered as inspired, the god being supposed to exist within him from that moment. He remains for a considerable time in silence with his hands clasped before him, his eyes are cast down and he rests perfectly still. During the time the victuals are being shared out and the *kava* preparing, the matabooles sometimes begin to consult him; sometimes he answers, and at other times not; in either case he remains with his eyes cast down. Frequently he will not utter a word till the repast is finished and the *kava* too. When he speaks he generally begins in a low and very altered tone of voice, which

¹⁷ A kind of 'clients' in the Roman sense

¹⁸ It is worthy of remark that *δαίμων* among the Greeks, and *Deus* among the Romans, had the same wide signification. The *dii manes* were ghosts of ancestors = Atuas of the family.

gradually rises to nearly its natural pitch, though sometimes a little above it. All that he says is supposed to be the declaration of the god, and he accordingly speaks in the first person, as if he were the god. All this is done generally without any apparent inward emotion or outward agitation, but, on some occasions, his countenance becomes fierce, and as it were inflamed, and his whole frame agitated with inward feeling; he is seized with an universal trembling, the perspiration breaks out on his forehead, and his lips turning black are convulsed; at length tears start in floods from his eyes, his breast heaves with great emotion, and his utterance is choked. These symptoms gradually subside. Before this paroxysm comes on, and after it is over, he often eats as much as four hungry men under other circumstances could devour. The fit being now gone off, he remains for some time calm and then takes up a club that is placed by him for the purpose, turns it over and regards it attentively; he then looks up earnestly, now to the right, now to the left, and now again at the club; afterwards he looks up again and about him in like manner, and then again fixes his eyes on the club, and so on for several times. At length he suddenly raises the club, and, after a moment's pause, strikes the ground or the adjacent part of the house with considerable force; immediately the god leaves him, and he rises up and retires to the back of the ring among the people. (Vol. i. pp. 100-101.)

The phenomena thus described, in language which bears the stamp of fidelity to any one who is familiar with the manifestations of abnormal mental states among ourselves, furnish a most instructive commentary upon the story of the wise woman of Endor. As in the latter, we have the possession by the spirit or soul (*Atua*, *Elohim*), the strange voice, the speaking in the first person. Unfortunately nothing (beyond the loud cry) is mentioned as to the state of the wise woman of Endor. But what we learn from other sources (*e.g.* 1 Samuel x. 20-24) respecting the physical concomitants of inspiration among the old Israelites has its exact equivalent in this and other accounts of Polynesian prophetism. An excellent authority, Moerenhout, who lived among the people of the Society Islands many years and knew them well, says that, in *Tabiti*, the rôle of the prophet had very generally passed out of the hands of the priests into that of private persons who professed to represent the god, often assumed his name, and in this capacity prophesied. I will not run the risk of weakening the force of Moerenhout's description of the prophetic state by translating it.

Un individu, dans cet état, avait le bras gauche enveloppé d'un morceau d'étoffe, signe de la présence de la Divinité. Il ne parlait que d'un ton impérieux et véhément. Ses attaques, quand il allait prophétiser, étaient aussi effroyables qu'imposantes. Il tremblait d'abord de tous ses membres, la figure enflée, les yeux hagards, rouges et étincelants d'une expression sauvage. Il gesticulait, articulait des mots vides de sens, poussait des cris horribles qui faisaient tressaillir tous les assistants, et s'exaltait parfois au point qu'on n'osait pas l'approcher. Autour de lui, le silence de la terreur et du respect. . . . C'est alors qu'il répondait aux questions, annonçait l'avénir, le destin des batailles, la volonté des dieux; et, chose étonnante ! au sein de ce délire, de cet enthousiasme religieux, son langage était grave, imposant, son éloquence noble et persuasive.¹⁹

Just so Saul strips off his clothes, 'prophesies' before Samuel, and lies down 'naked all that day and night.'

¹⁹ *Voyages aux îles du Grand Océan*, t. 1 p. 482.

Both Mariner and Moerenhout refuse to have recourse to the hypothesis of imposture in order to account for the inspired state of the Polynesian prophets. On the contrary, they fully believe in their sincerity. Mariner tells the story of a young chief, an acquaintance of his, who thought himself possessed by the Atua of a dead woman who had fallen in love with him, and who wished him to die that he might be near her in Bolotoo. And he died accordingly. But the most valuable evidence on this head is contained in what the same authority says about King Finow's son. The previous king, Toogoo Aho, had been assassinated by Finow, and his soul, become an Atua of divine rank in Bolotoo, had been pleased to visit and inspire Finow's son—with what particular object does not appear.

When this young chief returned to Hapai, Mr. Mariner, who was upon a footing of great friendship with him, one day asked him how he felt himself when the spirit of Toogoo Aho visited him; he replied that he could not well describe his feelings, but the best he could say of it was, that he felt himself all over in a glow of heat and quite restless and uncomfortable, and did not feel his own personal identity, as it were, but seemed to have a mind different from his own natural mind, his thoughts wandering upon strange and unusual subjects, although perfectly sensible of surrounding objects. He next asked him how he knew it was the spirit of Toogoo Aho? His answer was, 'There's a fool! How can I tell you *how* I knew it? I felt and knew it was so by a kind of consciousness; my *mind* told me that it was Toogoo Aho.' (Vol. i. pp. 104-105)

Finow's son was evidently made for a theological disputant, and fell back at once on the inexpugnable stronghold of faith when other evidence was lacking. 'There's a fool: I know it is true, because I know it,' is the exemplar and epitome of the sceptic-crushing process in other places than the Tonga Islands.

The island of Bolotoo, to which all the souls (of the upper classes at any rate) repair after the death of the body, and from which they return at will to interfere for good or evil with the lives of those whom they have left behind, obviously answers to Sheol. In Tongan tradition, this place of souls is a sort of elysium above ground and pleasant enough to live in. But, in other parts of Polynesia, the corresponding locality, which is called Po, has to be reached by descending into the earth, and is represented as dark and gloomy as Sheol may have been. But it was not looked upon as a place of rewards and punishments in any sense. Whether in Bolotoo or in Po, the soul took the rank it had in the flesh; and, a shadow, jived among the shadows of the friends and houses and food of its previous life.

T. H. HUXLEY. .

(To be concluded)

*MR. GODKIN ON POPULAR
GOVERNMENT.*

MR. GODKIN'S observations on a portion of the volume which I have recently published under the name of 'Popular Government' are certainly not open to exception on the score of courtesy or candour, and the information which, as an American, he is able to contribute to the discussion of my subject seems to me to possess singular interest and value. But, while on a few points I am not confident that I understand his meaning, I am sure that on some others he has not understood mine; and I am glad to have an opportunity of pointing out what I did say, and what I intended to convey, in the parts of the book which he has criticised.

Mr. Godkin states that, after carefully perusing the volume, and especially the first chapter of it, on the 'Prospects of Popular Government,' he laid it down without getting a very clear idea of the lesson I undertook to teach. I have assuredly no reason to complain of the language in which this statement is made, but I own that it has disappointed me. I supposed that, at the beginning of the chapter in question, I had explained my undertaking with considerable distinctness, and that in the closing pages I had set forth with sufficient clearness the conclusion at which I had arrived. 'We, too,' I wrote, 'who belong to Western Europe towards the end of the nineteenth century, live under a set of institutions which all, except a small minority, regard as likely to be perpetual. Nine men out of ten, some hoping, some fearing, look upon the popular government which, ever widening its basis, has spread and is spreading over the world, as destined to last for ever; or, if it changes its form, to change it in one single direction. The democratic principle has gone forth, conquering and to conquer, and its gainsayers are few and feeble. . . . Nevertheless those who recollect the surprises which the future had in store for men equally confident in the perpetuity of the present will ask themselves whether it is really true that the expectation of virtual permanence for governments of the modern type rests upon solid grounds of historical experience as regards the past and rational probability as regards the time to come. I endeavour in these pages to examine the question.' I then proceeded to call attention to a number of facts which, important and significant as they are, are very seldom brought to notice. Except in England and the United States, the desire for popular government began in the admiration of the British Consti-

tution which sprang up in France in the eighteenth century. A series of attempts to apply its principles commenced rather less than a hundred years ago, with the result that popular governments were established at various times in France, in Spain and Portugal, in the Austrian and German States, in South and Central America, and in Mexico. All these popular governments resembled one another in being provided with an apparatus of institutions intended to enable a more or less numerous electorate to control the Executive and the Legislature; and the countries in which they were set up virtually included the whole of the civilised western world, except Great Britain and the United States. Nevertheless, in a comparatively short space of time these governments have all been swept away by military or civil revolution, in some cases repeatedly; and one particular dictatorial tyranny, founded on the ruins of a popular government, was close to our shores till the other day. In the preface to my book, I expressed the facts in this way: 'Popular Government, since its reintroduction into the world,¹ has proved itself to be extremely fragile.' The conclusion which I drew, after closing the inquiry upon which I had entered, is given at the end of my first chapter, and it appears to me to err rather on the side of timidity than of temerity. 'My chief conclusion (p. 53), I said, can only be stated negatively. There is not at present sufficient evidence to warrant the common belief that popular governments are likely to be of indefinitely long duration.' But I added that the inquiry had suggested to me one positive conclusion. 'It is not too much to say that the only evidence worth mentioning for the duration of popular government is to be found in the success of the British Constitution during two centuries under special conditions, and in the success of the American Constitution during one century under conditions still more peculiar and more unlikely to recur.' With regard to the stability of the British Constitution, I hinted some misgiving, though my doubts fall far short of those of a great German authority on these subjects, Gneist, who has just expressed his belief that we shall come back to government by the 'King in Council,' so serious are the difficulties of our Parliamentary institutions. But my opinion respecting the American Federal Constitution was emphasised in a later part of my book (p. 197). 'The United States of America, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Canadian lakes to the Mexican border, appear destined to remain for an indefinite time under the same political institutions; and there is no evidence that these will not continue to belong to the popular type.'

¹ Mr Godkin will excuse me from following him in a speculation as to what I can have meant by the 'reintroduction of Popular Government into the modern world.' The truth is that, by a *lapsus calami*, he has interpolated the word 'modern' in the passage quoted by him from my preface; the words really used are as above.

The conclusion which I have expressed negatively appears for some reason or other to be very unacceptable to Mr. Godkin. He says that 'nothing is more delusive in the work of political speculation than short periods of observation.' He taxes me with abusive employment of what Mill calls the 'chemical method of reasoning.' These objections have so very remote a bearing on the result to which I actually conducted my inquiry, that I cannot but suspect him of having unconsciously substituted in his mind some other proposition; probably a less cautious proposition, for that which I maintain. I am quite aware that if my inference had been more unguarded than it is—if for instance, I had asserted that because popular government has perished in a considerable number of countries (significant as the fact is), it is destined to perish some day everywhere—I should have laid myself open to some part of Mr. Godkin's observations. But I refrained from drawing this conclusion exactly because I admit the time of observation to be too short for a very confident opinion. If popular government should last for another century, even for half a century, the evidence will strike the observer of that day in a very different light from that in which it appears at present. And even if there has been a wholesale destruction of popular governments, the success and apparent durability of the United States may still forbid either a very general or a very confident conclusion.

I maintain, however, that the facts which I have brought together, and the potency of the causes to which I have attributed a portion of these facts, amply justify me in disputing a particular belief, and an assertion implied in that belief. I still deny that there is 'at present sufficient evidence to warrant the common belief that popular governments are likely to be of indefinitely long duration.' It is not by way of a mere idle exercise of scepticism that I attempt to cast doubt on this persuasion. It is excessively prevalent. I see from my own observation that it has a strong hold on youthful minds, and gives them a political bias which in my judgment is not always healthy. The impression which it carries with it, that popular government is of so robust a fibre as to bear safely any wrench or strain, has much to do with the wild proposals of demagogues for the structural dislocation of constitutions, and with the facility of statesmen in buying off party difficulties by the sacrifice of constitutional safeguards. I seek to discredit it, not merely because it is false, but because like Mr. Godkin I hold 'politics to be an extremely practical kind of business.' I do not by any means think it beyond the powers of the human intellect to mitigate or even to remove the infirmities of popular government. I attribute much the greatest part of the success of the Government of the United States, first of all to the conviction (perhaps to some extent an overstrained conviction) of the framers of the Federal Constitution that democracies

were naturally shortlived and difficult of management; and, next, to the foresight and sagacity with which they made express provision for neutralising the weaknesses of the government which they were establishing. But the statesman who believes that a popular government, and especially a wide popular government, is naturally a government of indefinitely long duration will at the utmost leave it to take care of itself.

It does not appear to me that the undertaking which I had in hand, and the conclusion to which it led me, raise properly any question of the employment, abusive or otherwise, of the 'chemical method of reasoning.' But I am bound to say that I do not subscribe to Mill's estimate of the value of appeals to the experience of States or societies of men. Mill, though not exclusively a deductive thinker, was mainly wedded to that method of reasoning, and he did not live long enough to have fully before his mind the more recent view of societies as organisms with a development and laws of their own. Immediately before the passage quoted from his 'Logic' by Mr. Godkin, Mill observes that 'human beings in society have no properties but those which are derived from, or may be resolved into, the laws of the nature of individual men.' I do not assent to this, but the present occasion would be so inconvenient for entering on the difficult question raised that I am glad to think it irrelevant to the subject before me.

The residue of Mr. Godkin's paper is a criticism and commentary on the opinion which I have expressed that democratic principles of legislation are likely 'to put an end to all social and political activities and arrest everything which has ever been associated with Liberalism.' I will begin by saying that Mr. Godkin gives me the impression that he is unaware how old are these apprehensions and how widely they are diffused. As Mill has been quoted against me, I may be pardoned for pointing out that his view of the probable future of democracy does not sensibly differ from mine. In the course of the admirable paper on Bentham which he published in 1838, he is led to consider that writer's theory of government. The foundation of Bentham's political doctrine is, he says, that the best government of a State is government by the numerical majority. This majority, he points out, must necessarily consist of persons all standing in the same position and having the same pursuits, that is, of unskilled manual labourers. Is this fundamental doctrine of Bentham's political philosophy, he asks, a universal truth? Is it, at all times and places, good for mankind to be under the absolute authority of the majority of themselves?' It is chimerical to suppose that whoever has absolute power over men's bodies will not arrogate it over men's minds—will not seek to control opinions and feelings which depart from its standard, and to extinguish all books, all schools, all combinations of individuals for joint action upon society,

which may be attempted for keeping alive a spirit at variance with his own.² The result will be to make one narrow, mean type of human nature universal and perpetual, and to crush every influence which tends to the further improvement of man's intellectual and moral nature. Mill's conclusion is that it is on the whole right that the majority should be the paramount power in society, but that 'unless some centre of resistance can be found round which all the moral and social elements which the ruling power views with disfavour may cluster themselves,' the human race will degenerate, and the United States may become even as China. In his later life Mill appeared to find this 'centre of resistance' in the representation of minorities, but in 1838 he could only see the possibility of its discovery through the method of Montesquieu as it might be applied by De Tocqueville. Doubtless these opinions, which closely correspond to my own, were given to the world nearly fifty years ago. But I have much reason for believing that they are widely entertained at this moment by leaders of scientific thought and inquiry on the Continent who are sagacious enough to perceive that a common quarrel on certain points with the Church is not a sufficient basis for an alliance with democracy. In a book published only the other day, the *Nouvelles Lettres d'Italie* of M. Emile de Laveleye, I find the same misgivings most energetically expressed by an Italian man of letters and science who was also an experienced politician. The writer, who died quite recently, was Dr. Pantaleone, of Rome.

Our age (he says), which professes the worship of science everywhere, hands over power to the classes which are the antipodes of science and knowledge. Suppose, on the one hand, the masses were addressed by a superior and truly learned man, who appreciated the difficulties included in political and social questions and stated them clearly; and on the other, by an orator of low estate who was ignorant of the first principles of those questions but who flattered the instincts and appetites of the crowd, which of the two would be listened to and elected? . . . Thus, in proportion as government becomes a more difficult art, you trust it to people who are more and more unintellectual and incapable. Is not this to prepare your own downfall? When I see our statesmen becoming apostles of universal suffrage, and throwing the treasures of civilisation, which the best men of our kind have accumulated through centuries of toil, as pabulum to this flock of bipeds who are . . . in no state to discover even what is for their true interest, I am astonished at the extreme of blindness shown by men who are in some respects most enlightened. I can only ascribe it to the influence of an epidemic peculiar to our time, the *morbus democraticus*.

I have myself attempted to carry the argument a little further in a passage which Mr. Godkin has quoted, but which I am afraid I must quote again:—

Such a suffrage (a widely extended or universal suffrage) is commonly associated with Radicalism; no doubt, amid its most certain effects would be the extensive destruction of the existing institutions; but the chances are that in the long

² *Dissertations and Discussions*, vol. i. p. 378.

run it would produce a mischievous form of Conservatism, and drug society with a potion compared with which Eldonine would be a salutary draught. For to what end, towards what ideal state, is the process of stamping upon law the average opinion of an entire community directed? The end arrived at is identical with that of the Roman Catholic Church, which attributes a similar sacredness to the average opinion of the Christian world. 'Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus' was the canon of Vincent of Lerins. 'Securus judicat orbis terrarum' were the words which rang in the ears of Newman and produced such marvellous effects on him. But did any one in his senses ever suppose that these were maxims of progress? The principles of legislation at which they point would put an end to all social and political activities, and arrest everything which has ever been associated with Liberalism. A moment's reflection will satisfy any competently instructed person that this is not too broad a proposition. Let him turn over in his mind the great epochs of scientific invention and social change during the last two centuries and consider what would have occurred if universal suffrage had been established at any one of them. Universal suffrage which to-day excludes free-trade from the United States would certainly have prohibited the spinning-jenny and the power-loom. It would certainly have forbidden the threshing-machine. It would have forbidden the adoption of the Gregorian Calendar, and would have restored the Stuarts (p. 36).³

Mr. Godkin calls these deductions extraordinary. He has searched as carefully as he could for their basis. He thinks they were arrived at by the *à priori* method 'with a vengeance.' He observes that in no place has universal suffrage done anything like prohibiting a spinning-jenny or the threshing machine, or preventing the adoption of the Gregorian Calendar. He has not understood the argument, possibly through my own fault, in making tacit, instead of explicit, reference to events which I supposed to be extensively known. It is of course quite possible that they are not as clearly present to the mind of a highly educated American as they would be to an Englishman. As a matter of fact, they are among the most striking occurrences of the eighteenth and of the earlier part of the nineteenth centuries. In 1716 the notorious Jacobitism of the English masses, and the danger with which it menaced the establishment of the House of Hanover, already shaken by a rebellion, led the English Parliament to take one of the most remarkable steps in its history by passing the Septennial Act and prolonging its own existence from three years to seven.⁴ In 1751, the Act which introduced the Gregorian Calendar was passed. 'Great difficulty was found in appeasing the clamour of the people against it. . . . Years elapsed before

³ The last words of this passage which might have given Mr. Godkin a clue to my meaning are not quoted by him. 'It would have proscribed the Roman Catholics with the mob which burned Lord Mansfield's house and library in 1780, and it would have proscribed the Dissenters with the mob which burned Dr. Priestley's house and library in 1791.'

⁴ The Septennial Act (1 Geo. I. stat. 2, c. 38) recites in its preamble that Triennial Parliaments, if they should continue, may probably at this juncture, when a restless and popish faction are designing and endeavouring to renew the rebellion within this kingdom, be destructive of the peace and security of the government.

the people were fully reconciled to the new regulation.’⁵ In 1767, a series of destructive riots began, directed against the spinning-jenny which had just been invented by Hargreaves.⁶ They lasted till 1779 and spread through the then manufacturing counties. Many mills were burnt; Peel’s machinery was broken to pieces and thrown into the river; Arkwright’s mills were wrecked and destroyed. The riots broke out again in 1812, now principally aimed at the lace-frames and stocking-knitting machinery which had been introduced into Nottinghamshire. Under an imaginary leader, General Ludd, they lasted till 1816, and were only put down by the unsparing severity of the criminal law. The terrible phantom, General Ludd, was before long succeeded by another, Captain Swing. The threshing-machine had been invented in the eighteenth century, but it did not come into common use till the earlier part of the nineteenth. The rick-burning and farm-burning, which began at about 1826 and lasted till after 1830, were believed by the most competent authorities to have been provoked by the earliest agricultural inventions, though their spread may be partly accounted for by the fact that incendiarism is one of the most contagious of crimes.

My argument, then, is that, if universal suffrage had been introduced into this country at the time when these violent prejudices existed—that is, if the classes who shared these prejudices had governed the country—they would have given effect to their opinions, not simply by rioting and violence, but by law. They would have found leaders who justified their hostility to machinery as unfairly competing with human labour, and they would have elected Parliaments in which their leaders would have been supreme. The new machines would have been treated just as a machine of another order, the bodily faculties of the immigrant Chinese labourer, has been treated in the Pacific States of the American Union. The argument, at all events, is perfectly simple and perfectly legitimate, and it has no affinity for *à priori* reasoning.

The few words which I have said on the subject of Population are criticised by Mr. Godkin, but I think that, if he will give them a little further attention, he will find that he has attached to them a meaning which they will not bear. The main part of the passage is as follows:—

The central seat of all political economy was from the first occupied by the Theory of Population. This theory has now been generalised by Mr. Darwin and his followers, and, stated as the principle of the survival of the fittest, it has become the central truth of all biological science. Yet it is evidently disliked by the multitude and thrust into the background by those whom the multitude permits to lead it. It has long been intensely unpopular in France and on the Continent of Europe, and among ourselves proposals for recognising it through the relief of distress by emigration are viably being supplanted by schemes founded on the assump-

⁵ Coxe’s *Pelham*, vol. ii. p. 26.

⁶ Baine’s *History of the Cotton Manufacture*, p. 150

tion that, through legislative experiments on society, a given space of land may always be made to support in comfort the population which from historical causes has come to be settled on it.

Mr. Godkin supposes me to be complaining that the principle of the 'survival of the fittest,' that is, the Theory of Population in its highest scientific expression, is not preached to the multitude by its leaders, and he taxes the suggestion with something like brutality. But I have too keen a perception of 'the inequality of intelligences' to make any proposal of the kind. I know that the 'survival of the fittest' cannot be rendered generally endurable without an art which I do not possess; for I am unable to rise to the level of the declaimers against the tyranny of compulsory vaccination, who manage to give their doctrine an air of philanthropy and are not the less proposing that the ignorant and careless, and the children of the ignorant and careless, shall be left to die of a loathsome disease. But I was simply contrasting the enormous importance now belonging to the Theory of Population in scientific inquiry with the neglect and disfavour into which it has fallen with the masses and the teachers of the masses. I was referring to the theory in its humbler and less dignified applications. I meant to complain, and I still complain, of the silence on the subject observed by the modern English demagogue. I am quite aware that it is possible so to preach the doctrine as to violate morality and social decency; but in my judgment a man has no right to profess for such a class as the English agricultural labourers a love as intense as Rousseau professed to feel for the entire human race and yet to hide from them that there are forces at work among them which, if left unchecked, will defeat the most successful attempts to increase their comfort and well-being. If he cannot do this with propriety, the demagogue should abandon the profession he has adopted. At the very least, if he wishes to suggest an expedient for relieving the effects of the pressure of population when it has once set in, it ought to be adequate. Nevertheless in Ireland and the English agricultural counties, emigration is just as often attacked as seriously discussed, and even Mr. Godkin condescends to speak of sending the surplus population to till English moors. The present position of the subject seems to me a distinct mark of the degradation of opinion in our day. The very delusions which the author of the Theory of Population made an end of for a time are reviving and overwhelming his principles. Before he wrote, the deluge of loose and aimless humanitarianism was flowing from France over this country under the influence of Godwin. 'There will be no war,' says Godwin in his *Political Justice*, 'no crimes, no administration of justice, as it is called, and no government. Besides this, there will be neither disease, anguish, melancholy, nor resentment. Every man will seek with ineffable ardour the good of all.' But Malthus, whom Cobbett, the prototype of the modern demagogue,

called a 'brute,' and who was at all times anything but a popular writer, completely disposed of these fancies by showing with unrivalled clearness what are the real causes which determine the comfort and happiness of the great majority of men in every society. 'Malthus,' said Sydney Smith, 'took the trouble of refuting Godwin, and we hear no more of Mr. Godwin.' If anybody seriously thinks that a great movement can neither be started nor arrested by a book written by a thinker in his closet, he should study Mr. Bonar's *Malthus and his Work*. The cardinal Malthusian doctrine laid strongly hold of the leaders of the people, of those who loved popular favour no less than those who cared little for it. It converted the flower of the Whigs no less than in the long run it converted William Pitt, and at a later date the foremost men of both parties hazarded their popularity, by joining in support of the New Poor Law Bill, the measure intended to abolish a system which Malthus had denounced, and which was in fact the negation of his principles.

The closing pages of Mr. Godkin's article are extremely remarkable. They supply information of the highest interest concerning the American voting class and its attitude towards new scientific inventions; and they also contain a number of admissions so candid as to leave me in doubt whether the writer seriously dissents from the argument which at first sight he appears to be criticising. He begins by strongly denying that the American people manifest any jealousy or dislike of new inventions and processes.

I think (he writes) I might safely appeal to American men of science to say whether they do not suffer in reputation and influence with the people, for not making more and greater calls on their faith or credulity; or, in other words, for their slowness rather than for their haste in making and accepting discoveries. The fertility of Americans in inventions—that is, in the production of new machines and new processes—great as it is, is not so remarkable as the eagerness with which the people receive them and use them. The large number of medical quacks who infest the country, and their great success in the sale of their nostrums—the like of which I think can be seen nowhere else—is undoubtedly due to a sort of impatience with the caution and want of enterprise of the regular practitioners. The kind of fame which came to Edison after he had made some improvements in the electric light and invented the phonograph was a very good illustration of the respect of American people for the novel and the marvellous. For a good while he was hailed as a man to whom any problem in physics would be simple, and he was consulted on a variety of subjects to which he had given no attention, such as the means of diminishing the noise of the trains on the elevated railroads in the streets of this city. In fact, for a year or two, he held the position—doubtless to his own amusement—of a 'medicine man,' to whom any mystery was easy.

I have not the smallest right to deny any of these assertions, and I will add that, for various reasons, they seem to me eminently credible. In a country of which the natural resources, vast and formidable as they seem to us on this side of the Atlantic, have not been in all probability more than very superficially developed, a new labour-saving machine must promise fortune to the average American

rather than injurious competition; in a country where domestic service is expensive and not good, some of the most ingenious of recent inventions must suggest nothing but increase of comfort. But this ready welcome of new inventions may have another cause not mentioned by Mr. Godkin. I have high authority for saying that the ordinary American citizen cannot help himself, even if they shocked his prejudices or menaced his industry. They are patented under laws of the United States made in virtue of a provision in the Federal Constitution. The patent can only be impeached in the Courts of the United States. This really means that, if a new American invention were as unpopular as was the spinning-jenny in England a hundred years ago, legislative interference to prohibit it would, in nearly all conceivable cases, be practically unattainable.

Yet there is one extreme case in which Mr. Godkin would hardly, I think, deny that the American labouring man has shown himself to be of the same spirit as the Englishmen of the same class in the last century. Sometimes these last were animated by simple prejudice. The repugnance to the new Calendar is said to have arisen from its being supposed to change the saints'-days and 'immoveable' feasts. But the spinning-jenny, the lace and stocking frames and the threshing machine were hated because they were likely to compete with hand-labour. Now there is one machine more delicate than all, the human body. The stupidest Irish hodman who ever climbed a ladder (to take an illustration of Mill's) can do some things which no machine could possibly do. And if the command of the faculties of the human body can be obtained cheaply and plentifully, there is at once a vast addition to economical forces and probably to domestic comfort. What then happened in the Pacific States of the American Union when the immigration of Chinese labourers threatened to lower the wages of American working men? First of all there were violent riots, in which the Chinese were brutally outraged. Next, the rioters, being voters, attempted to use their voting power against the immigrants. In order that they might employ it effectually in California, the Constitution of the State was changed and the notorious 'Kearney' Constitution substituted for it. Here, however, occurred a difficulty peculiar to the United States. The Kearney Constitution conflicted on some points with the Federal Constitution and with Federal law, and thus it could not be brought into force. Nothing could now help the enemies of the Chinese except the Congress of the United States,⁷ and at length that high authority gave them legislative assistance, each set of dominant politicians having become alarmed lest the support of the Pacific States should be lost to its side. I am not contending that this movement, which has all but stopped Chinese immigration, was wholly selfish. Many Americans strongly assert that

⁷ The principal law restricting Chinese immigration is chap. 126 of the Statutes of the United States (Sess. 2 of 1882).

it was, but others justify it on the ground of legitimate objection to Chinese morality and Chinese habits of life. But that it was largely selfish, is not likely to be denied. The whole story manifestly goes a long way to support my hypothetical statement as to what might have been expected to occur in England if universal suffrage had existed here in the last century. The new machines were just as unpopular as the immigrant Chinaman on the American Pacific coast, and for the same reason. They were attacked and broken up just as the Chinaman was attacked and sought to be driven away. But they survived their unpopularity because their assailants did not belong to the class which had votes, whereas the Chinese immigrants have been expelled because their assailants were voters.

It must, however, be admitted that there is not at present any direct evidence of the existence among the American people of such feelings and passions as, during much of the last century and much of the present, roused the English masses against the spinning-jenny, the lace-frame, and the threshing-machine. In a community which enjoys the means of living and prospering in the greatest abundance, the question of the relation of democratic government to scientific invention and discovery will be a question of tendencies seen to be at work which have not yet produced their full effect, but which are sure to have it, if left unchecked, in the future. That such tendencies do exist 'in the direction which I predict or guess,' is allowed by Mr. Godkin. I will give his account of them in an abridged form; it is full, clear, and, I will add, most astonishing.

No observer of American politics can deny that, with regard to matters which can become the subject of legislation, the American voter listens with extreme impatience to anything which has the air of instruction. . . . Self-depreciation, even in the matter of knowledge, has become one of the ways of commending oneself to the multitude, which even the foremost men of both parties do not disdain. . . . Nothing is more fatal to a stump orator than an air of superior wisdom on any subject. . . . Orators of a demagogic turn push this caution to its extreme, and often affect ignorance, and boast of the smallness of the educational opportunities enjoyed by them in their youth and of the extreme difficulty they had in acquiring even the little they know. . . . The truth seems to be that, with regard to all matters within the field of politics the new democracy is extremely sensitive about any doubts of its competency. It will not suffer any question or sign of question of its full capacity to deal with any matter which calls for legislation. It is ready enough to base legislation on investigations and reports, but these investigations and reports must be made in its name and by its authority through what it calls practical men as distinguished from scientific or professional men. By practical men, it means men engaged in some industrial or money-making pursuit, like the bulk of the community, and making no pretence to learning or theoretical knowledge. . . . It is rare indeed that an economic or other fallacy connected with legislation which has once taken hold of the popular mind in this country can be overthrown by the attacks of authority or of historical experience. In fact, the intervention of the professors to expose it is very apt to hasten its conversion into law, if only for the purpose of showing the literary men that they must not meddle in politics.

The gist of all this may fairly be said to be that the American

people refuse all submission to intellectual authority, unless it either is, or is seconded by, the authority of persons who have made a fortune in business.

In order to bring clearly before the mind the prospect thus pre-figured, it is necessary to call to recollection the nature of the advantages which mankind may expect to derive from advancing scientific knowledge. These advantages are not included in, nor are they measured by, the multiplication of machines so ingenious and striking that the multitude regards the inventor as a magician. The gift of invention is very valuable, but its connection with science is often slight and remote, whilst the highest triumphs of the trained scientific intellect are not always, and indeed are seldom, of such a kind that they may be made perfectly plain to the ignorant across a green baize table. As the greatest discoverers of our day track the subtler laws of nature and specially those of human life—and, with human life, of health—they learn not only what nature is but how nature may be directed and conquered. Nobody can venture to predict what are the full benefits which may be reaped by the human race from the immense advances recently made by biology. Modern medicine, the medicine on which we all depend, is not fifty years old. Modern surgery, within the memory of a generation, has made two extraordinary new departures, through the employment of anæsthetics, and through the adoption of the antiseptic process. It would be safe to say that the future progress of both arts will be vast and rapid, but it would be dangerous to lay down in what direction it will be made. At the same time, there are many signs that some part of these advances will be made by the processes of which compulsory vaccination is the type—that is, by the complete and organised co-operation of great masses of men, particularly in crowded societies, or, in other words, by common self-denial, by common submission to scientific authority and to common rules dictated by it; and, to secure these ends, so far as we can see, legislation will be needed. But, if Mr. Godkin be right, what prospect have men of science in democratic societies of obtaining legislative sanction for the arrangements which they deem essential to the well-being of mankind? They will have to bow before the sovereign multitude with as much humility as does the pushing demagogue, though doubtless with more pain. They will have to disclaim all authority and to assure their master that he knows naturally quite as much about the matter as they do. They will have to obtain a guarantee for their opinions from men who have made a fortune in business. And after all their efforts to get rid of any ‘air of superior wisdom,’ the ruler will perhaps find them too ‘professorial,’ and dismiss them to mind their own business. For the honour of human nature, there is one reason why this method of bringing over a sovereign multitude to a scientific opinion will never succeed. The combination of lying, cowardice, and hypocrisy which the process of

persuasion involves is utterly inconsistent with the possession of the highest intellectual faculties.

I have very little reason to complain of Mr. Godkin's criticisms, but I must say that he has done me some injustice in taxing me more than once with having bestowed insufficient attention to the working of democratic institutions in the United States. He has, perhaps, not given as much attention to the last chapter of my book on the 'Constitution of the United States' as to its earlier portions, an opinion which I hazard because in one instance he has committed the singular inadvertence of charging me with 'singular ignorance' of the exact nature of the tariff controversy in his country, and then of giving what he considers to be the true view of it in words which are almost exactly my own (see *Popular Government*, p. 247). I am extremely sensible of the disadvantage in which I stand from having no personal knowledge of American democratic society, but I think I may claim to know something, perhaps I might even say not a little, of the Constitutions of the United States and of the several States, and of American Federal and State legislation. Mr. Godkin will not, I hope, think me too audacious if I venture, on the strength of my legal studies, to differ from some of his statements about his own country. 'Nothing,' he writes in one place, 'is sacred in America, and nothing elicits so much ridicule as an attempt to put any thing or any person into the category of the unchangeable or unapproachable.' If this statement is intended to be applied to American Constitutions, I think they must cause much amusement to the communities subject to them. For the Constitution of the United States is certainly the most unchangeable in the world, and, though so strong an assertion cannot be made of the State Constitutions, yet even the most carefully guarded among them is hedged round with securities for mature consideration and deliberation before changing any part of it, which are wholly wanting in the British Constitution. As regards American legislation, what strikes me about it is the comparative infertility of the legislative bodies which create it, rather than the importance of their work. I admit that the State legislatures pass many laws and change them quickly, but many of them refer to subjects which, in the British Parliament, belong to 'private business;' there is a good deal of legislative activity, but it is confined within narrow limits. If I were allowed to omit from consideration the legislation of the revolutionary period following the close of the War of Secession, I should make the same statement concerning the Congress of the United States. Let us call to mind the tremendous legislation of the British Parliament in 1832 and the years succeeding it. What is there corresponding to it in America during the same period, except the discussions on the relations between the Federal Government and the Bank of the United States, discussions in which the greatest American orators exhausted every

resource of argument and eloquence. Think again on the storm of legislation which has raged around us since 1868, promising at this moment to end in the greatest crisis in all our history. I can perceive nothing answering to it in the United States except the Bland Silver Act, which seems to fill the whole of Mr. Godkin's mind and to supply him with all his tests of political orthodoxy and heterodoxy. If these were mere impressions I might distrust them, but they seem to me to figure the direct consequences of the wise restrictions by which the fathers of the American Constitution have limited legislative audacity both in the United States and the several States, and, in a less degree, of the effect of their example on the Constitution-makers of every State in the Union. These restrictions are a high and close fender before the fire towards which the politicians and statesmen of Great Britain are ever fluttering, like so many moths.

I ought not to end without saying that, after carefully reading Mr. Godkin's paper, I have come to the conclusion that he does not widely differ from me. He seems to think that the only evidence worth mentioning for the duration of democracy is that furnished by the United States; and I think so too. He thinks—at least he gives reasons for thinking—that the prospects of scientific thought and discovery in democratic societies are very gloomy; and that also is my opinion. We have reached these results by different routes, but the results do not greatly differ.

H. S. MAINE.

THE FREE-TRADE IDOLATRY.

It is singular that many of those who call themselves Liberals, and who permit themselves to freely examine and question every principle of political or social economy hitherto accepted as sound by the Liberal party, should so stoutly refuse to examine 'Free Trade.' There is every reason for courting inquiry if our present system is a wise one. For there is a strong feeling growing up against it among the wage-earning classes, and the 'cheap loaf' that has done so much in the past will not for ever stand in the place of an intelligent inquiry into the working of a system now nearly forty years old, which, for good or evil, must largely influence our country's welfare in the future.

One can hardly fail to agree with Mr. Fawcett, when, in his temperate and careful treatise in favour of Free Trade, he says:—

It is unfortunate that in discussing the subject English Free Traders frequently adopt a tone which is not calculated to convince those who differ from them. When Protectionists are spoken of as if they were either solely prompted by a desire to sacrifice the welfare of the community in order to promote their own selfish ends, or when they are derided as the victims of economic fallacies so transparent that they ought not to mislead a child, it should be remembered that it is not many years since the great majority of the English people were ardent Protectionists, and the fallacies for which we now feel so much contempt were unhesitatingly accepted by many of the most eminent of our countrymen.

In the ten years between 1870 and 1880 the industries of all nations, says Mr. Mulhall, in his *Balance Sheet of the World*, show an advance of 22½ per cent. since 1870, and he goes on:—

At present Great Britain holds the foremost place, but the United States will probably pass us in the next decade. Europe in the meantime is losing weight in the balance of labour. This is due not only to the rise of the United States, but also to that of the British Colonies, which are already assuming the importance of kingdoms.

Surely here is food for reflection—Who is it that overtakes and threatens to pass us in the race? Why, the very community that has carried the principle of Protection twice as far as any other nation—I mean the United States—while our own Colonies are fast following in her footsteps. Canada indeed almost rivals America. 'It is thoroughly protective,' says Mr. Farrar, in his pamphlet entitled *Free Trade and Fair Trade*.

It was expressly intended so by its authors, and bids fair, if the spirit in which it was proposed continues to prevail there, to rival the monstrous tariff of the United States.

That we stand alone in the wide world after forty years' display of the benefits of 'Free Trade,' as we call it, gives us also food for reflection. The French, the Germans, the Italians, not to mention our own keen-witted cousins the Americans—races that have produced philosophers, calculators and reasoners second to none—have heard our arguments, watched our celebrated system of 'Free Imports' for nearly half a century, and deliberately decline to adopt it. Are we really, then, so much wiser than the rest of the world? Surely here again is food for reflection! The reason given by the writers for the Cobden Club for this conduct on the part of foreign nations is not complimentary to them and can hardly satisfy us.

In Mr. Medley's pamphlet entitled *England under Free Trade* I find it thus explained. After stating that it is the cost of wars which necessitates heavy taxation in these countries, he goes on thus:—

The persons who impose that taxation are for the most part ignorant of political economy. They take the first impost which occurs to them, and they lay it on the people they misgovern. They know nothing of the possible consequences, in an economic point of view, of what they do.

And now we have to brace ourselves, it seems, for a struggle to maintain our supremacy in trade. When it is coming on to blow, a sailor looks to his tackle, and I venture to think we should do no harm in looking to ours.

These considerations have led me to ask myself whether we can safely rely upon this abstract principle, under the domination of which we are not even at liberty to discuss any proposal for the imposition of an import duty upon any article the like of which we make in this country. Those who uphold the system of 'Free Imports,' the so-called 'Free Traders' of the present day, assert this principle in its plainest and boldest form. I shall refer here, and indeed throughout the observations I desire to make, to the pamphlets issued either by or under the patronage of the Cobden Club; and upon them I feel justified in relying, not only for the statement of principles, but for the facts and figures to which it is necessary to have recourse. In the pamphlet entitled *Pleas for Protection Examined* (at p. 1) is the following:—

The test that shall draw the line between true 'Free Traders' and sham 'Free Traders' is simple and easy of application. '*Free Trade*' does not allow of any import duties being imposed on such articles as are likewise produced at home.

It is this abstract principle, I may at once say, held so sacred and so devoutly acted upon, which I wish to discuss; not its application to corn or any other species of goods whatever. It is of incalculable

value to the nation that the truth concerning it should be ascertained.

The intelligence of the country has been awakened to a discussion of the causes and possible remedies for the present depression, not only in agriculture, but in many departments of trade—a depression from which they seem unable, as on all former occasions, to emerge. It is a natural consequence that all sorts of plans and remedies should be proposed, and there is no lack of them. Many of the proposed remedies involve some fresh arrangement of our import duties. It is here that the imperative principles of what is called 'Free Trade' play a serious part—they forbid discussion. An expansion of trade, and an enlarged market for our manufactures, and the products, in all forms, of our industries (hitherto more stringently excluded every year from the markets of the foreigner), is the obvious desideratum. But no new arrangement of duties, designed to foster trade with our Colonies, can be even considered on its merits without infringing the sacred principle of 'Free Imports.' All plans for opening or widening the market for our manufactures, in concert with foreign countries, or by making it less their interest to keep their markets closed to us, must, in like manner, be abandoned without discussion, if they involve a duty, however slight, upon imported goods of any kind. No matter whether the consumers of these goods are the poor and many, or the rich and few; whether they minister to need or luxury, the principle of 'Free Imports' is imperative, and any such duty must be condemned unheard. If the above principle of 'Free Imports' is a sound one, it is right enough to sweep on one side all proposals that conflict with it; but we ought to be very sure that it is sound, and that we are right, and all the rest of the world wrong, before we yield it so blind and so far-reaching an obedience. I know not whether any of these plans are feasible, still less whether they would be beneficial, but in the interests of the community, it is, I think, a pity that they should not be discussed upon their merits. I have myself no plan to offer, no system of taxation to advocate, but if it were otherwise I should hardly feel that I had any such experience in matters of commerce as to justify me in coming before the public as a Mentor in such matters. But abstract principles and the fair result of facts and arguments are within the reach of all, and may be discussed without special knowledge or experience, and if after a long and careful consideration of them, I have come to the conclusion that the principle in question is unsound, and erroneous, I may perhaps be pardoned for stating in what manner this conclusion has been reached.

I feel assured that it will be found on reflection that no general or universal rule applicable to all importing countries, and applicable to all species of goods without reference to their nature or the classes that consume them, or the classes that produce similar goods in this country, can be safely laid down.

The question of duty or no duty is a separate question for each article of import, to be determined by the Legislature in each instance upon a review of all the circumstances of the case, and decided according as the balance of advantage to the whole of the community may be found to lie in taxation or freedom from duty. And I proceed to state why. But before doing so, let me remove an obstruction from my way. I know it is said that this question was finally settled and the principle under discussion was finally accepted by the national judgment in 1846, when the Corn Laws were repealed; but I cannot so regard it. At that time, and during the long contest which preceded it, there was not a speaker or writer, from Mr. Cobden and Sir Robert Peel down to the least instructed of the paid lecturers who laboured to inform public opinion, who did not count with absolute certainty upon the following by foreign countries of our example. Over and over again they asserted, with the certainty of conviction, rather than the modest reserve of prophecy, that once the example set by us, other nations could not fail to follow it. It was only a question of time, they said. Mr. Cobden, I think, put the time at ten years at the furthest. Others were more sanguine, but as to the ultimate result all were equally positive; the only difficulty was to find language strong enough to express the certainty of it. One or two quotations will be sufficient.

Mr. Fawcett, in his pamphlet entitled *Free Trade and Protection*, says :—

Nothing could exceed the confidence with which it was predicted that when England had once enjoyed the advantages of unrestricted commerce, other countries would be led to follow her example by the irresistible force of self-interest. During the memorable debates which took place thirty years since, when the financial reforms of Sir Robert Peel were before Parliament, it was again and again unhesitatingly asserted that all commercial countries would soon be eagerly striving to share with England the advantage of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market. Even as recently as 1860, when the French commercial treaty was on the eve of ratification, its author declared that 'nothing would be able to withstand the moral contagion of the example of England and France acting together on the principles of Free Trade;' and he predicted that the stimulus thus given to Free Trade 'would extend far beyond the limits of the two countries.'

Mr. Cobden went even further. Speaking in 1844, he is reported to have said: 'You have no more right to doubt that the sun will rise to-morrow than you have to doubt that in less than ten years from the time when England inaugurates the glorious era of commercial freedom every civilised community will be Free Traders to the backbone.'

Upon this conviction indeed the whole fabric of the new system rested. It was a grand conception, and broadly stated it came to this. In place of each nation selfishly striving to foster within the limits of its own population every manufacture and industry without discrimination, let each nation, they said, devote the labours of its

people to the work to which soil, climate, mineral resources, and the genius of its inhabitants naturally incline it—let the selfishness of individual protection be swept away, and an interchange of commerce absolutely free take its place—thus will the economy of production throughout the world be exalted to its highest level, and in the general welfare of all will the highest prosperity of each be secured. Forty years have passed away, the sun has continued to rise, but the peoples of the earth, including our own brethren in America, and our children in the Colonies, have absolutely refused to accept our views or adopt our practice, and the beneficent project of 1845 reveals itself in 1885 as little better than a baseless dream. This is no reproach to those who framed the system—for the system has not failed—it has never been tried. It could not be tried without the co-operation of other nations—and they have refused to co-operate. And so we still stand alone—having performed, and still performing, our part of the general interchange, to no purpose as far as the original ends and objects of the system are concerned, and to the advantage only, I am afraid, of those who have refused to join us. It is as though a man had learnt his part in a concerted piece of music and were to insist on performing it though the other performers had obstinately refused their co-operation.

It is natural that those who laboured to erect this system, which both in its direct and indirect effects would have been a priceless blessing to mankind, should be loth to retrace their steps—loth to resign hope under the pitiless pressure of experience. But the Nation cannot be content to do this. It is fatuity to shut our eyes to the fact that what we accepted in 1845 was Free Trade—that is, a free interchange of commodities unfettered by fiscal laws—and that what we are living under in 1885 is 'Free Imports' in our own country and a commerce loaded with fetters abroad. The difference between the two is well and plainly stated by Mr. Medley, writing under the patronage of the Cobden Club (in *England under Free Trade*, p. 1), as follows:—

In the abstract, Free Trade may be defined as that state of affairs in which the nations exchange with each other their various products, untrammelled by hostile prohibitory tariffs. Well, we know that 'Free Trade' thus defined does not exist. We are said to be living under 'Free Trade,' but in a strict sense that is not so. We are living under a system in which our imports alone are free, our exports for some of the principal markets not being free.

This system of 'Free Imports,' then, may be a good thing or it may not, but it is not *the* thing that the national judgment approved when the Corn Laws were repealed. It is a new and very different thing. That distribution of production among the nations of the earth which was to be guided only by national aptitudes, is now regulated in all countries but our own by laws made in the interest of each. The very essence, therefore, of the system which was promulgated by

Cobden under the name of 'Free Trade' is wanting, in the practice of 'Free Imports.' And so far from each nation devoting itself to the production of what it could produce cheapest and best, to the general ease of all, every nation but our own is striving to find employment for its population by keeping their own markets to themselves, whilst enjoying the benefits of selling freely in ours. If the system of 'Free Imports,' therefore, is a good thing, it must be so upon very different grounds, and must be upheld by very different reasoning from that upon which the doctrine of Free Trade was preached and accepted.

I have endeavoured, I hope not without success, to ascertain what these grounds are, and to appreciate the reasoning by which the new system of 'Free Imports' is now maintained. But I confess it has not always been easy to obtain reasoning from those who are most in favour of it. In the mouths of many the arguments offered are simply the arguments upon which 'Free Trade' was originally based, which, for the reason just given, are inapplicable to 'Free Imports'—while others are so entirely convinced that 'Free Trade,' with all its benefits of reciprocal interchange, is identically the same thing as 'Free Imports,' with no interchange at all, that they put down all controversy with the remark that the question was settled by the Nation at the repeal of the Corn Laws, and with as free a suggestion as courtesy will permit, that those who doubt the wisdom of their principles are—well—below the usual standard in intelligence.

I recur, therefore, to what I will call the 'Cobden Club pamphlets,' as being likely to contain the most authoritative statements of the arguments by which the system of 'Free Imports' is to be upheld. I will venture to quote again the passage above referred to, from the pamphlet *Pleas for Protection Examined*, in order to fix attention upon the exact definition of 'Free Trade' as there given:—

The test that shall draw the line between true 'Free Traders' and sham 'Free Traders' is simple and easy of application. 'Free Trade' does not allow of any import duties being imposed on such articles as are likewise produced at home.

If this principle be sound, it settles the question for all species of goods. If it be not sound, then, and not till then, will arise the question whether any, and if any, which of our imports should be taxed?—a question the discussion of which I leave to others.

Now, at first sight, it is obvious enough that, if the people of this country, instead of consuming the products of 'home' labour, consume the goods made by the foreigner, they withdraw in the same degree from the 'home' markets the demand for goods of English origin, and directly injure the 'home' producer by decreasing the demand for his goods.

On the other hand, it is equally obvious that by admitting the

successful competition of the foreigner the price of the article is likely to be maintained at its lowest point, which is a direct benefit to the consumer.

In a national point of view, the question will be which of these two results is of the higher concern to the community—to benefit the producer by securing him a market, or the consumer by securing for him a low price.

The doctrine of 'Free Imports' settles the question in favour of the consumer, and that without any distinction as to the nature of the goods, the classes that consume them, or the character of the wants which they supply. Upon the question of duty or no duty, it ignores the claims of the home-producer to any consideration whatever. This, however, is denied by the 'Free Importers:' it is here indeed that the main argument in favour of 'Free Imports' arises, an argument most specious and attractive, and which has been repeated over and over again in all the writings and speeches to which I have had access.

The argument is this, and I cannot do better than quote it from the writings of Mr. Mongredien, who has published so much on the subject for the Cobden Club; he says:—

The trade of a country consists of the aggregate operations of individual traders, which are always equal, co-ordinate and self-balancing, and which *necessitate to a mathematical certainty (excepting bad debts) an import to every export, and vice versa.*

And again:—

Now if the country imports articles X, Y, Z, it necessarily exports in exchange for them (*for every increase of imports necessitates an increase of exports*) other articles of native production, which we may call A, B, C, and thus further channels of employment are created.

I need quote no more; the argument in various forms of expression is in the mouth of everyone who is called upon to justify the injury done to 'home' production and to the employment of our dense population, by the successful competition of the foreigner. It must be admitted that this proposition, if sound, does indeed justify a system of free imports to the full—for the interest of both producer and consumer, instead of being opposed to one another, are both served by the same system; and though the production at 'home' of any particular class of goods may be checked by the import of foreign goods, an impetus is given to 'home' production in the same degree for other classes of goods in order to pay for them. If complaint is made that a particular industry of this country has received a fatal check by its produce being thrust out of the market, the ready answer of the 'Free Importers' is found in the suggestion that those who followed it should turn their hands to 'something else.' It is not denied that the dislocation of trained workers from their work, and the enforced acquirement of new aptitudes, is an evil, but this is

represented as the inevitable friction only that attends the shifting needs of trade. Because, say they, the imports which have injured some one of our 'home' manufactures, have at the same moment, and in the very act, given birth to a foreign demand of equal value for some other manufacture equally of English production. And this, they add, is 'mathematically certain.' The foreigner who imports into this country does not make us a present of his goods—he must be paid; it is certain that gold or silver is not exported to pay him—therefore he must be paid in English goods. All, therefore, that the English worker has to do, if the trade he was brought up to has been injured or stifled, is to transfer his energies to the production of the particular class of goods which the foreigner wants, and which he must have, as the only means of receiving payment for the goods which he has sold. So runs the argument—I believe I have stated it fully and fairly; I have endeavoured to do so, for I look upon it as containing the substance of the theory upon which the system of 'Free Imports' is upheld. If foreign nations mean to continue to reap the advantage of importing their produce and manufactures into this country, these imports must be paid for; and they can only be paid in goods, and British goods, therefore, of some kind they must inevitably take. So say the advocates of 'Free Imports.' But are they right? Is it true that the foreigner must be paid, and is in fact paid, by receiving British goods? I fear not. Indeed, in thinking the subject out, I am only surprised that anyone could ever have thought that it was.

For what is it that determines whether a particular country, say France, shall import half a million or a million or five millions' worth of any British produce? Surely nothing else than the wants of its population for the thing imported, and the comparative attractions in merit and price of the British article over those of other countries. The trade of a country consists of the aggregate operations of its individual traders, as Mr. Mongredien truly says. Let us take, therefore, the case of some individual trader in France who is in the habit of importing from England a given class of goods, say iron manufactures. Now, in any given year, what is it that determines whether he shall import much or little British iron? Does he inquire how much silk, or wine, or other produce is being exported to this country from France, and has got to be paid for, and regulate his purchases accordingly? Has he the means of entering upon such a calculation? and if he had, how can he tell how far the operations of others in France have already supplied the needful payment? The bare statement of such a thing on paper looks foolish, and I cannot suppose for a moment that anyone, however keen in this controversy, will suggest that the Frenchman's purchases are really regulated in the smallest degree by anything but the one consideration of his own interests, or that he asks himself any other question than this; whether he can sell at a profit the amount of iron, great or small,

which he is about to order from England. The purchase of British produce in any given year, or in other words British exports, is the aggregate result of the volitions of millions of foreign purchasers, each acting independently, and each in his own interests alone. And these volitions are again guided by the volitions of tens of millions of consumers, each acting independently, and producing collectively that demand for British produce which set the importers of it in motion. How is it possible that a result so brought about can be caused by, or regulated in its amount by, the quantity of foreign goods which are at the same time being imported by others into this country? An import of French goods into this country cannot of itself, therefore, as it seems to me, bring about an export from this country of the like value or of any value at all. The one thing cannot be the cause of the other. On the contrary, the causes which regulate the amount of either are absolutely independent of one another—the Englishman ordering just so many French goods as there is a demand for here, and the foreigner ordering such English goods as meet the demands of his own market on the other side.

But here comes the most extraordinary part of this controversy. For forty years this doctrine of every import 'necessitating' an equal export has held its ground, and yet during the whole of this forty years the exports in no single year have equalled, or anything like equalled, the value of the imports. The difference yearly and every year is enormous; it has only to be stated, to dispel all suggestions of error and all possibilities of mistake. In the year 1880 the imports were in round numbers 411 millions and the exports were 286 millions: the difference between them amounting to the vast sum of 124 millions. And so it has been, though of course in a less degree, ever since the system of free imports was adopted, and for long before that.

Is it true, then, as a matter of fact, that every import necessitates an equal export? It is all very well to argue and show by argument that it *must* be so, that it is a mathematical certainty that it should be so. But calculations, even if they be mathematical, must give way to facts. It is facts that must govern the prosperity of the kingdom, and not calculations or mathematics, however exact: and however the fact may be accounted for or its existence explained, it remains a fact that every import is *not* balanced and paid for by an export of equal value. How then do those who rely so constantly upon this argument explain the fact, or reconcile it to their contention? I will quote the same writer, Mr. Mongredien. He says (*Pleas for Protection Examined*, p. 15):—

Beside the normal commercial profits which naturally contribute to make what comes in of greater value than what goes out, wealthy nations which have lent money to foreign States, or otherwise invested money in foreign countries, have annually to receive large amounts for dividends on those loans and investments.

These amounts are periodically remitted to them in goods (not in specie), which figure in their statistical returns as excess of imports. Let us take the case of England. She has yearly to receive about 80,000,000*l.* from abroad for interest on foreign investments. She has also to receive some 40,000,000*l.* to 50,000,000*l.* more for ocean freight (gross) and charges, because two-thirds of the entire ocean-carrying trade of the world is conducted by her mercantile navy. Now, since England has to receive about 100,000,000*l.* per annum from abroad in goods, for which, as they constitute a payment to her and not a sale, she has to make no return, it is clear that these will figure in the Board of Trade returns as imports without any corresponding amount of exports. They will appear as an excess of imports over exports to the extent of 100,000,000*l.*

This advances the investigation a considerable stage, for it is clear that the difference between imports and exports in the opinion of the writer is a real one; and so far from its being accounted for by any difficulty in the mode of calculating their respective values, it shows that the excess is not only real, but that it requires the sum of a hundred millions every year of money due to England to pay for it. In other words, what the writer says is that of our total imports at least one hundred millions' worth on the average are in every year sent to this country in payment of existing obligations by foreign countries. But how then can any portion of this hundred million pounds' worth of goods cause an export of equal value, or indeed of any value, to pay for them? As regards these hundred millions at least, not a single pound's worth of British goods is exported in connection with them: and the dictum that every import necessitates an equal export must be largely modified—it must run thus: Every import, over and above one hundred millions, necessitates an equal export. This is, surely, a very notable deduction, and those who complain of the injury done to 'home' products by the importation of foreign goods free of duty cannot look for any compensation in the stimulation of exports of equal value until that hundred millions' worth have been imported *without* any such compensating effect. It is very far from true, therefore, to say that every import leads by an unerring law to an export of similar value.

One might well stop here perhaps. The above considerations show that, whatever benefits the nation obtains in the direction of cheapness to the consumer by free imports, it cannot be said in addition that the interests of the producer are advanced in a similar degree by these imports, by reason of the exports to which they inevitably lead. On the contrary, such a proposition is subject to the enormous deduction of a hundred millions annually. It is just, in passing, however, to say that in some of the publications by the Cobden Club, the existence of this large sum of money coming to this country annually by way of debt or obligation is acknowledged and deducted, as it were, beforehand, in the statement of the proposition. Thus in the pamphlet entitled *Free Trade and English Commerce*, by Mr. Mongredien, I find his second chapter headed thus: 'Exports (unless in payment of debt) necessitate imports to the same amount.'

Now, if the debt here spoken of was a constant and never varying quantity, the argument as thus modified might stand thus:—We receive every year say a hundred millions' worth of goods in payment of the debt due to us, and every 100*l.* worth of goods that we import *beyond that* must inevitably lead to an export of equal value; so that every such import, besides benefiting the consumer, also benefits the producer. But the debts due to us as interest on our investments abroad, and from other causes, are not, and cannot be, a constant quantity—they are the direct results of individuals acting independently of each other, and are derived from investments perpetually changing hands from the Englishman to the foreigner, and *vice versâ*, thereby increasing or diminishing the total sum invested by our countrymen in any given year abroad. The needs of mercantile business—the distribution of property brought about by death—the attractions of fresh and more lucrative fields of enterprise—the enhancement or fall of prices, sometimes real, sometimes artificially brought about by the operations in the stock and share market of speculators—all co-operate to forbid anything like uniformity in the amount due to this country from foreigners from year to year. So that the argument is really reduced to this:—Imports are every year balanced by exports, coupled with the obligations of the foreigner, both of which are fluctuating in amount. If our imports then are in any year increased in amount, either our exports must be increased, or the debts owing to us must be increased, if the balance is to be maintained. The resulting balance may be produced either way. It is quite as just, therefore, to say that every fresh import leads necessarily to a fresh foreign investment as it is to say that it leads to a fresh export—and yet such a proposition would, I fancy, find few supporters. Of course, in speaking of putting English money into foreign investments, it must be understood that the first effect of doing so is to produce, not a debt coming to this country, but the reverse; and it is the interest or dividend or other form of profits which bring about the debt by foreign countries which is now under discussion.

So far in the direction of abstract argument; but the actual results of a system of 'Free Imports' are recorded for us by the Board of Trade. We have the means of knowing whether, in point of fact, an increase of imports in any given year is, or is not, accompanied by an equal increase or indeed by *any* increase of exports in the same year from this country—and surely a reference to these recorded results is more trustworthy than any argument that can be used! I will refer to the imports and exports year by year, as stated in the 'Statistical Abstract' presented to Parliament for the 15 years between 1866 and 1880. The figures are curious and interesting; they will be found in table 13 of the 28th number. I will state a few of them. Between 1866 and 1867 the imports fell off by 20 millions, and the exports fell off by only 8 millions—between 1867

and 1868 the imports increased by 19 millions, and the exports, instead of increasing as they ought to have done, fell off by 1 million—between 1868 and 1869 the imports increased by 1 million, but the exports increased by 10 millions—between 1869 and 1870 the imports increased by 8 millions, and the exports by 10—and between 1870 and 1871 the imports increased by 28 millions, and the exports by 24. These last two years present, perhaps, the nearest approach to a concordance between the two which is to be found in the fifteen years. Between 1872 and 1873 the imports increased by 17 millions, but the exports fell off by 1 million—between 1873 and 1874 the imports fell off by 1 million, and the exports fell off by 16 millions—between 1874 and 1875 the imports increased by 3 millions, but the exports, instead of increasing, fell off by 16 millions—between 1875 and 1876 the imports increased 2 millions, and the exports fell off 23—and lastly between 1876 and 1877 the imports increased by 21 millions, but the exports fell off by 2. I think it will be difficult in these figures to trace the action of any constant law under which any addition to our imports leads inevitably to a similar increase, or to *any* increase, in our exports. The contrast between hardly any two successive years appears to exhibit the action of such a law, while in some years the divergence points the other way, and is so marked that an additional import of 17 millions is actually accompanied by a decrease of exports, and an addition of 21 millions to the imports takes place side by side with a decrease in the exports of 2 millions. The total result of the 15 years shows an increase in imports of 163 millions, with an increase of exports of only 35.

In the face of these facts, whether mathematics prove that for every additional import there must be a corresponding export or not, is a question immaterial to the nation; for, whatever it is that interferes with the operation of such a law, the nation does not get the benefit of its action.

But this belief, that by importing largely we are by some mysterious law inevitably securing to ourselves an outlet for our manufactures by an increase of our exports, lies so universally at the root of the faith in 'Free Imports,' and, as it seems to me, constitutes so entirely the basis of all reasoning in favour of that belief, that I may be pardoned if I pursue the subject a little further.

All imports must be paid for: we do not pay for them in bullion; therefore we must pay for them in goods; therefore our export of goods must increase with any increase of imports. This is the chain of reasoning—where is it that it fails? as fail it must if it comes into collision with a contrary result in fact. I think it fails in this. Is it true that we do not pay for our purchases in money? It is plain that we do not pay by sending bullion abroad; the export of bullion is always, I think, under ten millions in any given year, and oftentimes the balance is the other way. How then *do* we pay?

I know how the actual importer in any case pays. He *does* pay in money—that is, he gives his acceptance at two or three months or whatever ‘prompt’ is customary in the trade, and when the bill falls due he pays it. When and how is it, then, that this money payment, before it arrives in the foreigner’s hands, is converted into goods, as the ‘Free Importers’ say that it is? What becomes of the acceptance? We know that it is, or may be, transferred from hand to hand by endorsement in this country, or sold and sent abroad. It is impossible to conjecture into whose hands it may have found its way whilst running, or to whom it may ultimately be paid. But whoever may be the holder (unless the purchaser becomes insolvent, in which case the foreigner’s goods are never paid for at all, either in goods or money or anything else), the price of the foreign goods is *paid in actual money* when the bill falls due. Surely this closes the transaction, and if all foreign imports are paid for in this way (saving, as I have said, the case of bad debts) what room is there for the assertion that they are paid for in goods, and goods of British manufacture?

What, then, is the difficulty in paying the foreigner for the goods which we have imported? and paying him in a manner which leaves no record in the Custom House? The actual importer, as I have said, no doubt pays in money and not goods, for he pays his acceptance when it falls due. The foreigner who receives this acceptance may, as I have just pointed out, be paid at once in money, for he may turn the bill into money here, or may sell the bill abroad to anyone who wants to remit money to London, either in payment of a debt due here, or for the purpose of investment in the English Funds or the innumerable shares of industrial enterprise, or to meet any of the requirements of his business or the needs of his private life. In either case the foreigner receives payment for his goods in money.

It will, perhaps, be said—indeed I see it has been said—that though we may pay for our imports in the first instance with money, or bills, or securities, that in the end, if a hundred millions of value (so to speak) have been poured into this country in the shape of imported goods, something of substantial value, to the same or approximately the same amount, must go out of it in return; and that bills or notes only represent goods, which must in the end constitute the real payment which we have to make.

The first half of this statement is true enough—deducting the profits of trade, the value of imported goods into this country is no doubt met by a return of substantial value in some shape from this country—but that substantial value need not take the form of goods at all, and still less need the goods be goods of English production. Surely I transfer to a foreigner substantial value in return for his goods, if I give him the right to receive the price in gold either in London, when my bill is payable, or in any country in the world where he

prefers to receive it! For he has only to turn my acceptance into money by discounting it or selling it, and he can, with the money, buy a bill payable in any country where he wishes to receive it. And as for securities, such as the bonds and obligations of foreign governments which pass by delivery from hand to hand, they are as much things of real—and not representative—value as gold or goods themselves. There is really no difficulty to deal with in this direction and nothing worth an extended explanation, but there has been set afloat a sort of hazy notion, founded upon the statement that all trade is in substance only barter, that if you hunt down a purchase of goods through the intricacies of modern commercial expedients, you will come in the end to goods as the real means of payment. This is not in the least true, unless in *goods* you include all things of substantial value. A hundred pounds' worth of English Consols, or the obligations of any admittedly solvent government or corporation, is as much a thing of value as a hundred pounds' worth of French silk, or German hops, or English iron. Anything, in short, that is readily saleable for a hundred pounds in gold, is as valuable and constitutes as substantial a payment as goods of that value, for the very simple reason that it will purchase goods of that value.

It is by the reciprocal transfer and set-off of obligations between nations and individuals that the vast and complicated dealings of the world move forward in harmony from day to day, while goods and the precious metals alike find their way where they are wanted, as articles of merchandise, and pass from country to country obedient to the law of supply and demand in satisfaction of wants—not in discharge of debts, though they may have that effect when they take their place in the adjustment of the general balance.

The only wonder is that the complicated dealings of different countries should reciprocally adjust themselves from day to day, without the intervention and transfer of more of the precious metals than is actually the case. A parallel state of things in miniature is to be found in the City of London, which, if it does not explain, at least illustrates the extent to which obligations *do*, as a matter of daily experience, balance one another without passing gold or valuables of any sort from hand to hand, except to an incredibly small extent. I allude to the Bankers' Clearing House. There, as is well known, the representatives of the City bankers meet daily and compare the cheques drawn upon each other and payable to each other, and, by setting them off one against another, arrive at a balance incredibly small to be adjusted by a money payment. A payment in gold or notes amounting to, I believe, hundreds, serves to adjust obligations amounting to many millions of pounds. I refer to this, not only for the purpose just mentioned, but because it offers a singular and decisive refutation, as it seems to me, of the species of argument by which it is maintained that an export of goods from

this or any other country can be caused by importing into it goods of the like amount. For, surely, it would be just as reasonable to say that because the cheques drawn on bank A and payable to the customers of bank B did, in fact, at the end of the day, balance, or nearly balance, the cheques drawn on B and payable to the customers of A, therefore the customers of B must have drawn these cheques for the purpose of adjusting the balance; or, in other words, that the fact of 10,000*l.* being on any given day drawn upon bank A and payable to bank B caused the customers of bank B to draw for 10,000*l.* in favour of the customers of bank A in order to balance the account.

For these reasons I find great difficulty in accepting the very inviting proposition that we need not vex ourselves about the employment of our people, or be anxious lest in the pursuit of cheapness we allow the foreigner to take our place in producing what used to give employment to our people when we made it for ourselves, seeing that a great principle, self-acting, working with mathematical exactitude and unerring result, is always safeguarding us—working, it may be, with a show of hardship on the surface by extinguishing production in one direction, but only to stimulate it in an equal or greater degree in some other—and in the meanwhile securing to us the happy results of cheapness and the profits of transport and trade.

This, I say, is a most inviting proposition: no wonder that it has been accepted—it has the ineffable charm of saving the trouble of thinking, and the mental labour of working out principles from facts. It offers to the true believer the reposeful certainty that all is going well, without the labour of investigating whether it is so or not. If the news of an old and lucrative industry suppressed by foreign competition should give rise at times to an occasional twinge of doubt—doubt whether it is likely that we are the only wise nation on the face of the globe—or if the vast progress of other nations under a tariff which we repudiate as positively ruinous to those who impose it, should sometimes awaken us for a moment from our dream of security and rouse us to the terrible trouble of thinking; this great principle is at hand to our comfort, and we are fain to sink back again into our complacent repose, soothed by the conviction of superior wisdom.

The very foundation, therefore, of this theory that we are able, with mathematical certainty, to increase our exports by increasing our imports, seems to be cut from under it. To use an American expression, the 'bottom of the argument tumbles out' when you come to handle it; and with its disappearance must also disappear all hope of benefit by way of additional exports, from a system under which the import of foreign manufactures is cherished by relieving them of all taxation, however useful to the revenue that taxation might be.

I have, in the foregoing remarks, discussed what I believe to be

the main support of the system of 'Free Imports' in the minds of those who have thought much upon the subject.

But there remains an argument far more potent with those who have *not* thought much upon the subject—and they are the majority. I mean the argument derived from the great increase in trade and commerce which this country has experienced since the system of 'Free Imports' was adopted.

I believe the reasoning which refers this prosperity to that system to be unsound and misleading, and will endeavour to show where it fails on another occasion.

PENZANCE.

(*To be concluded*)

*TURNER'S DRAWINGS AT THE
ROYAL ACADEMY.*

THE collection of drawings now on view at Burlington House, though not extensive, is undoubtedly the most important display of Turner's work in water-colour which has yet been seen by the public.¹ The number placed at the disposal of the Royal Academy was so large that it was determined to divide them into successive Exhibitions, and it was arranged that this, the first, should contain only examples of the highest excellence, and mainly of the central period of Turner's art, ranging chiefly from 1815 to 1835, although not wholly excluding earlier and later works. In subsequent years his career will be treated more from the chronological point of view. The whole range of his art will be shown, beginning with the simple 'washed' or 'tinted' drawings of his boyhood, passing onward through the stages of sober browns and greys, emerging gradually, but surely, into strength and colour, and ending finally in the poetical, if impossible, rainbow visions of his old age.

Concurrently with the Royal Academy's Exhibition of Turner's Drawings, there are to be seen at the Burlington Fine Arts Club engravings of those of them which have been translated into black and white; and, the number being considerable, the opportunity of studying his art from the two sides is especially valuable.

The work of Turner, like that of many other great painters, may, as is well known, be broadly and conveniently divided into an early, a middle, and a late manner; and although these distinctions are necessarily arbitrary, yet they answer their purpose, and it is not often that the style of one time is found overlapping that of another. The first period, excluding his boyhood, may be placed from about 1795 to 1815, the second from 1815 to 1835, and the third from 1835 to his death in 1851.

In the Exhibition at the Royal Academy there are comparatively few drawings of the early period, but those few are fine and characteris-

¹ Its excellence is owing almost entirely to the untiring zeal and industry of Mr. Horsley, R.A.

tic. Most of them are large in size as well as in treatment, and a study of English water-colour art, of the origin and development of which I shall say more hereafter, leads me to the conviction that the same relation of strength to size has very generally held good. The art, I believe, has lost much by the continued tendency to smallness of scale, and no man's more than Turner's.

The earliest drawing, *Llangollen* (No. 43), executed before 1800, though painted almost entirely in the sombre browns and greys which tradition still imposed on all landscape art, has nevertheless a breadth and force new to Water Colour. Of the same broad yet sober style is the *Snowdon* (No. 25) of a few years later, about 1805. This grand and solemn work, the impressiveness of which would be more readily perceived were it differently mounted and framed, is remarkable for the singular *unity* in time, thought, and effect which it conveys. The moment at which the moon appears above the hills has been seized by the painter, and this is the keynote of the whole composition. For a long time the technical means to which was due the peculiar glow of the halo round the moon here was a puzzle to artists. A few years ago the drawing had to be remounted, and the mystery was solved. Turner had soaked away the paper behind at this part to an extremely thin film, and had affixed at the back a cake of orange-vermilion, which, showing through the wash of colour he had given to the front, produced the effect he desired.

Drawings such as these, and as the *Kirkstall Abbey* now in the Soane Museum, the *Warkworth* at South Kensington, the *Ewenny Priory*, *Salisbury* and *Ely Cathedrals*, and *Caernarvon*, *Norham*, and *Harlech Castles*—all painted about this time—were to exert a powerful effect on the development of English water-colour art, just then (1800) rising into notice. Turner was intimately connected with this, which appears to me the only original, if not indeed the only *School* of painting, strictly speaking, which England has produced, and which deserves I think, more attention than it has yet received. For, original as were our three great painters, Hogarth, Reynolds, and Gainsborough, it was inevitable that they should have been influenced, and to a considerable extent even inspired, by the masters of Italy, France, and the Netherlands who had preceded them. And, although their influence in turn was felt by English artists immediately succeeding them, yet I fail to see that to either of the three can be ascribed the formation of a distinct school in painting, or anything approaching such a new development of art as that of which I am now speaking. Bonington and Constable also, who may be said to have been the founders of modern French and Dutch landscape, had few followers in England; and the influence of Crome, the only other great landscape painter of the time, was confined to a

small, though highly interesting group of men, all more or less centred round Norwich.

It is often supposed that because colours soluble in water were used by the mediæval missal-painters, and after them by the artists of Italy, Germany, France, and Holland, in the studies for their pictures, that English water-colour art was merely an expansion or outgrowth of this practice. Mr. Redgrave,² however, has conclusively shown that it had an entirely different and an entirely national origin. It arose at the end of the last century, out of the development in England of a taste for antiquarian and therefore for architectural and topographical studies. The first English water-colourists were not so much painters as architectural draughtsmen, who, commissioned by the publishers, travelled over the country, making sketches of castles, abbeys, country seats, and places of historical interest. These sketches, usually carefully outlined with the pen and then lightly 'tinted' in monochrome, were to be issued as engravings in the numerous illustrated books, chiefly of a serial character, then coming into vogue.

From mere architectural detail to attractive backgrounds of parks, trees and hills was only a step, and the more artistic among the draughtsmen, such as Paul Sandby, Hearne, Rooker, Dayes (Turner's master), and others, soon distinguished themselves by the charm of their treatment of the landscape features of the composition. Turner himself gained his first introduction to Art through this portal, and it was his drawings of London and of the surrounding counties, executed as commissions for Walker and other publishers, and exhibited on the walls of the Royal Academy, that first brought him into notice. The extraordinary breadth and force of his work were quickly recognised as a new departure in English Art.

As early as 1797 the *St. James's Chronicle* says of Turner's *Ewenny Priory* in the Royal Academy Exhibition of that year: 'In point of colour and effect this is one of the grandest drawings we have ever seen, and equal to the best picture of Rembrandt.' It also praises for 'its true sublimity and grandeur of effect' his *Choir of Salisbury Cathedral* of the same year. In 1798 the same newspaper describes his *Norham Castle on the Tweed* as 'having the force and harmony of an oil-painting,' and characterises it as, 'in short, the best landscape in the present Exhibition.' In 1799 the *True Briton*, speaking of *Harlech Castle* says: 'This landscape, though it combines the style of Claude and of our excellent Wilson, yet wears an aspect of originality that shows the painter looks at Nature with his own eyes; we expect Mr. Turner to gain the highest distinction in his province.' Other newspapers and reviews

² *Descriptive Catalogue of the Historical Collection of English Water-Colour Paintings in the South Kensington Museum, 1877.*

concur in the general praise of Turner's work ; one of them concluding a eulogistic article with the odd remark : 'The drawings are, on the whole, among the best productions, and, *allowing for the peculiar circumstances of the country*, are very respectable.'³

This ready and universal admiration of Turner's genius was shared by the Royal Academicians, and in 1799 they elected him an Associate member of their body, mainly on the strength of his works in water-colour, the majority of which had appeared on their walls. At that time they freely admitted to their highest honours the best water-colour painters.

The influence of Turner and of his close friend and fellow-student, Girtin (the latter soon to be cut off by an early death), made itself speedily felt on the other water-colourists of the time, who a little later, 1804, formed themselves into a Society, the parent of the two well-known institutions of our own day. A breadth, force, and naturalness of treatment unknown before was introduced into their work, and a number of gifted artists rose quickly into notice, whose taste and skill carried English water-colour painting to a point which had never before been touched or attempted in any other country or century. Cozens, Edridge, Girtin, Glover, John Varley, Barrett, Robson, De Wint, Cotman, Copley Fielding, and David Cox, have left a record in art of which any country might be proud.

* If I am asked to describe the main feature which, with all their differences of manner, marks the work of these distinguished men, and to which, it appears to me, 'is mainly owing its unrivalled excellence, I should, speaking on matters of technique as an amateur only, ascribe it to their nearly invariable use of *transparent* colours. By no other vehicle—oil, fresco, pastel, or body-colours—have the passing phases of nature, light and shade, sunshine and storm, wind and weather—all of the very essence of the landscape painter's art—ever been so effectually rendered.

But unfortunately it is now difficult to obtain for the early English water-colourists the appreciation due to the originality and excellence of their work. For time has dealt hardly with the majority of their pictures, and few of even the important drawings that now come into the market but have faded more or less. I do not hesitate to say that only those who have the good fortune to know collections such as that of Dr. Percy and the one in the Print Room of the British Museum (which are habitually guarded from light and kept in portfolios) can form an adequate idea of the delicacy, force, and beauty of colour which were attained by the artists

³ An examination of the art criticisms of the newspapers and reviews from 1800 and onwards is sufficient to refute the notion—if it still survives—that Turner was not appreciated in his own day.

I have named, and by others of their less-known contemporaries. A large proportion of the splendid Ellison and Townshend bequests permanently exhibited at South Kensington have greatly deteriorated, and we have only to look at several of Turner's drawings in the present Exhibition to see the havoc which undue exposure to light has made with them. Yet the fine condition of so large a number proves that with due care the duration of water-colour drawings is practically unlimited. Probably few owners would be contented to keep their possessions always in portfolios, nor is that needful or even expedient; but the fewer hours of exposure to light the better, and the avoidance of anything like direct sunlight is an absolute necessity to the preservation of their freshness and charm of colour. I venture here to suggest to the owners of yet unspoiled treasures their responsibility in this matter, not only to future generations, but also to the fame of painters.

To return to the pictures at the Royal Academy—The large picture of *Chryses* (No. 4) merits attention, not only from its fine drawing of rocks, trees, and above all of waves (his complete mastery of the sea was one of the most striking as well as one of the earliest of Turner's achievements), but also from its departure from the conventional brown landscape manner of the time. We have here warm and noble colour; the golden light of sunset suffuses the whole scene and turns from blue to green the sea around the path of the sun. The drawing has faded perhaps, slightly but harmoniously, the sea and the sky ageing together.

The close of the first period of Turner's art is represented at the Royal Academy by three drawings of singular power and charm from the famous collection at Farnley Hall, the owner of which, Mr. Fawkes, was one of Turner's earliest and most liberal patrons, at whose hospitable house he was a frequent guest. The *Falls of the Reichenbach* (No. 34), the *Devil's Bridge* (No. 36), and the *Lucerne* (No. 35) constitute a trio which alone would place their painter in the highest rank of landscape art.

May I be permitted here to remark that their present frames (Turner's original ones, it is true) dwarf and circumscribe these noble pictures? They are also surely hung much too low. The question of framing water-colour drawings, and especially those of the early artists, is as difficult as it is important to their effect, and I desire to speak with due diffidence on the subject. I am convinced however, that the purer and the more transparent in colour the drawing, the less, as a rule, will it bear that close contact with the gold frame which is so essential to the impasto and the relief of an oil picture. There are several small drawings of Turner's in the present Exhibition greatly injured by the very modern-looking deep gold 'flats' brought close up to them. There are others in which

the crude white mounts wholly or partially destroy the value of those 'high lights' always so carefully placed by Turner, and which were with him so integral a part of every composition. I believe that the margin which the eye nearly always requires in a transparent water-colour drawing, is best obtained by a mount of roughish paper or board, of light neutral grey or brown, the tone varying according to the subject, and harmonising with the *general* effect of the colour of the picture itself.

The Middle period is represented at Burlington House by a large number of drawings of high merit, the majority of which are also in fine condition. Yet I cannot but feel that, although they represent the work of a time when the painter's knowledge, force, skill in composition, and mastery of colour were at their highest point, and when his poetic imagination was still sane and under due control—yet, as a whole, they are surely not as grand as might have been expected from the earlier promise. The reason, I believe, lies in the fact that they were almost exclusively made for engraving, and they bear on them the limitations which that condition imposed. The 'largeness of the earlier time' was no longer possible on the scale to which the publishers bound Turner down—a scale which, indeed, the conditions under which they themselves worked rendered unavoidable. And not only had drawings for engraving to be of moderate dimensions, but Turner found that picture-buyers would give far more for an oil-painting than for a water-colour of equal size and merit. Consequently we have in water-colour no more works of the size and style which had characterised the beginning of his art, and had exercised so marked an influence on the art of his contemporaries.

They begin with the well-known series undertaken for Dr. Whitaker's *History of Richmondshire*, of which there are four examples—*Egglestone* and *Marrick Abbeys* (Nos. 13 and 36), *Heys-ham* (No. 11), and the *Crook of Lune* (No. 14). The first three are much faded, and can now be better seen in the fine engravings from them, but the last is perfect in condition and colour, and, despite the probably faulty perspective of the river, it ranks among the most attractive pictures in the room. There are also the beautiful drawings of the *Vales of Pevensey* (No. 30) and *Ashburnham* (No. 40), belonging to a series of fifteen commissioned by Mr. Fuller, of Rose Hill, about 1816, and engraved at his expense. Of the same time, more delicate and refined in execution, as suited to the scale on which they were to be engraved, are the four charming subjects from *Cooke's Southern Coast*—*Plymouth, Torbay, Rye, and Poole* (Nos. 16, 29, 41, 42). In all the foregoing works Turner's expansion in the direction of colour, as yet soberly used, is apparent; but it is not until we reach the famous engraved *England and Wales* series, commenced about 1825 and laid aside in 1838, that we find the painter at his highest

point of drawing, colour, and composition. Ten of these *England and Wales* drawings are in the present Exhibition. Among the most noticeable are *Knaresborough* (No. 15), conspicuous for refined splendour of colour and for poetic feeling; *The Chain Bridge over the Tees* (No. 9), boldly original and romantic in its rendering of wild North of England scenery; *Cowes* (No. 19), extraordinarily skilful in composition, perfect in harmony of sober twilight hues, and strong and dramatic in effect. *Rivaulx* (No. 23) deserves attention not only for general beauty, but for the skill with which the mists are thrown into the shadow of the hills, thereby concentrating the light, as was Turner's intention, on the Abbey, the central point of interest in the picture. The pose of the angler (who, with his tall rod, is of such value to the composition) will be recognised as eminently true to life. Turner, a keen fisherman himself, drew fishermen as well as he drew most other human beings badly.

But I give the palm to the first drawing on entering the room—*Llanthony Abbey* (No. 1). This, like a great portrait by a great master, is, as it were, a vision seen for a moment, and *breathed* upon the paper. It has all Turner's force in his grasp of Nature's changing moods of storm and sunshine; its drawing shows his knowledge of the forms of the hills, the cleavage of the rocks, and the movement of running water. The lonely tower and the mouldering walls of the Abbey gleaming wet through the shower give it that charm which association with the past always conveys; and the figures which so often mar his finest works are here (thanks to the rain) safely bestowed under a hedge. The whole work has that quality of 'inevitableness' which is the mark of only the highest art.

Turner had painted *Llanthony* some twenty-five years before (about 1795), and the earlier drawing is now at the Burlington Club. It is interesting to trace in the resemblances and the differences of the two drawings, the change which those twenty-five years had made in his art. Among the other works of this period may be briefly named *Hawthornden* (No. 45), unfortunately circumscribed by its framing, noticeable for sylvan beauty and exquisite drawing; *Linlithgow* (No. 45), with a dainty grace of sunset colouring; *Folly Hill* (No. 10), the foreground of which is most skilfully composed, and the whole drawing a series of varying planes, each in a differing tone of green, thoroughly English in its whole effect; *Virginia Water* (No. 23), with a rare opalescent charm of colour and a singular stateliness befitting the spot, largely due to the recurring lines on the still water, and the measured stroke of the oars of the state barge.

Of the last manner of Turner there are but few examples. The *Righi at Sunrise* (No. 3) and the *Righi at Sunset* (No. 4) cannot fail to arrest attention. The story of these solemn and noble companion drawings, and of the *Splugen* (No. 22), another of the same series,

painted about 1845, is told with a charm which is Mr. Ruskin's own in his *Notes on his Turner Drawings*, 1878. More characteristic of the period which, speaking generally, is rightly regarded as one of decline, are the *Lucerne* (No. 6)—which should be contrasted with the earlier and far finer *Lucerne* (No. 35) opposite it—and the *Constance* (No. 18). In these are apparent the crudeness and unnaturalness in colour, and the striving after forced effect, to which Turner in his later years was prone. I do not, however, think that the ingenious theory propounded a few years ago by the eminent surgeon, Mr. Liebreich, need necessarily be adopted. He attributed the tendency to the excessive use of yellow in the pictures of Turner's later life to physical changes in the lenses of the eye producing a distorted colour-sense always tending to yellow. No doubt in many oil-pictures of this time yellow does largely predominate, but at the same time he was producing drawings, simple, sober, and pure in colour as the two *Righis* just noticed, as the magnificent *Coblentz* exhibited by Mr. Ruskin in 1878, and many others known to all Turner students—in which yellow, if present, plays no undue part. It would rather seem to me that the fault in question, as also his over-use of scarlet in the shadows, arose from the uncurbed license he gave to his imagination, and from his continued attempts, undeterred by failures and by the attacks from all sides which those failures provoked, to paint those visions of pure sunlight which, even to such a Titan as he, was impossible.

Thackeray, writing on this subject, has said: 'As one can only look at the sun through a blackened glass, it has seemed to us that the most dazzling of Turner's fancies have often been improved by the sobering influences of the graver; and in nothing has his style proved more triumphant than in withstanding this test.' It will be interesting to pass from the drawings to the engravings from them now to be seen on the walls of the Burlington Club.

It should be remembered that Turner's first connection with art proper (following his employment as a mere colourist of plans and studies in the office of Mr. Hardwick, the architect) was in the service of the publishers by whom, in 1793, he was commissioned to travel through England and Wales, making sketches for engravings in books. And although none of his works of that early period are now on view at the Royal Academy, no less than thirty-nine out of the fifty-three drawings there were intended for translation into black and white. A connection with engravers, lasting over fifty years, together with considerable practice of his own hand in various methods, made him a master of all the arts and methods of the craft. His early work was engraved by the humbler members of the profession who were employed on the Magazines, 'Pocket Annuals,' and 'Views of Country Seats,' in vogue at the end of the last century, and

he first met an engraver worthy of him in James Basire, whose strong and masterly handling of Turner's pictorial headings to the 'Oxford Almanacks' from 1799 to 1811, has made the latter so well known and so much prized.⁴ On the margin of a 'trial proof' of one of these in my possession (*Christ Church Cathedral*) I find the first instance I know of those detailed instructions to the engraver which Turner afterwards so continuously practised. Whether Basire considered himself too important to defer to the painter's suggestions I do not know, but they were not carried out.⁵

In 1807, inspired especially by emulation of the *Liber Veritatis* of Claude, a new volume of which had just been successfully issued by a firm of printsellers, Turner started his own great venture of the *Liber Studiorum*, a work which, though at the time pecuniarily a failure, is now, as is well known, of high value, and rightly regarded as one of the most enduring monuments of his fame. In it he not only himself etched on the copper the leading outlines of every plate, but in eleven out of the seventy-one published he also mezzotinted the whole plate himself. The *Liber* was laid aside in 1819, and before that time he had begun again to work for various publishers. About 1814 he commenced his connection with W. B. Cooke, the publisher of the *Southern Coast*, himself an engraver, whose brilliant and decisive touch so ably rendered Turner's drawings for that work, and who, in conjunction with his brother, G. Cooke, also engraved the *Views in Sussex* and other single and serial plates. Dr. Whitaker, the eminent antiquarian and historian of Yorkshire, employed Turner to illustrate his *Parish of Whalley, History of Craven*, and later on his now celebrated *History of Richmondshire*. Of several drawings for the latter work I have already spoken. Most of them are now more or less faded; but the engravings remain, a monument alike of Turner's knowledge and taste, and of his engravers' skill. In the *Southern Coast*, the *Richmondshire*, *Hakewills' Italy*, and later in the *England and Wales*, Turner was brought into contact with a band of young engravers, who, under his influence and guidance, carried landscape engraving to a pitch of excellence unsurpassed by our own Woollett or even by the greatest men of the Italian and French schools of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The two Cookes, Heath, Pye, Le Keux, and W. R. Smith were followed by Miller (the ablest perhaps of all), Jeavons, Goodall, Wallis, Brandard, and Willmore, names known to every student of Turner, as is their work to every

⁴ It is interesting to see the Oxford Almanack still flourishing and preserving the quaint forms which it has retained from the seventeenth century.

⁵ He required the addition of some crockets to the spire, and further advised Basire to look at certain engravings, after M A Rooker and others, of the same subject. This from a young artist, Basire, who was a man of high standing in his profession, may not unlikely have resented.

reader of the voluminous illustrated literature of the first half of this century. Its excellence was almost entirely due to the watchful care, the untiring industry, and the consummate skill with which Turner directed every detail of every plate. Trial-proof after trial-proof was submitted to him, to be returned drawn upon in pencil or crayon, and with the margins often covered with minute instructions as to the additions or alterations needed, such instructions being accompanied in most instances *with the reasons for the alterations*, couched in laconic and sometimes even caustic terms. The study of these terse, if often ungrammatical, remarks is of the greatest value in understanding Turner's aims and methods, and enables us to see how he educated his engravers to the high point to which they attained.

From the fine *England and Wales* plates, ten of which are to be seen at the Burlington Club, Turner passed to his series of small engravings of scenes on the Seine and the Loire, generally known as his *Rivers of France*, and to the exquisite vignettes which have immortalised Rogers's *Poems* and *Italy*, and which, including the prices paid to the painter and the engravers, cost the poet over ten thousand pounds. Turner was also commissioned to illustrate the poems and prose works of Sir Walter Scott. He stayed at Abbotsford while engaged on this task, and in the charming vignette of *Melrose* he has introduced Sir Walter's figure as well as his own in the group in the foreground. The engravings from Turner in Byron's, Campbell's, and Moore's poems, Finden's *Illustrations of the Bible*, and Milton's *Paradise Lost*, are well known, as are also the large subscription plates, such as the *Ancient and Modern Italy*, the *Carthage*, the *Approach to Venice*, and others too numerous to mention, which were published at intervals during his life, and executed after his death by the engravers whom he had trained.

After having tried aquatint, mezzotint, etching, and a mixture of all these methods, as well as many experiments of his own devising, Turner was, I think, unquestionably right in his final adoption of Engraving in Line as the best method of translating his pictures into black and white. Fashion and photography have led to its disuse in our day; two veterans only of the band who worked under Turner now survive, and the race of line engravers is nearly extinct. But for the reproduction of landscape art no other method appears to me to be comparable with it. Aquatint requires colour, which is too costly. Mezzotint, so valuable in portraiture and in rendering light and shade, is apt to be heavy in landscape, and has moreover the disadvantage of yielding but few impressions. Etching, now so much in vogue, is admirably adapted for giving, as in Rembrandt's and Van Dyck's hands, the subtleties of character and the play of expression in the human face; Hollar has shown how it can render the textures of furs and stuffs and the delicate intricacies of shells;

and Meryon (not to mention living etchers) has displayed its resources in architecture ; but in landscape, etching is scratchy, black, and totally wanting in that *luminousness* which is the very soul of landscape art, and which, combined with force, delicacy, and brilliance, characterises the work of that great school of engravers of which I have here briefly spoken.

W. G. RAWLINSON.

IN FRENCH PRISONS.

THE St. Paul prison at Lyons, where I spent the first three months of my incarceration, is not one of those old, dilapidated, and damp dungeons which are still resorted to in many French provincial towns for lodging prisoners. It is a modern prison, and pretends to rank among the best *prisons départementales*. It covers a wide area enclosed by a double girdle of high walls; its buildings are spacious, of modern architecture, and clean in aspect; and in its general arrangement the modern ideas in penitentiary matters have been taken into account, as well as all necessary precautions for making it a stronghold in the case of a revolt. Like other departmental prisons, its destination is to receive those prisoners who are awaiting their trial, as also those of the condemned whose penalty does not exceed one year of imprisonment. A subterraneous gallery connects it with another spacious prison for women—the St. Joseph.

It was on a December night that I arrived there from Thonon, accompanied by three gendarmes. After the usual questions, I was introduced into a *pistole* which had been cleaned and heated for receiving me, and this *pistole* became my abode until the following March. On a payment of six francs per month and three francs to the waiter, each prisoner incarcerated for the first time may hire a *pistole* for the time of his preventive incarceration, and thus avoid living in the cells. The *pistole* is also a cell, but it is somewhat wider and much cleaner than the cells proper. A deep window under the ceiling gives enough of light, and six or seven paces may be measured on its stone pavement, from one corner to the opposite one. It has a clean bed and a small iron stove heated with coke, and for one who is occupied and is accustomed to solitude it is a tolerably comfortable dwelling-place—provided the incarceration does not last too long.

Not so the cells which occupy a separate wing of the prison. Their arrangement is the same as everywhere now in Europe: you enter a broad and high gallery, on both sides of which you see two or three storeys of iron balconies; all along these balconies are the doors of the cells, each of which is ten feet long and six or seven feet wide, and has an iron bed, a small table, and a small bench—all three made fast to the walls. These cells are very dirty at Lyons,

full of bugs, and never heated, notwithstanding the wetness of the climate and the fogs which rival in density, if not in colour, those of London. The gas-burner is never lighted, and so the prisoner remains in an absolute obscurity and idleness from five, or even four on a winter night, until the next morning. Each prisoner himself cleans his cell; that is, he descends every morning to the yard to empty and wash his bucket with dirty water, and he enjoys its exhalations during the day. Even the simplest accommodation for avoiding this inconvenience, which we found later on at Clairvaux, has not been introduced at Lyons. Of course, no occupation is given to the prisoners during the preventive incarceration, and they mostly remain in perfect idleness throughout the day. The prison begins to exercise its demoralising influence as soon as the prisoner has entered within its walls.

Happily enough, the imprisonment before the trial is not so dreadfully protracted as in my own mother-country. If the affair is not too complicated, it is brought before the next assizes, which sit every three months, or before the following ones; and cases where the preventive incarceration lasts for more than ten or twelve months are exceptional. As to those affairs which are disposed of by the *Police Correctionnelle* Courts, they are usually terminated—always by a condemnation—in the course of one month, or even a fortnight. A few prisoners, already condemned, are also kept in the cells—there being a recent law which permits the counting of three months of cellular imprisonment as four months of the penalty. This category, however, is not numerous, a special permission of the Ministry being necessary in each separate case.

Small yards, paved with asphalt, and one of them subdivided into three narrow compartments for the inmates of the cellular department, occupy the spaces between the high wing of the prison. There the prisoners take some exercise, or spend several hours in such work as may be done out-doors. Every morning I could see from my window some fifty men descending into the yard; there, taking seats on the asphalt pavement, they were beating the wound-off cocoons from which the floss silk is obtained. Through my window, or while occasionally passing by, I sometimes saw also swarms of boys invading one of the yards; and at a three years' distance I cannot remember these boys without a sad feeling and heartburn. The condemnations pronounced against children by the always condemning *Police Correctionnelle* Courts are, in fact, much more ferocious than those pronounced against adults. The adult may be condemned to a few months or a few years of imprisonment; the boy is invariably sent for the same crime to a 'House of Correction,' to be kept there until his eighteenth or twenty-first year. When the prosecutions against the Anarchists at Lyons had reached their culminating point, a boy of fifteen, Cirier, was condemned by the Lyons Court of Appeal to be

kept in prison until the age of twenty-one, for having abused the police in a speech pronounced at a public meeting. The president of the same meeting, for exactly the same offence, was condemned to one year of imprisonment, and he is long since at liberty, while the boy Cirier will remain for several years more in prison. Similar condemnations are quite usual in French Courts. I do not exactly know what the French penitentiary colonies for children may be, the opinions which I have heard being very contradictory. Thus I was told that the children are there taught agriculture, and that they are treated not very badly, especially since several improvements which have been introduced of late; but I was told also, on the other side, that a few years ago, in a penitentiary colony in the environs of Clairvaux, the children were unscrupulously overworked by a person to whom they were intrusted, or rather rented by the State, and that they were abused. At any rate, we saw at Lyons numbers of boys—mostly runaways and ‘incorrigible ones’ from the penitentiary colonies; and to see the demoralisation developed among these boys was really awful. Brutalised as they are by the warders, and left without any honest and moralising influence, they are foredoomed to become permanent inmates of prisons, and to die in a central prison, or in New Caledonia. The warders and the priest of the St. Paul prison were unanimous in saying that the only desire which day and night haunts these young people is that of satisfying the most abject passions. In the dormitories, in the church, in the yards, they are always perpetrating the same shameful deeds. When we see the formidable numbers of the *attentats à la pudeur* brought before the Courts every year, let us always remember that the State itself maintains, at Lyons and in fact in all its prisons, special nurseries for preparing people for those abject crimes. I seriously invite, therefore, those who elaborate schemes for the legal extermination of old offenders in New Guinea, to hire, for a fortnight or so, a *pistole* at Lyons, and to re-examine there their foolish schemes. They would perceive that they begin their reforms from the wrong end, and that the real cause of the old offender lies in the perversion due to such infection-nests as the Lyons prison is. As for myself, I suppose that to lock up hundreds of boys in such infection-nests is surely to commit a crime much worse than any of those committed by any of the old offenders themselves.

On the whole, the prisons are not places for teaching much honesty, and the St. Paul prison makes no exception to the rule. The lessons in honesty given from above are not much better than those imparted from below, as will be seen from what follows. Two different systems are in use in French prisons for supplying the inmates with food, dress, and other necessaries. In some of them the State is the undertaker who supplies both food and dress, as also the few other things which the prisoner can purchase at the canteen with

his own money (bread, cheese, some meat; wine and tobacco for those who are not yet condemned; prison-knives, combs, brushes, paper, and so on). In this case, it is the State which raises a certain percentage, varying from three to nine-tenths on the payment due to the prisoner for the work he has done in prison, either for the State, or for private undertakers; three-tenths of the wages are retained if the prisoner is under preventive incarceration; five-tenths if he is condemned for the first time; and six, seven, eight, or nine-tenths if he has had one, two, three, four, or more previous condemnations; one-tenth of the salary always remaining for the prisoner, whatever the number of condemnations. In other prisons the whole is rented to a private undertaker, who is bound to supply everything due in accordance with regulations. The undertaker in this case raises the just named tenths on the salaries of the prisoner, and he is paid, moreover, by the State a few centimes per day for each prisoner. As to those inmates who find it more advantageous to labour for the trade outside (skilled shoemakers, tailors, and scribes are often in this case), they are bound to pay to the undertaker a certain redemption money—mostly 10*d.* per day—and then they are dispensed from compulsory labour. Now, the St. Paul prison is established on the second system; everything is supplied by a private undertaker, and I must confess that everything is of the worst quality. The undertaker unscrupulously robs the prisoners. Of course the food is far from being as bad as it is in Russian prisons, but still it is very bad, especially if compared with what it is at Clairvaux. The bread is of a low quality, and the soup and *ration* of boiled rice, or kidney-beans, are often execrable. As to the canteen, everything is dear and of the lowest kind; while the Clairvaux administration supplied us for threepence a piece of good steak with potatoes, we paid at Lyons sixpence for a slice of very bad boiled meat, and in the same proportion for everything.

How the works are conducted and paid at Lyons I cannot judge from my own experience, but the above account does not inspire much confidence in the honesty of the enterprise. As to the dress, it is of the worst kind, and also much inferior to what we saw at Clairvaux, where also it leaves very much to desire. When taking my daily walk in one of the yards at Lyons, I often saw the recently condemned people going to change their own dress for that of the prisoners, supplied by the undertakers. They were mostly workmen, poorly but still decently dressed—as French workmen, even the poorest, usually are. When they had, however, put on the uniform of the prison—the brown jacket, all covered with multicoloured rags roughly sewn to cover the holes, and the patched-up trousers six inches too short to reach the immense wooden shoes—they came out quite abashed with the ridiculous dress they had assumed. The very first step of the prisoner within the prison walls was thus to be wrapped up in a dress which is in itself a story of degradation.

I did not see much of the relations between the administration and the common-law prisoners at Lyons. But I saw enough to perceive that the warders—mostly old police-soldiers—maintained all the well-known brutal features of the late Imperial police. As to the higher administration, it is pervaded with the hypocrisy which characterises the ruling classes at Lyons. To quote but one example. The Director of the prison had reiterated to me on many occasions the formal promise of never sequestering any of my letters, without letting me know that such letters had been confiscated. It was all I claimed. Notwithstanding that, several of my letters were confiscated, without any notice, and my wife, ill at that time, remained anxious without news from me. One of my letters, stolen in this way, was even transmitted to the Procureur Fabreguettes, who read it before the Court of Appeal. I might quote several other examples, but this one will do.

There is in our system of prisons a feature well worthy of notice, but completely lost sight of, and which I would earnestly commend to the attention of all interested in penal matters. The leading idea of our penal system is obviously to punish those who have been recognised as 'criminals;' while in reality the penalty of several years of imprisonment hurts much less the 'criminal' than people quite innocent—that is, his wife and children. However hard the conditions of prison-life, man is so made that he finally accommodates himself to these conditions, and considers them as an unavoidable evil, as soon as he cannot modify them. But there are people who never can nor will accommodate themselves to the imprisonment of the man who was their only support in life. Such are the prisoner's wife and his children. The judges and lawyers who so freely pronounce sentences of two, three, and five years of imprisonment—have they ever reasoned about the fate they are preparing for the prisoner's wife? Do they know how few are the women who can earn more than six or seven shillings per week? And do they know that to live with a family on such a salary means sheer misery with all its dreadful consequences? Have they ever reflected also about the moral sufferings which they are inflicting on the prisoner's wife—the scorn of her neighbours, the sufferings of the woman who naturally exaggerates those of her husband, the preoccupations for the present and the future? . . . Who can measure all these sufferings, and count the tears shed by a prisoner's wife? He who could, would certainly say that the law hits far less the man considered as a criminal than his family which it considers as innocent.

If the slightest attention were ever given to the sufferings of the prisoner's kinsfolk, surely the inventors of schemes of civilised prisons would not have invented the reception-halls of the modern dungeons. They would have said to themselves that the only consolation of the prisoner's wife is to see her husband, and they would not

have inflicted on her new and quite useless sufferings, and planned those halls where everything has been taken into account—everything excepting the wife who comes once a week to cast a glance on her husband, and to exchange a few words with him.

Imagine a circular vaulted hall, miserably lighted from above. If you enter it at the reception-hours, you are literally stunned. A clamour of some hundred voices speaking, or rather crying all at once, rises from all parts of it towards the vault, which sends them back and mingles them into an infernal noise, together with the piercing whistles of the warders, the grating of the locks, and the clashing of the keys. Your eyes must be first accustomed to the darkness before you recognise that the clamour of voices comes from six separate groups of women, children, and men, crying all at once to be heard by those whom they address. Behind these groups, you perceive along the walls six other groups of human faces, hardly distinguishable in the darkness behind iron-wire networks and iron bars. You cannot divine at once what is going on in these groups. The fact is, that to have an interview with his kinsfolk the prisoner is introduced, together with four other prisoners, into a small dark coop, the face of which is covered with a thick network of iron bars. His kinsfolk are introduced into another coop opposite, also covered with iron bars, and separated from the former by a passage three feet wide, where a warder is posted. Each coop receives at once five prisoners; while in the opposite coop some fifteen men, women, and children—the kinsfolk of the five prisoners—are squeezed. The interviews hardly last for more than fifteen or twenty minutes, all speak at once, louder and louder, and amidst the clamour of voices, each of which is raised louder and louder, one soon must cry with all his strength to be heard. After a few minutes of such exercise, my wife and myself were voiceless, and were compelled simply to look at each other without speaking, while I climbed like a tiger on the iron bars of my coop to raise my face to the height of a small window which feebly lighted the coop from behind; and then my wife could perceive in the darkness my profile on the grey ground of the window. She used to leave the reception-hall saying that such a visit is a real torture.

I ought to say a few words about the *Palais de Justice* of Lyons, where we were kept for ten days during our trial. But I should be compelled to enter into such disgusting details that I prefer to go on to another subject. Suffice it to say that I have seen rooms where the arrested people were awaiting their turn to be called before the examining magistrate, amidst ponds of the most disgusting liquids; and that there are within this 'Palace' several dark cells which have alternately a double destination: sometimes they are literally covered with human excretions; and a few days later, after a hasty sweep, they are resorted to for locking up newly arrested

people. Never in my life had I seen anything so dirty as this Palace, which will always remain in my recollections as a palace of filth of all descriptions. It was with a real feeling of relief that I returned from thence to my *pistole*, where I remained for two months more, while most of my comrades addressed the Court of Appeal. This last confirmed, of course, the sentences pronounced by order of Government in the Police Correctionnelle Court; and a few days later, on March 17, 1883, we were brought in the night, in great secrecy, and with a ridiculous display of police force, to the railway-station. There we were packed up in cellular waggons to be transported to the 'Maison Centrale' of Clairvaux.

It is remarkable how so many improvements in the penitentiary system, although made with excellent intentions of doing away with some evils, always create, in their turn, new evils, and become a new source of pain for the prisoners. Such were the reflections which I made when locked up in a cell of the cellular waggon which was slowly moving towards Clairvaux. A French cellular waggon is an ordinary empty waggon, in the interior of which a light frame-work consisting of two rows of cells, with a passage between, has been constructed. But I am afraid of conveying a false and exaggerated impression to my readers when I write 'two rows of cells.' 'Two rows of cupboards' would be more correct, for the cells are just of the size of small cupboards, where one may sit down on a narrow bench, touching the door with his knees and the sides with his elbows. One need not be very fat to find it difficult to move within this narrow space; and he need not be too much accustomed to the fresh breezes of the sea-side to find difficulties in breathing therein. A small window protected by iron bars, which is cut through the door of the cupboard, would admit enough air; but to prevent the prisoners from seeing one another and talking, there is an additional little instrument of torture in the shape of a Venetian blind, which the warders close as soon as they have locked up somebody in the cupboard. Another instrument of torture is an iron stove, especially when it runs at full speed to boil the potatoes and roast the meat for the warders' dinner. My fellow-prisoners, all workmen of a great city, accustomed to the want of fresh air in their small workshops, did not actually suffocate, but two of us were prevented from fainting only by being allowed to step out of our respective cupboards and to breathe some air in the passage between. Happily enough, our journey lasted only fifteen hours, but I have Russian friends, who were expelled from France, and who have spent more than forty-eight hours in a cellular waggon on their way from Paris to the Swiss frontier, the waggon being left in the night at some station, while the warders called at the Mâcon and other prisons.

The worst is, however, that the prisoners are completely given up

to the mercy of the two warders ; if the warders like, they put the cuffs on the hands of the prisoners already locked up in the cupboards, and they do that without any reason whatever ; and if they like better, they, moreover, chain the prisoners' feet by means of irons riveted to the floor of the cupboards. All depends upon the good or bad humour of the warders, and the depth of their psychological deductions. On the whole, the fifteen hours which we spent in the cellular waggon remain among the worst reminiscences of all my comrades, and we were quite happy to enter at last the cells at Clairvaux.

The central prison of Clairvaux occupies the site of what formerly was the Abbey of St. Bernard. The great monk of the twelfth century, whose statue, carved in stone, still rises on a neighbouring hill, stretching its arms towards the prison, had well chosen his residence at the mouth of a fine little dale supplied with excellent water from a fountain, and at the entrance to a wide and fertile plain watered by the Aube. Wide forests cover still the gentle slopes of the hills, whose flanks supply good building-stone. Several lime-kilns and forges are scattered round about, and the Paris and Belfort railway runs now within a mile from the prison. During the great Revolution the abbey was confiscated by the State, and its then extensive and solid buildings became, in the earlier years of our century, a *Dépôt de Mendicité*. Later on, their destination was changed, and now the former abbey is a 'Maison de Détention et de Correction,' which shelters about 1,400 and occasionally 2,000 inmates. It is one of the largest in France ; its outer wall—the *mur d'enceinte*—a formidable masonry some twenty feet high, incloses, besides the prison proper, a wide area occupied by the buildings of the administration, barracks of the soldiers, orchards, and even corn-fields, and has an aggregate length of nearly three miles. The buildings of the prison proper, with its numerous workshops, cover a square about 400 yards wide, inclosed by another still higher wall—the *mur de ronde*. With its lofty chimneys, which day and night send their smoke towards a mostly cloudy sky, and the rhythmical throbbing of its machinery, which is heard late in the night, it has the aspect of a little manufacturing town. In fact, there are within its walls more manufactures than in many small towns. There are a big manufacture of iron beds and iron furniture, lighted by electricity, and employing more than 400 men ; workshops for weaving velvet, cloth, and linen ; for making frames to pictures, looking-glasses, and meters ; for cutting glass and fabricating all kinds of ladies' attire in pearl-shell ; yards for cutting stone ; flour mills, and a variety of smaller workshops ; all dress for the inmates being made by the men themselves. The whole machinery is set in motion by four powerful steam-engines and one turbine. An immense orchard and a corn-field, as also small orchards allotted to each warder and

employé, are also comprised within the outer wall and cultivated by the prisoners.

Without seeing it, one could hardly imagine what an immense fitting up and expenditure are necessary for lodging and giving occupation to some 1,400 prisoners. Surely the State never would have undertaken this immense expenditure, had it not found at Clairvaux, St. Michel, and elsewhere, ready-made buildings of old abbeys. And it never would have organised so wide a system of productive work, had it not attracted private undertakers by renting to them the prisoners' labour at a very low price, to the disadvantage of free private industry. And still, the current expenses of the State for keeping up the Clairvaux prison and the like must be very heavy. A numerous and costly administration, seventy warders, nourished, lodged, and paid from 45*l.* to 56*l.* per year, and a company of soldiers which are kept at Clairvaux, bear hard on the budget—not to speak of the expenses of the central administration, the transport of prisoners, the infirmary, and so on. It is obvious that the above-mentioned percentage, raised on the salaries of the prisoners, which does not exceed an average of 7*d.* per day and per head of employed men, falls very short of defraying all these heavy expenses.

Leaving aside the political prisoners who are occasionally sent thither, there are at Clairvaux two different categories of inmates. The great number are common-law prisoners condemned to more than one year of imprisonment but not to hard labour (these last being transported to New Caledonia); and there are, besides, a few dozen of soldiers condemned by martial courts—the so-called *détentionnaires*. These last are a sad product of our system of militarism. A soldier who has assaulted his corporal, or officer, is usually condemned to death; but if he has been provoked—which is mostly the case—the penalty is commuted into a twenty years' imprisonment, and he is sent to Clairvaux. I cannot explain how it happens, but there are *détentionnaires* who have to undergo two or three like condemnations—probably for assaults committed during their imprisonment. There was much talk, during our stay at Clairvaux, of a man, about forty years old, who had cumulated an aggregate penalty reaching sixty-five years of imprisonment; he could fulfil his sentence only if he could prolong his life beyond his hundredth year. On the 14th of July, twenty-five years of his term were taken off by a decree of the President of the Republic; but still the man had some forty years more to remain imprisoned. It may seem incredible, but it is true.

Everybody recognises the absurdity of such condemnations, and therefore the *détentionnaires* are not submitted to the usual regimen of the common-law prisoners. They are not constrained to compulsory labour, and they enter a workshop only if they like. They wear a better grey dress than other prisoners, and are permitted to take

wine at the canteen. Those who do not go to the workshops occupy a separate quarter, and spend years and years in doing absolutely nothing. It is easy to conceive what some thirty soldiers, who have spent several years in barracks, may do when they are locked up for twenty years or so in a prison, and have no occupation of any kind, either intellectual or physical. Their quarter has so bad a reputation that the rains of brimstone which destroyed the two Biblical towns are invoked upon it by the administration.

As to the common-law prisoners, they are submitted to a regimen of compulsory labour, and of absolute silence. This last, however, is so adverse to human nature that it has in fact been given up. It is simply impossible to prevent people from speaking when at work in the workshops; and, without trebling the number of warders and resorting to ferocious punishments, it is not easy to prevent prisoners from exchanging words during the hours of rest, or from chattering in dormitories. During our stay at Clairvaux we saw the system abandoned more and more, and I suppose that the watchword is now merely to prohibit loud speaking and quarrels.

Early in the morning—at five in the summer, and at six in the winter—a bell rings. The prisoners must immediately rise, roll up their beds, and descend into the yards, where they stand in ranks, the men of each workshop separately under the command of a warder. On his order, they march in Indian file, at a slow pace, towards their respective workshops, the warder loudly crying out, *un, deux ! un, deux !* and the heavy wooden shoes answering in cadence to the word of command. A few minutes later, the steam-engines sound their call, and the machines run at full speed. At nine (half-past eight in the summer) the work is stopped for an hour, and the prisoners are marched to the refectories. There they are seated on benches, all faces turned in one direction, so as to see only the backs of the men on the next bench, and they take their breakfast. At ten they return to the workshops, and the work is interrupted only at twelve, for ten minutes, and at half-past two, when all men less than thirty-five years old, and having received no instruction, are sent for an hour to the school.

At four the prisoners go to take their dinner; it lasts for half-an-hour, and a walk in the yards follows. The same Indian files are made up, and they slowly march in a circle, the warder always crying his cadenced *un, deux !* They call that *faire la queue de saucissons*. At five the work begins again and lasts until eight in the winter, and until nightfall during the other seasons.

As soon as the machinery is stopped—which is done at six, or even earlier in September or March—the prisoners are locked up in the dormitories. There they must lie in their beds from half-past six until six the next morning, and I suppose that these hours of enforced rest must be the most painful hours of the day. Certainly, they are permitted to read in their beds until nine, but the permission

is effective only for those whose beds are close to the gas-burners. At nine the lights are diminished. During the night each dormitory remains under the supervision of *prévôts* who are nominated from among the prisoners and who have the more red lace on their sleeves, as they are the more assiduous in spying and denouncing their comrades.

On Sundays the work is suspended. The prisoners spend the day in the yards, if the weather permits, or in the workshops, where they may read, or talk—but not too loud—or in the school-rooms, where they write letters. A band composed of some thirty prisoners plays in the yard, and for half-an-hour goes out of the interior walls to play in the *cour d'honneur*—a yard occupied by the lodgings of the administration—while the fire-brigade takes some exercise. At six all must be in their beds.

Besides the men who are at work in the workshops, there is also a *brigade extérieure*, the men of which do various work outside the prison proper, but still within its outer wall—such as repairs, painting, sawing wood, and so on. They also cultivate the orchards of the house and those of the warders, for salaries reaching but a few pence per day. Some of them are also sent to the forest for cutting wood, cleaning a canal, and so on. No escape is to be feared, because only such men are admitted to the exterior brigade as have but one or two months more to remain at Clairvaux.

Such is the regular life of the prison—a life running for years without the least modification, and which acts depressingly on man by its monotony and its want of impressions—a life which a man can endure for years, but which he cannot endure—if he has no aim beyond this life itself—without being depressed and reduced to the state of a machine which obeys, but has no will of its own—a life which results in an atrophy of the best qualities of man and a development of the worst of them, and, if much prolonged, renders him quite unfit to live afterwards in a society of free fellow-creatures.

As to us, the 'politicals,' we had a special regimen—namely, that of prisoners submitted to preventive incarceration. We kept our own dress; we were not compelled to be shaved, and we could smoke. We occupied three spacious rooms, with a separate small room for myself, and had a little garden, some fifty yards long and ten yards wide, where we did some gardening on a narrow strip of earth along the wall, and could appreciate, from our own experience, the benefits of an 'intensive culture.' One would suspect me of exaggeration if I enumerated all crops of vegetables we made in our kitchen-garden, less than fifty square yards. No compulsory work was imposed upon us; and my comrades—all workmen who had left at home their families without support—never could obtain any regular employment. They tried to sew ladies' stays for an undertaker of Clairvaux, but soon abandoned the work, seeing that with the deduction of three-

tenths of their salaries for the State they could not earn more than from three to four pence a day. They gladly accepted the work in pearl-shell, although it was paid but a little better than the former, but the orders came only occasionally, for a few days. Over-production had occasioned stagnation in this trade, and other work could not be done in our rooms, while any intercourse with the common-law prisoners was severely prohibited.

Reading and the study of languages were thus the chief occupations of my comrades. A workman can study only when he has the chance of being imprisoned—and they studied earnestly. The study of languages was very successful, and I was glad to find at Clairvaux a practical proof of what I formerly maintained on theoretical grounds—namely, that the Russians are not the only people who easily learn foreign languages. My French comrades learned, with great ease, English, German, Italian, and Spanish; some of them mastered two languages during a two years' stay at Clairvaux. Bookbinding was among us the most beloved occupation. Some instruments were made out of pieces of iron and wood, heavy stones and small carpenters' presses were resorted to; and as we finally obtained—about the end of the second year—some tools worth this name, all learned bookbinding with the facility with which an intelligent workman learns a new profession, and most of us reached a great perfection in the art.

A special warder was always kept in our quarter, and as soon as some of us were in the yard, he regularly took his seat on the steps at the door. In the night we were locked up under at least six or seven locks, and, moreover, a round of warders passed each two hours, and approached each bed in order to ascertain that nobody had vanished. A rigorous supervision, never relaxed, and maintained by the mutual help of all warders, is exercised on the prisoners as soon as they have left the dormitories. During the last two years I met with my wife in a little room within the walls, and, together with some one of our sick comrades, we took a walk in the solitary little garden of the Director, or in the great orchard of the prison; and never during these two years was I left out of sight of the warder who accompanied us, for so much as five minutes.

No newspapers penetrated into our rooms, excepting scientific periodicals or illustrated weekly papers. Only in the second year of our imprisonment were we permitted to receive a halfpenny colourless daily paper, and a Governmental paper published at Lyons. No socialist literature was admitted, and I could not introduce even a book of my own authorship dealing with socialist literature. As to writing, the most severe control was exercised on the manuscripts I intended to send out of the prison. Nothing dealing with social questions, and still less with Russian affairs, was permitted to issue from the prison-walls. The common-law prisoners are permitted to write letters only once a month, and only to their nearest rela-

tives. As to us, we could correspond with friends as much as we liked, but all letters sent or received were submitted to a severe censorship, which was the cause of repeated conflicts with the administration.

The food of the prisoners is, in my opinion, quite insufficient. The daily allowance consists chiefly of bread, 850 grammes per day (one pound and nine-tenths). It is grey, but very good, and if a prisoner complains of having not enough of it, one loaf, or two, per week are added to the above. The breakfast consists of a soup which is made with a few vegetables, water, and American lard—the last very often rancid and bitter. At dinner the same soup is given, and a plate of two ounces of kidney-beans, rice, lentils, or potatoes is added. Twice a week the soup is made with meat, and then it is served only at breakfast, two ounces of boiled meat being given instead of it at dinner. The men are thus compelled to purchase additional food at the canteen, where they have, for very honest prices varying from three-farthings to twopence, small rations of cheese, or sausage, pork-meat, and sometimes tripe, as also milk, and small rations of figs, jams, or fruits in the summer. Without this supplementary food the men obviously could not maintain their strength; but many of them, and especially old people, earn so little that, after deducting the percentage money raised by the State, they cannot spend at the canteen even twopence per day. I really wonder how they manage to keep body and soul together.

Two different kinds of work are made by the prisoners at Clairvaux. Some of them are employed, by the State, either in its manufactures of linen, cloth, and dress for the prisoners, or in various capacities in the house itself (joiners, painters, man-nurses in the infirmary, accountants, &c.). They are mostly paid from 8*d.* to 10*d.* a day. Many, however, are employed in the above-mentioned workshops by private undertakers. Their salaries, established by the *Chambre de Commerce* at Troyes, vary very much, and are mostly very low, especially in those trades where no safe scale of salaries can be established on account of the great variety of patterns fabricated and of the great subdivision of labour. Very many men earn but from 6*d.* to 8*d.* per day; and it is only in the iron bed manufacture that the salaries reach 1*s.* 8*d.* and occasionally more; while I found that the average salaries of 125 men employed in various capacities reached only 11*d.* (1 franc 17 centimes) per day. This figure is, however, perhaps above the average, there being a great number of prisoners who earn but 7*d.* or even 5*d.*, especially in the workshop for the fabrication of socks, where old people are sent to die from the dust and exhaustion.

Several reasons might be adduced as an apology for these small salaries; the low quality of prison-work, the fluctuations of trade, and several other considerations ought no doubt to be taken into account.

But the fact is that undertakers who have rapidly made big fortunes in the prisons are not rare; while the prisoners consider with full reason that they are robbed when they are paid only a few pence for twelve hours' work. Such a payment is the more insufficient, as one half, or more, of the salaries is taken by the State, and the regular food supplied by the State is quite inadequate, especially for a man who is doing work.

If the prisoner has had a previous condemnation before being sent to a central prison—and this is very often the case—and if his salary is 10*d.* per day, 6*d.* are taken by the State, and the remaining 4*d.* are divided into two equal parts, one of which goes to the prisoner's reserve-fund and is handed over to him only on the day of his delivery; while the other part—that is, 2*d.* only—is inscribed on his 'disposable' account and may be spent for his daily expenses at the canteen. With 2*d.* per day for supplementary food a workman obviously cannot live and labour. In consequence of that a system of *gratifications* has been introduced; they mostly vary from two to five shillings, and they are inscribed in full on the prisoner's 'disposable' account. It is certain that this system of *gratifications* has given rise to many abuses. Suppose a skilled workman who is condemned for the third time and of whose salary the State retains seven-tenths. Suppose further that the work he has made during the month is valued at 40*s.* The State taking from this salary 28*s.*, there will remain only 6*s.* to be inscribed on his 'disposable' account. He proposes then to the undertaker to value his work only at 20*s.* and to add a gratification of 10*s.* The undertaker accepts, and so the State has only 14*s.*; the undertaker disburses 30*s.* instead of 40*s.*; and the prisoner has on his disposable account 3*s.*, as also the whole of the *gratification*—that is, 13*s.*; all are thus satisfied, and if the State is at loss of 14*s.*—*ma foi, tant pis!*

Things look still worse if the great tempter of mankind—tobacco—be taken into account. Smoking is severely prohibited in prisons, and the smokers are fined from 5*d.* to 4*s.* every time they are discovered smoking. And yet everybody smokes or chews in the prisons. Tobacco is the current money, but a money so highly prized that a cigarette—a nothing for an accomplished smoker—is paid 2*d.*, and the 5*d.* *paquet* of tobacco has a currency worth 4*s.* or even more in times of scarcity. This precious merchandise is so highly esteemed that each pinch of tobacco is first chewed, then dried and smoked, and finally taken as snuff, although reduced to mere ash. Useless to say that there are undertakers who know how to exploit this human weakness and who pay half of the work done with tobacco valued at the above prices, and that there are also warders who carry on this lucrative trade. Altogether, the prohibition of smoking is a source of so many evils that the French Administration probably will be compelled soon to follow the example of Germany and to sell tobacco

at the canteens of the prisons. This would be also the surest means for diminishing the number of smokers.

We came to Clairvaux at a propitious moment. All the old administration had been recently dismissed, and a new departure taken in the treatment of prisoners. A year or two before our arrival a prisoner was killed in his cell by the keys of the warders. The official report was to the effect that he had hanged himself; but the surgeon did not sign this report, and made another report of his own, stating the assassination. This circumstance led to a thorough reform in the treatment of prisoners, and I am glad to say that the relations between the prisoners and the warders at Clairvaux were without comparison better than at Lyons. In fact, I saw much less brutality and more human relations than I was prepared to see—and yet the system itself is so bad that it brings about most horrible results.

Of course the relatively better wind which now blows over Clairvaux may change in a day or two. The smallest rebellion in the prison would bring about a rapid change for the worse, as there are enough warders and inspectors who sigh for 'the old system,' which is still in use in other French prisons. Thus, while we were at Clairvaux, a man was brought thither from Poissy—a central prison close by Paris. He considered his condemnation as unjust, and cried loudly day after day in his cell. In fact, he already had the symptoms of a commencing madness. Now to silence him the Poissy authorities invented the following plan. They brought a fire-engine and pumped water on the man through the opening in the door of his cell; they then left him quite wet in his cell, notwithstanding the winter's frost. The intervention of the Press was necessary to bring about the dismissal of the Director. As to the numerous revolts which have broken out during the last two months in several French prisons, they seem to show that 'the old system' is in full force still.

And now, what are these better relations between warders and prisoners which I saw at Clairvaux? Many chapters could be written about them, but I shall try to be as short as possible, and point out only their leading features. It is obvious that a long life of the warders in common and the very necessities of their service have developed among them a certain brotherhood, or rather *esprit de corps*, which causes them to act with a remarkable uniformity in their relations with the prisoners. In consequence of that *esprit de corps*, as soon as a prisoner is brought to the prison, the first question of the warders is whether he is a *soumis* or an *insoumis*—a submissive fellow, or an insubordinate. If the answer is favourable, the prisoner's life may be a tolerable one; if not, he will not soon leave the prison; and if he happens ever to leave it, he will do it with broken health, and so exasperated against society at large that he will be soon re-interred in a prison and finish his days there, if not in New Cale-

donia. If the prisoner is described as an insubordinate, he will be punished again and again. If he speaks in the ranks, although not louder than the others, a remonstrance will be made in such terms that he will reply and be punished. And each punishment will be so disproportionate that he will object again, and the punishment be doubled. 'A man who has been once sent to the punishment quarter, is sure to return thither a few days after he has been released from it,' say the warders, even the mildest ones. And this punishment is not a light one. The man is not beaten; he is not knocked down. No, we are civilised people, and the punished man is merely brought to the cellular quarter, and locked up in a cell. The cell is quite empty: it has neither bed nor bench. For the night a mattress is given, and the prisoner must lay his dress outside his cell, at the door. Bread and water are his food. As soon as the prison-bell rings in the morning, he is taken to a small covered yard, and there he must—walk. Nothing more; but our refined civilisation has learned how to make a torture even of this natural exercise. At a formal slow pace, under the cries of *un, deux*, the patients must walk all the day long, round the building. They walk for twenty minutes; then a rest follows. For ten minutes they must sit down immovable, each of them on his numbered stone, and walk again for twenty minutes; and so on through all the day, as long as the engines of the workshops are running; and the punishment does not last one day, or two; it lasts for whole months. It is so cruel that the prisoner implores but one thing: 'Let me return to the workshops.'—'Well, we shall see that in a fortnight or two,' is the usual answer. But the fortnight goes over, and the next one too, and the patient still continues to walk for twelve hours every day. Then he revolts. He begins to cry in his cell, to insult the warders. Then he becomes 'a rebel'—a dreadful qualification for any one who is in the hands of the brotherhood of warders—and as such he will rot in the cells, and walk throughout his life. If he assaults a warder, he will not be sent to New Caledonia: he will still remain in his cell, and ever walk and walk in the small building. One man, a peasant, seeing no issue from this horrible situation, preferred to poison himself rather than live such a life—a terrible story which I shall some day tell in full.

As we were walking with my wife in the garden, more than two hundred yards distant from the cellular quarter, we heard sometimes horrible, desperate cries coming from that building. My wife, terrified and trembling, seized my arm, and I told her that it was the man whom they had watered with the fire-pump at Poissy, and now, quite contrary to the law, had brought here, to Clairvaux. Day after day—two, three days without interruption, he cried: '*Vaches, gredins, assassins!*' (*vache* is the name of the warders in the prison language), or loudly called out his story, until he fell, exhausted, on

the floor of his cell. He considered as unjust his detention at Clairvaux in the punishment quarter, and he declared loudly that he would kill a warder rather than remain all his life in a cell. For the next two months he remained quiet. An inspector had vaguely promised him that he might be sent into the workshops on the 14th of July. But the 'Fête National' came, and the man was not released. His exasperation then had no limits; he cried, insulted, and assaulted the warders, destroyed the wooden parts of his cell, and finally was sent to the black-hole, where heavy irons were laid upon his hands and feet. I have not seen these irons, but when he reappeared again in the cellular quarter, he loudly cried out that he was kept in the black-hole for two months, with irons on his hands and feet so heavy that he could not move. He already is half mad, and he will be kept in the cell until he becomes a complete lunatic, and then . . . then he will be submitted to all those tortures which lunatics have to endure in prisons and asylums. . . .

And the immense problem of suppressing these atrocities rises at its full size before us. The relations between the administration and the prisoners are not imbued at Clairvaux with the brutality which I often have spoken of on former occasions. And yet our penitentiary system fatally brings about such horrible results as the above—the more horrible as they must be considered a necessary consequence of the system itself. But why are these sufferings inflicted on human creatures? What are the moral results achieved at the cost of such sufferings and of so heavy an expenditure of human labour as that implied by our prisons? In what direction lies the solution of the immense problem raised by our system of punishments and prisons? Such are the grave questions which necessarily rise before the observer. To these questions I shall return on another occasion.

P. КРОПОТКИН.

HOME RULE.

I.

PRECEDENTS.

THE problem which Parliament has been suddenly called upon to discuss and to solve, at the instance of its most experienced statesman—namely, the framing of an autonomous Government for Ireland, without impairing the unity and strength of the central government of the empire—difficult and momentous as it is, is scarcely more so than what has been frequently presented to statesmen in other countries and has been solved by them. The cases therefore where it has been found necessary to grant autonomous institutions to dependent kingdoms or provinces, for the purpose of giving content by assuaging historical, national, ethnographical or geographical conditions, opposed to a more complete union, are full of instruction for those who are prepared on principle, or on the ground of expediency, to make concessions to Irish opinion.

In the many constitutional changes of the last hundred years, we can recognise two distinct movements leading to results not dissimilar in kind. The one is a centripetal movement—the union of states previously independent of one another, but with more or less of common race, language and interests. Their union has for the most part been effected on the Federal principle; the states or provinces have retained to a large extent their autonomy, legislative and administrative, but have combined together on equal terms for certain definite common purposes, for defence or for commercial or administrative objects. The other is a centrifugal movement, where the centralisation of the previous century under despotic rule had been found irksome and intolerable, and it was necessary to make large concessions in the direction of autonomy, in order to cause content and to prevent rebellion and secession. The movement towards decentralisation has doubtless been in a great measure due to the advance of democracy, and to the awakening of national aspirations with which it was accompanied. The centralisation of various distinct communities could only be maintained by a rigorous despotism; democracy weakened the central power and gave opportunity to the dependent provinces to reassert their national claims. In a similar

manner, where the main movement has been towards union and greater centralisation, the tendency has been controlled by democracy; it was felt wiser and safer to leave many of the powers of government, administrative and legislative, to be exercised by the local authorities, and to concede to the new central authority only so much of the functions of government as were absolutely necessary for the common safety or common utility. We may, then, I think, deduce from the general principles of democracy, and we may verify our conclusion by examination of the many cases now before us, that democracy is safest and most easily regulated, when its powers are broken up and divided between many centres of local government, and where as little as is consistent with safety and public utility, is reserved for the central authority which controls or combines the whole.

As the result of the changes in these two directions in Europe and America we find every form of union of states, and every degree of variation between the relations of the central authority of an empire or state and its dependent states or provinces, which can well be conceived, and we have no lack of precedents for procedure in such matters, or of illustrations and examples, from which to make choice in the changes we may propose to make in the constitution of Ireland.

Beginning with those states or dependencies where the union is of the loosest kind, we have the case of Sweden and Norway, united under the same sovereign, but where the union is otherwise nominal only, where there is complete autonomy for both in every respect, and where even the army and navy and the system of taxation are entirely separate and distinct. Even this slender bond of union does not appear to work badly: it secures peace and harmony between two kindred nations; it combines them together for purposes of defence against possible enemies. Again, we have the union of Finland and Russia and of Luxemburg and Holland. The former is one of considerable interest, for while the superior power is under a system of pure and unrestrained despotism, Finland has a liberal constitution with representative institutions; it has administrative autonomy superintended by a Russian governor; its recruits are enlisted for separate Finnish regiments of the Russian army. On the other hand, it has no foreign or commercial policy distinct from that of its pre-eminent superior power.

Under the same head may be treated the relations of Austria to Hungary (which I shall refer to again later), and those of Great Britain to her numerous Anglo-Saxon colonies. Within the present century free constitutions have been granted to all of these colonies. They have now complete autonomy as regards all internal affairs, including even the right to levy customs duties on the manufactures

of the mother country. On the other hand, they have no representation in the Imperial Legislature and no voice in the determination of foreign or other imperial questions. They contribute nothing to the maintenance of the forces necessary for the general support and defence of the empire; and it is only recently that some of them have undertaken to a small extent the cost of their own defence. Much has recently been written of Federation of the Empire; its advocates, however, have not yet agreed in defining the common objects which any central representative body would undertake. Whether the relations of these colonies to Great Britain would stand the strain and friction of a serious European war, in which the former may have no real interest or concern, is yet to be tested, and it is to be hoped the test will long be deferred.

Turning, then, from these examples of union, where the main if not the only connecting link is the Sovereign, and where autonomy of the fullest kind is reserved, we come to the other and far more numerous class of cases based more or less on the Federal principle. The most important of these is that of the United States of America, the details of whose Constitution are so well known that it is scarcely necessary to refer to them. The main principle of the Union was the maintenance of the separate existence of the States, which had previously been distinct political communities dependent on the English crown. The founders of the Union proposed to delegate so much of the sovereign powers of these separate States to a central authority as were necessary for the common safety and for other definite purposes then agreed upon; but whatever was not expressly thus delegated by the Constitution was reserved for the States. For the interpretation of this written Constitution it was necessary to provide a Supreme Court of Law, independent of the legislatures and of the civil authorities of the Union and of the separate States. No reversal of the decision of this court is possible by the Legislature, and no amendments can be made in the Constitution except in the manner pointed out by the Articles of Union: namely, by a majority of two-thirds of Congress, and of three-fourths of the State Legislatures. One of the most important provisions of the Constitution is that which declares that any law passed by a separate State impairing the obligation of contracts is null and void.

Closely analogous to the American Federal Constitution is that which was in 1867 freely conceded to our Canadian dependencies, differing, however, in some most important respects. It should be noted, especially in view of the course we may find it necessary to take with Ireland, that the Confederation of these provinces partook both of the centrifugal and of the centripetal movement. Upper and Lower Canada had been united together under one government and one legislature in 1840, upon terms of equality of the two provinces:

that is, in spite of the great and constantly growing superiority of Upper Canada in population, wealth and intelligence, it was to have equal representation only with Lower Canada in the united Legislature. This yoking together of two communities so unequal, and with many distinct institutions and laws, led inevitably to grave difficulties. Upper Canada pressed continually more and more for a share of representation in proportion to its population. This was bitterly opposed by Lower Canada, fearful lest its separate institutions should be attacked and destroyed if a greater share of power were given to its partner.

The condition is well described by Sir John Macdonald in his able speech on moving the resolutions for Confederation in the Legislative Assembly of Canada in 1865 : a speech which is well worthy of attention by those who regard with concern the present relations of England and Ireland.

Men of all parties (he said) and all shades of politics became alarmed at the aspect of affairs. They found that such was the danger of impending anarchy in consequence of the irreconcilable differences of opinion between Upper and Lower Canada, that unless some solution of the difficulty was arrived at we should suffer under a succession of weak Governments—weak in numerical support, weak in tone, weak in power of doing good. All were alarmed at this state of things. We had election after election, we had ministry after ministry, with the same result. Parties were so equally balanced that the vote of one member might decide the fate of the administration and the course of legislation for a year or a series of years. None were more impressed by this momentous state of affairs, and the grave apprehensions that existed of a state of anarchy, destroying our credit, destroying our prosperity, destroying our progress, than were the members of this House, and the leading statesmen of both sides seemed to have come to the common conclusion that some step must be taken to relieve the country from the deadlock and impending anarchy that hung over them.

To find an issue out of this deadlock, it was determined by the leading men of both parties in Canada to invite a union of the other Colonies, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, upon the principle of a Federation. Sir John Macdonald stated that 'it was the policy of his Government, if they could not succeed in forming a union with the other provinces, to attempt to free the country from the deadlock in which they were placed in Upper and Lower Canada in consequence of the difference of opinion between the two sections, by having a severance to a certain extent of the union between the two provinces and the substitution of a Federal Union between them.' This, however, became unnecessary when it was found that the maritime provinces were prepared to unite. The question then arose whether such Union should be a legislative or complete one, or a federal one. Sir John Macdonald stated his own personal preference for a legislative union—that one Government and one Parliament legislating for the whole of the people of British North America would be the best, the

cheapest, the most vigorous and the strongest system. But on looking at the subject in conference with the other provinces, they found that such a system was impracticable.

It would not meet with the assent of Lower Canada, because they felt 'that in their peculiar position—being in a minority, with a different language, nationality, and religion from the majority—in case of a junction with the other provinces, their institutions and their laws might be assailed, and their ancestral associations, on which they prided themselves, attacked and prejudiced.' There was also as great a disinclination on the part of the maritime provinces to lose their individuality as separate political organisations. Accordingly it was decided to proceed on the basis of a federal union. Sir John Macdonald pointed out that although they had nominally a legislative union in Canada, yet as a matter of fact they had a federal union: that in matters affecting Upper Canada solely, members for that section claimed and generally exercised the right of exclusive legislation; while members from Lower Canada legislated on matters affecting only their own section. In this respect, he said, the relations of England and Scotland were very similar, for the Act of Union between them provided that the law of Scotland could not be altered except for the manifest advantage of Scotland; and the stipulation had been held to be so obligatory on the Legislature of Great Britain, that no measure affecting the law of Scotland is passed unless it receives the sanction of a majority of the Scottish members in Parliament.

The scheme of constitution adopted by the Premier of Canada was based, then, on the federal principle. It bore on its face the marks of a compromise. There was much mutual concession. It was framed largely on the model of the United States Constitution, but differed in some very important respects.

The constitutional relation of the province to the central Government of Canada is the reverse of that of the American States to the Union. The Canadian statesmen avoided what they considered the errors into which the framers of the American Constitution had fallen. Instead of defining strictly the powers and functions of the central Government, and reserving all others to the separate States, the Canadian Constitution defines and limits the powers of the provincial Governments, and reserves all others for the central Dominion Government, so as to make it impossible for any local Parliament to interfere with the central power in a manner detrimental to the interests of the whole. The interpretation of the provisions giving power to the provincial Governments rests necessarily with the courts of law, from which there is an appeal to the Privy Council of England.

In the American Union, the separate States elect their own

governors, in whom is vested all administrative power and authority not reserved to the President of the Union, the maintenance of order, the control of the police. In the Canadian Dominion, the governors of provinces are nominated by the central Government for five years, a provision which was intended to establish connection of authority between the central power and the different provinces.

A most important provision of the Canadian Constitution is that which reserves a veto to the Dominion Government in respect of legislation of the local Parliaments. This power is not reserved to the President or Government of the United States in respect of State legislation. The State Governor has the right to veto the legislation of the State; but he derives his authority from the same electors of the State as do the State Legislatures; and the only effective power over State legislation is the Supreme Court of Justice, and then only in respect of matters where legislation is unconstitutional. On the other hand, there is no such provision in the Canadian Constitution as that forbidding interference with contracts. The veto of the central Government is apparently a substitute for it.

Among the subjects reserved for the provincial legislatures are: direct taxation within the limits of the province, loans on the credit of the province, administration of public lands belonging to the province, prisons, hospitals, licensing laws, municipal institutions within the provinces, local works, marriage laws, property and civil rights, the administration of justice, the organisation of courts of law with civil and criminal jurisdiction, the infliction of penalties for the purpose of compelling the execution of provincial laws, and generally all matters of a purely local and private nature. Education is also confided to the local Legislatures. Apparently, the claims of minorities to schools of a denominational kind were the cause of great difficulty; and the Constitution accordingly contains a compromise on this point, to the effect that nothing shall prejudice any right or privilege confirmed pending the Union by the laws to any particular class of persons for denominational schools, and further that all privileges given in Upper Canada to separate schools and Catholic schools shall be extended to the Protestants and Catholics in the province of Quebec. Everything not thus specified is reserved for the central Government—including public debt and customs, postal service, the militia, trade and navigation, fisheries, currency, patents, copyright, &c. &c.

The local Legislatures were not constituted on the same model in all the provinces. In Upper Canada, one assembly only was established, consisting of eighty-two members. In Quebec two chambers were instituted: a Legislative Council or Upper House, consisting of twenty-four members, to be nominated by the Lieutenant-Governor for life;

and a Lower House or Legislative Assembly, to consist of sixty-five members.

It is not necessary to describe further this Constitution. It derives its authority from the Imperial Parliament, to whom whatever powers are not expressly conceded are reserved. It is scarcely necessary to add that the Constitution has been an eminent success. The deadlock which existed between Upper and Lower Canada, which was the main cause of the movement in favour of federation, has been completely removed. The separate national and historical traditions of the French population of Lower Canada have been conciliated by the concession of autonomy within limits which include whatever they value most in their separate institutions; while the central Government has most important functions, and is not wanting in control over the provinces.

Reverting to Europe, the chief exemplar of Federal union is that of the German Empire, constituted in 1871, immediately after the great military defeat of France. By this Constitution the various Germanic States, 27 in number, formerly forming part of the very weak and loosely connected Confederation, where there was no central authority and no real power or control, were united together in a federal system under the presidency of the King of Prussia, as Emperor. The Emperor represents the Federation in all its international relations, has alone the power of declaring war and of making alliances and other conventions with foreign states, and of accrediting and receiving diplomatic envoys. The legislative power of the empire is exercised by a Federal Council, consisting of fifty-eight members, nominated in a fixed proportion by the different states, Prussia, including Hanover, Hesse, and Holstein, having seventeen members; and by the Reichstag, consisting of 397 members, elected by universal suffrage. The administrative powers of the Empire are vested in the Federal Council, which is divided into seven permanent commissions for this purpose, dealing with the various subjects reserved for it: namely, the army, navy, customs, commerce, railways, postal and telegraph service, justice, &c. There is, however, nothing in the nature of ministerial responsibility to the Reichstag. Cabinet Government such as we have is unknown. The Federal Council is practically under the control of the King of Prussia, and his personal will, guided by Prince Bismarck, is the guiding spirit of the Federation.

It will be seen that the various states—whose autonomy is preserved for many important purposes, and whose separate Courts and representative institutions are retained—are reduced to the position of members of a federation, not dissimilar to that of the United States of America. Their reserved powers are not more important than those of the separate States of the Union; while

the Emperor may be properly described as occupying a position not different from that of the President of the United States, save that his position is permanent and hereditary, in lieu of being elected every four years.

Prussia, it will be seen, largely predominates in the Empire. It is many times larger than any of the other states. It is composed itself of many *disjecta membra* of the old Germanic Confederation, having formerly a separate existence, with the addition of provinces obtained by conquest or fraud, such as Silesia, Posen, and Holstein. It has found it necessary to concede local representative institutions to these provinces: to the Rhine provinces, to Westphalia, to Hanover, and to others. No such local institutions, however, have been accorded to the Polish province of Posen. The Poles are represented in the Prussian Landtag, where in the popular chamber their members form a discordant element, not dissimilar, in their spirit of hostility to the Prussian Government, to the Irish Nationalist members in the British House of Commons. The power of the Prussian Government over its Polish province, and its methods of dealing with a dependent nationality, are best evidenced by its recent measures, banishing from the territory many thousands of Poles who were not actually natives of the province, and replacing them by Germans who are under the obligation to intermarry only with people of their own race. Since the plantation of Ulster, there has been nothing in Europe to which such action can be compared.

The position of Alsace and Lorraine is a somewhat peculiar one. Since their conquest from France they have formed a part of the German Empire, and are represented in the Reichstag, but not in the Federal Council. The government, administrative and legislative, of this province was committed to the Emperor, controlled, however, in respect of matters reserved by the Constitution of the Empire, by the Federal Council. In 1877 and 1879 an attempt was made to give something of autonomy to the province. The Emperor was empowered to delegate his authority to a governor. A local Council of State was instituted, consisting of certain State functionaries, and of eight or ten other members, three of whom are elected by the delegates of the province, and the others nominated by the Emperor. The Delegation, consisting of fifty-eight members elected by the people, is limited to the right of suggesting legislation for the province which does not infringe on the powers of the Federal Council, and of forwarding to the Ministers any petitions which may be addressed to it. A certain advance has therefore been made to autonomy, which, considering the hostile attitude of its population to Germany, is significant. The position of the province seems to be not dissimilar to that of Ireland before 1783.

When we turn to Austria we find the same practical results arrived

at from a different starting-point. The movement of the present century has been of a centrifugal character. The Austro-Hungarian Empire consists, it need scarcely be remarked, of the most varied and heterogeneous collection of nationalities and populations, of different races, religions, habits, and traditions, which could possibly be gathered together. This composite empire, held together so long by force, was aggregated not so much by conquest as by the fortunate alliances of the Hapsburg family and by skilful diplomacy. The titles of the Emperor indicate the many sources of his sovereignty. He is King of Hungary, and as such King of Croatia and Transylvania; he is King of Bohemia, Dalmatia and Galicia; Archduke of Austria and Cracow; Duke of Styria, Silesia, Carinthia, Salzburg and Bukowine; Margrave of Moravia and Istria; Count of the Tyrol, Gortz and Gradevia; and each of these titles represents some merged or suppressed state formerly independent, and with separate traditions, and often of distinct race.

The natural impulse of a power thus constituted and held together by military force, controlled and guided by a dominant race such as the Germans, was towards despotism and centralisation. The various component parts of the Empire had, previous to their incorporation, separate and generally national administrations, and distinctive laws. Where the union was effected by conquest the separate administration was naturally incompatible with the new condition. In all, the separate institutions were discouraged, and were allowed to fall into decay; and every effort was made by the central power, with the best of motives, to assimilate the laws of the various provinces, to centralise powers, and to suppress national and indigenous institutions, which were held to be opposed to the existence and safety of the empire. This method was only in accord with the tendencies which everywhere existed in Europe at the time, and for which the example had been set by the centralising policy through centuries of the French monarchy. The Empress Maria Theresa and Joseph the Second pursued these objects with great activity. The Austrian statesmen hoped to force the union of their dependent Czechs, Slovaks, Ruthenes, Poles, Magyars, Croats, Roumanians, and Italians, in the same manner as the French had done in the case of Normans, Bretons, Burgundians, and Provençals.

From the union of Hungary with Austria, in 1526, a continuous effort was made to reduce the former to the position of a mere province of the empire. The Hungarian Constitution was one of the most ancient in Europe, dating back from 1222, six years later only than the Magna Charta of England. In support of this Constitution and of their national institutions the Hungarians opposed a stubborn resistance, which in 1848 broke out into open rebellion against the empire.

This, with the aid of Russia, was put down, and for twenty years Hungary was subjected to the despotic rule of Austria. In 1860 it was attempted by the Emperor to carry constitutional reforms for the whole empire, and to preserve its administrative and legislative integrity, by conceding to it one representative assembly, in which all the component parts of the empire should be represented. Hungary refused this concession and declined to send its representatives to this Imperial Diet. Other parts of the empire followed this example, and the Emperor was at last compelled to abandon the attempt at unification of his various states, and finally conceded to Hungary the utmost of its demands, and established what is known as the dualism of the empire. For Hungary this change involved a restitution of its ancient Constitution—the re-establishment of its autonomy as a kingdom, united to Austria only by the Sovereign. Its laws and administration are entirely distinct. Its system of taxation is a separate one. Certain specified objects, however, of an imperial character, such as the army, navy, foreign affairs and finance, are withdrawn from the consideration of both the Austrian and Hungarian Diets, and are submitted to delegations of both of these bodies, each of which consists of sixty members, and which sit separately, meeting together only for the purpose of voting and not of discussion, when they find it impossible to come to previous agreement. There is, therefore, absolute equality between Hungary and Austria, in spite of their unequal population and wealth. The delegations have no power of voting money, and every important act of the empire is consequently dependent on the joint action and agreement of the two kingdoms. Such an arrangement differs from any other known constitution. It has inherent weakness, which must at some critical time show itself and lead perhaps to disaster. It is obvious that such a relation cannot be a model for any other power, least of all for countries so unequal in population and strength as Great Britain and Ireland.

More reason is there to draw analogy and experience from the relations of Austria proper and her dependent provinces in the Cisleithan Empire, and of Hungary and her dependencies. The fifteen different provinces of Austria, each of them representing some ancient state with historic traditions, and often different race, have been accorded since 1861 provincial representative institutions of a wide character. The principal of these are Bohemia with a population of 5,560,000, Galicia 5,958,000, Lower Austria 2,300,000, Moravia 2,150,000, Styria 912,000, Upper Austria 750,000. It will be observed that these provinces are of very unequal size and importance. They are not formed on the principle of equal areas for administrative convenience, but have followed ancient landmarks.

The Landtags of these provinces are composed partly of members

nominated from the class of large proprietors and of Catholic archbishops and bishops, and partly of elected members.

There can be no doubt that these local assemblies have done much to give contentment to the people and to appease their national sentiments. In some parts, and especially in Bohemia, there is agitation for the concession of greater autonomy. It is interesting, however, to compare the condition of Austrian Poland (Galicia), with this amount of local representation based on nationality, with that of Prussian Poland, where no local institutions are tolerated, and where an exception is made against that province as compared with other Prussian provinces. Galicia, while retaining some national aspirations, is fairly content and is loyal to the Austrian rule, while Posen is thoroughly disaffected to its Prussian masters.

More interesting still and more worthy of attention is the Constitution which has been conceded by Hungary to its Slav dependency Croatia; and especially interesting is it as the most recent experiment in this direction, and as the work of one of the greatest of modern statesmen, namely Deák. Croatia bears to Hungary about the same relative proportions as Ireland to England, its population being two millions, while that of Hungary is fifteen millions. It was from very ancient times united to Hungary under the crown of St. Stephen, but as a separate kingdom with complete autonomy. In the centralising tendencies of the Austrian and Hungarian rulers every effort was made to merge its national existence, sometimes in that of Hungary and sometimes in that of the Austrian empire.* So bitter was the feeling of its people against Hungary on this score that in the Hungarian rebellion of 1848, they joined with the Austrians against the Hungarians, and marched an army to Pesh. They gained little by this action, for the Austrians as little respected their autonomy as had the Hungarians, and for twenty years they were governed despotically from Vienna, without regard to their local liberties and ancient rights. When in 1867 a settlement was made between Austria and Hungary, it was recognised by the former that Croatia was a dependency of Hungary; and Deák and the statesmen who had achieved the practical independence of their own country were prepared to make large concessions to Croatia. A Constitution conceding autonomy was given to Croatia and was legalised by the Hungarian and Croatian Diets—one which is well worthy of study with a view to the Irish question. The Constitution takes the form of an agreement or compromise between the people of the two countries.

It provides that the common affairs of Hungary and Croatia shall be managed by the Hungarian Diet, to which the Croatian Diets shall send a delegation of thirteen members to the Chamber of Magnates, and forty deputies to the Chamber of Deputies. Croatia

is provided with a separate Diet for local affairs. As the Hungarian Diet deals not only with the common affairs of the two kingdoms, but also with the separate internal affairs of Hungary, it is provided that the common affairs shall as far as possible be treated before and after all others; and that in all cases arrangement shall be made that the Deputies of Croatia shall have an interval of three months in which to deal with their internal affairs within their own separate Diet at Agram. The common affairs are defined as including among other things legislation relative to recruiting the army, the system of defence and military service, and all the measures necessary for the disposition of troops, the general organisation of taxes, the vote of taxes direct and indirect, loans, public lands, monopolies, royalties, and generally all that attaches to financial affairs common to the two countries, the monetary system, treaties of commerce, banks and credit, weights and measures, posts, telegraphs, railways. With respect to the revenues of the province, it is provided

That, as the total of the ordinary revenue of Croatia would not cover its share of common expenses without devoting the greater part of the sums necessary to its interior administration, Hungary, in consideration of the renewal of fraternal relations which have existed for centuries between her and Croatia, consents voluntarily that a certain portion of the revenues of Croatia, which shall be determined from time to time by common accord, shall be reserved for the internal expenses of the country, and that the residue shall be devoted to the common expenses. The portion of the revenues of Croatia to be appropriated to the expense of internal affairs is fixed at 45 per cent. If the 55 per cent. exceeds the demands, the surplus shall be to the profit of Croatia.

With respect to the internal affairs of Croatia it is provided that 'its autonomy extends, as well from the point of view of legislation as of government, to all that concerns interior administration, religion, education and justice, including procedure.'

At the head of the autonomous government is the Ban, nominated by the King on the recommendation of the Hungarian Prime Minister. The Diet is composed partly of deputies and partly of ecclesiastical functionaries and hereditary barons. By act of the Croatian Diet the administration is divided into three departments, (1) for home affairs, (2) for religion and education, (3) for justice. The heads of these are appointed by the Ban. It is also provided by the principal Constitution, that to represent the interests of Croatia there shall be nominated at the central Government at Buda Pesth a special Minister for Croatia without portfolio, and that this minister shall be a member of the common council of ministers, with deliberative voice and responsible to the common Diet. He is to act as intermediary between the King and the national Government of Croatia. Another important provision is that

The central Government will make efforts to act in accord with the Government of Croatia; but as it is responsible for its acts to the common Diet, where Croatia

is also represented, the national Government and the municipalities of Croatia must lend their assistance to the execution of its decisions, or even execute them directly whenever the central Government has no agent.

It is guaranteed to Croatia that the central Government will name national Croats to the Slavo-Croat sections of the central administration, and to the posts in the government of this country. For all the objects which are not reserved by virtue of the present compromise to the common Diet or to the central Government Croatia shall enjoy, both in respect of legislative and executive power, complete autonomy. Croatia is permitted, within its limits for its own affairs, to use its national colours and arms, surmounting, however, the arms with the crown of St Stephen. Finally it is provided that

This compromise, after receiving the sovereign sanction, shall be inserted among the particular laws of Hungary and Croatia as a common fundamental law. This compromise cannot be the subject of special legislation of either contracting party, and no modification of it can be made without following the method employed for concluding it, and with the agreement of all the powers concerned.

The weak point of these arrangements has in practice proved to be the absence of direct responsibility of the Ban and his Government to the Diet of Croatia. The Ban is nominated by the Hungarian Premier. He appoints on his part the three principal ministers. The appointments have of recent years been made with the object of promoting the Magyar policy in this country, and without regard to the views and wishes of the people of Croatia. There is a not inconsiderable Magyar party in Croatia, though a minority, in whose interests and policy the administration has been carried on, and hence the recent discontent in Croatia, and the disputes between the Ban and his ministers and the Diet.

The Constitution in other respects is so reasonable, so framed with respect and care for the national feeling and historic traditions of the people, that it is a misfortune that difficulties should have been experienced in working it. On this point it is a warning to those who have to frame the constitutional changes in Ireland.

Generally it may be said that immense advance has been made in central and eastern Europe towards popular institutions. Autonomous institutions or local representative institutions have been largely, and on the whole successfully, conceded to dependent provinces with distinctive populations or with traditions of ancient independence; a certain loss of central power for administrative purposes has resulted, but it cannot be denied that this has been for the benefit of the people concerned, nor is there evidence that there has been any weakening of the central Government for external purposes, or even for the purpose of holding together the autonomous dependencies. A federation is not necessarily weak either for internal or external

purposes. The United States Government was able to put down with a strong hand the secession of the Southern States of the Union, and to readmit them to the Union immediately after upon terms of equality and without infringing upon their autonomy. The federal power of Germany under the hegemony of Prussia is the strongest military force which modern Europe has known since the days of Napoleon in the plenitude of his fame. The army of the Austro-Hungarian empire, with all the traditions of the Hapsburg family, is still a most powerful force.

As distinguished from these movements we have the union of the Italian states under the House of Savoy, where every vestige of their autonomy has been destroyed, and where the object has been to form a centralised Government on the model of those of France and Spain. It may well be doubted whether a looser formation, with autonomous institutions for provinces so different as Naples and Milan, and with dependencies so distinct as Sicily and Sardinia, and with traditions so conspicuous as those of Venice and Florence, would not have been a wiser and better solution of the Italian problem. In France the centralising despotism through centuries of the Bourbon kings destroyed nearly all that had previously existed of autonomy and separatism, and what little remained was extinguished by the French Republic in the Revolutionary period; but here again it may be doubted whether, under a democracy, France would not be safer and happier with more of local institutions, and with greater variety in its laws, to suit local habits and traditions. The same may be said of Spain, where the spirit of provincial independence, once so strong, has within the last two centuries been almost crushed out of existence by the Bourbon rulers, and where democracy seems inclined to follow the same system, rather than to encourage local institutions.

From this brief historical record of the tendency of modern Constitutions many deductions, it seems to me, may be drawn of interest and import in the problem before us. The first is, that there is no inherent impossibility in framing the constitutional relations between a superior power and a dependent one, so as to secure the unity of the two for external purposes, for the common safety and other purposes essential to the wellbeing of both, and at the same time to concede so much of autonomy as will conciliate national sentiments and afford opportunity for the development of distinct ideas.

Two essentially different methods of effecting this may be deduced from the examples I have given: the one that of 'autonomous dependency,' where the dependent state has complete autonomy for its own internal affairs, but is not permitted to have any voice in the external policy of the superior state. The best example of this relation is to be found in the relation of the British colonies

to the parent country, where there is no representation accorded in the Imperial Parliament.

If Ireland were placed in this position, its local Parliament would have full control over its administration and executive; it might have full power of taxation, subject to a customs' convention insuring free trade; but it would have no power to deal with imperial questions or raise a military force. The position would be that of a reformed Grattan's Parliament, *plus* what was wanting in those days—a native administration responsible to it, and with strictly defined limits of power. What conditions or reservations it would be possible to insist upon for the protection of the minority or to make the Union more secure I will not now enter upon. It is obvious that the tie in such case would not be a strong one; the danger, however, would be, not so much the desire of the assembly thus constituted for complete separation, but that it would still claim a voice in imperial matters and endeavour to influence decisions in important matters, in questions of foreign and colonial policy, from which it had been excluded by the Constitution. It is obvious that it would be impossible to call upon a subject state thus constituted to contribute to the costs of a policy in which it has no voice. It would be possible, indeed, to decide in advance for a fixed contribution to imperial purposes. The financial aspects of the subject, however, become less material and important when we consider the very altered proportions of Ireland to Great Britain as compared with what they were at the Union in 1800. The population of Ireland was then one-third of that of the United Kingdom; and its wealth was probably not less than one-seventh. At the last census, in 1881, the population of Ireland was only one-seventh that of the United Kingdom; its wealth was certainly not more than one-twentieth. Its civil administration, in spite of this great disproportion in wealth, is carried on at a relatively much higher cost, and it needs for the maintenance of order and in support of the imperial rule a very large police and military force. The financial result is that the cost of the administration and control of Ireland, civil and military, is greater than its payment in taxes to the Exchequer, and that consequently it does not really contribute anything either to the payment of the national debt, or to the support of the imperial forces, which are required for the maintenance generally of our colonial empire and the protection of our vast trade and commerce.

This financial position of Ireland relatively to Great Britain will fairly raise the question whether, if local autonomy be conceded to the former, it will be necessary and expedient to maintain its representation in the Imperial Parliament, or its voice in the determination of a policy to the cost of which it makes no contribution. The possibility of relieving the British House of Commons from the presence of Irish members may, when the alternative is presented to them, induce

many to prefer an arrangement, even though it should entail some greater risk, and is more open to theoretical objection.

The other method is that based on the federal principle ; where Ireland, while receiving large powers of autonomy, would still retain a representation in the Imperial Parliament. If this method were adopted in principle, it is probable that the best solution of it would be found in the precedents afforded by the relations of the Dominion of Canada to its provinces, and of Hungary to Croatia. In the first of these the powers of government are distributed and balanced with very great skill, and, as experience has shown, with the happiest results. There can be no essentially greater differences between the Catholic population of Ireland, with its separatist feelings, and its national sentiments, and incompatibility of temper, with reference to the people of Great Britain, than in the case of the French Catholics of Canada and the Anglo-Saxon Protestants of the other provinces. The working out in detail of such an arrangement between Great Britain and Ireland would present difficulties, not indeed insuperable, but numerous and serious. Unless we assume that Scotland and perhaps Wales are, without any demand on their part having arisen, to be dealt with in the same manner, we should have Ireland alone with a special local Government, and yet represented in the Parliament of Great Britain for common and imperial purposes. Are its members in this Parliament to be excluded from taking part in purely English and Scotch questions ? and if so, by what process ? by legal enactment or by the regulation of Parliament itself ? How would their presence affect the position of ministries ? Suppose a Government with a majority when the Irish members were present, and in a minority when they were absent, how would its responsibility to Parliament be determined ?

Assuming that this solution is the preferable one, the questions arise, What shall be the relation of the central Government and the Imperial Parliament to the local administration and local Parliament of Ireland ? Are we to adopt the Canadian or the American method ? Is the central Government to retain a veto over the local legislation of Ireland ? How is the connection between the two Governments to be maintained ? With respect to the Irish local Government and administration, what is to be its relation to the local Parliament ? Are the heads of the local administration to be responsible to the local Parliament and members of it ? Is, in fact, responsible government and Cabinet government on the English model to be carried out, or are we to adopt the American system of a governor elected by universal suffrage with the right to appoint ministers independent of the Legislature ? Is the local Parliament to be composed of one or of two chambers ; and if of one only, are any of its members to be nominated by the Crown ? Is the Irish representation in the Imperial Parliament to be maintained at its present number ? and if reduced, on

what principle with respect to the wealth and the contribution of Ireland?

These and many other important questions necessarily arise; and above all we have the question whether we should make it a part of the operation that the landlords should have the right to claim compensation for their land, and whether English credit should be used for this purpose. I do not propose, however, to frame a plan for settling this grave matter; my present object is rather to point out the questions that must arise, and to show that in their solution we may learn much from the examples I have referred to.

Another lesson we may learn, quite as important, is that such arrangements are best arrived at, and perhaps can alone be safely arrived at, if a permanent settlement is desired, by agreement with the chiefs or representatives of the people to be dealt with. The settlement should take the form of a solemn compact; it must necessarily be a compromise where much is conceded on both sides; but the compromise should be made by the leaders of the two people and should be presented with all their authority to the people they represent.

It was thus that the Canadian Confederation was carried. It was in the same way that a settlement was effected between Austria and Hungary, and between Hungary and Croatia. For all these objects the authority which Mr. Parnell has acquired over his followers and over the Irish people is of the utmost importance and value. Without such agreement no settlement would be a permanent one, and for this reason many minor forms of local government which have been suggested would be useless, as they would not only not settle the question, but would only make it easier to raise further demands.

The illustrations further show how greatly the weight and authority of the statesmen charged with such a task would be increased, if they had the support of the whole of Parliament, and not only that of their own party. It is to be feared that this will be wanting to any arrangement now to be made, or to any negotiations which may be entered upon. Yet there is some reason to believe that many of the leaders of the Tory party do not substantially differ from their great rival in their views as to what should now be done. Many recent statements of Lord Salisbury tend to show that he, at least, appreciated the importance of concession, and that he would not object to borrow much from the American Constitution (which he never alludes to without special commendation) if he could thereby settle the Irish question. It is difficult to believe that the late Government, when they refused to renew the clauses of the Coercion Act, which Lord Spencer considered to be necessary to

preserve order, and when they sent as Lord Lieutenant the statesman who had carried through Parliament the Act for the Canadian Confederation, and the more recent but abortive scheme for South African Confederation, had not some intention of moving in this direction for Ireland, if the new Parliament should contain a majority sufficient to enable them to act boldly and independently. It cannot be supposed that Lord Carnarvon went to Ireland with the intention of being a mere stopgap, and of running away at the moment of difficulty, when the necessity for action or legislation, and for deciding between such momentous alternatives as Coercion or Conciliation, should arise. It will be interesting to know his views, and the result of his inquiries as to the government of Ireland.

One other argument may perhaps have some avail with those who are about to rush into a party conflict, and to do their best to ruin and prevent a policy of conciliation; it is this: that if once a great scheme for giving autonomy to Ireland is propounded to Parliament by the leader of the Liberal party, supported by the bulk of his party, even allowing for many defections, and if this scheme meets with the approval of the Irish people, it is absolutely certain—as certain as anything can be in political affairs—that no alternative policy of coercion will ever again be possible to the opposing party, even if they should succeed in defeating the measure and the Government. The Irish, when they have the moral support of one of the great parties of state to their claims, would thenceforward be justified in going to lengths, which I should be sorry to hint at, in resisting the alternative policy of coercive laws. The only effect, then, of defeating such a measure would be to entail upon the victors the responsibility of producing an alternative measure with the same object, or perhaps a wider and more thorough one. If I were to venture to predict what will happen in the event of the Tories succeeding in defeating a scheme founded on one of the two methods of dealing with the question to which I have referred, it would be that the Tory party, when again in office and responsible for the government of Ireland, would find itself compelled to propose and carry a scheme founded on the other method. If the federal scheme should be adopted by Mr. Gladstone, the Tories would probably find that when once the principle of autonomy is adopted they would prefer the other and more advanced scheme, under which the Irish members would no longer be represented in the Imperial Parliament, and they would make this a special merit of their settlement. If, on the other hand, Mr. Gladstone should propose a scheme based on the colonial principle, it would be more open to attack as interfering with the unity of the Empire, and when defeated its opponents would make a merit of proposing a plan based on federation.

This suggestion is made in no spirit of party cynicism, but is based on the conviction that when once a scheme is launched by

either of the two great parties of England for conceding autonomy to Ireland, the other will by force of circumstances be compelled eventually to admit the principle, and the question will then become one of form only, and one of degree, on which there may still be differences of opinion and difference of methods. The English mind moves slowly at the commencement of such questions ; it is not imaginative or speculative ; it embraces with reluctance a new idea ; but when once it begins to move, it acquires momentum rapidly ; and solutions become possible to statesmen, which but a short time previously appeared remote or impossible.

The highest quality of statesmanship is that which enables a leader to appreciate the moment when this first impulse can be given. Nothing in the past half-century has been more remarkable than the manner in which the great Liberal chief, rising to the necessities of the hour, at a time when his political career must be approaching its end, came to the conclusion almost alone that this great question must be solved ; having done so, he set about to convert to his views his colleagues, his party, and his countrymen, with a result already most surprising, and which is pregnant of success in the future.

G. SHAW LEFEVRE.

II.

IN AUSTRIA.

THE lands situate to the east of the Elbe and of the junction of the Enns and the Danube were occupied in the ninth century by Slavonic tribes, and formed the Great Moravian Empire, where Christianity was preached by the Eastern apostles, Cyril and Methodius: the two apostles whom the Roman Curia—not satisfied with the canonisation of Dr. Fisher and Sir Thomas More—has recently sought to add to the Calendar of the Saints of the Church. Between the pressure of the Teutonic population eastward—the first beginning of the *Drang nach Osten*—and the westward invasion of the Magyars, this Moravian Empire in the tenth century went to pieces. Like two thunderstorms, the Magyar and the Teuton met. The great battle fought near Augsburg in 955 convinced the Magyar that he had found an antagonist before whom even his own fierce chivalry and consummate obstinacy must pause. The rival races then became fixed along the lines where, upon the whole, they are still to be found to-day, and sundered the Slavonic peoples, who had been united in the Moravian Empire, into two divisions, separated by the solid wall formed by the German population of Austria, Styria and Carniola, by the Magyar population of Hungary, and by the Wallach or Rouman population, which at an uncertain period of history occupied the countries between the Maros and the Black Sea—the territories now known as Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia—and constituted a further bar to the union of all the Slaves in one great geographical area. This separation of the Slaves into two isolated masses is the first great fact which at the present day lies at the root of the difficulties which trouble the East. The peculiar characteristics of the Magyar population added a second. Being essentially a pastoral people, they were content to occupy the great central plain between the Carpathian Mountains and the Alps, leaving the Slavonic population on the higher lands around them. Consequently the Magyar population of Hungary has no good geographical frontiers. Imagine a white saucer with a broad coloured rim, and the reader will have no unfair idea of the distribution of the Magyar and non-Magyar populations in the lands of the crown of St. Stephen. But the geographical separation of the Slaves into two masses had itself also an important result. The northern Slaves,

the Poles, and Czechs of Moravia and Bohemia, became subject to the influence of the Church of Rome; the southern Slaves, with the exception of the Slovenes and a majority of the Croats, remained in communion with the Greek Orthodox Church. These ethnographic and religious difficulties were further increased as time went on. A Magyar colony of the toughest description, known as the Szeklers, planted itself on the extreme limits of Transylvania, where to this day it has successfully withstood, even in the matter of language, the attempts of the surrounding Rouman population to absorb it. The settlement of large bodies of German industrial settlers in the towns of the same province, while it brought civilisation and culture amongst the rudest of the Christian populations of the East, thereby added one more element to the confusion of race and language, which was further increased by the coast towns of Istria, Dalmatia, and Croatia becoming Italianised through the influence of commerce. The contests of the Reformation had the consequence of introducing a strong Catholic German element into Bohemia, a country which in the days of Huss had seemed likely to become a Slavonic Protestant power, and of creating a considerable Protestant body in Hungary, while the long struggle with the Turks had, amongst other results, the effect of driving considerable bodies of Slaves, belonging to the Greek Orthodox Church, into Croatia, where they are still settled along the southern frontier. Each deluge, in fact, added something to the political strata.

History at any early date finds the German, the Slav, and the Magyar, engaged in a series of struggles, to terminate which nothing less than the existence of an overwhelming common danger was necessary. But the preliminary question had first to be settled, which of the contending races was best entitled to the hegemony in the hour of danger, and the answer to this question carries with it the explanation of how Austria was invented.

The name of Austria—*Oesterreich*—the *Empire of the East*, is said to be found for the first time in a document bearing the signature of the Emperor Otho the Third towards the close of the tenth century. But the territory thereby designated had no certain limits, nor any history distinct from that of the great Teutonic kingdom of which it formed the Eastern March; till after the tide of the Magyar invasion had been definitively checked, it was reconstituted under the Counts of Babenberg, the name of whose family still survives in the Bavarian town of Bamberg. Their territory comprised the lands lying on the Danube now known as Upper and Lower Austria and situated between Bohemia and Moravia on the north, Bavaria on the west, Carinthia on the south, and Hungary on the east. This margraviate was raised into a duchy by Frederic Barbarossa in the time of Henry Jasomirgott, and freed from the suzerainty it had till then owed to Bavaria, at whose expense it received a considerable territorial enlargement. The

Babenberg dynasty lasted till 1246. But before it terminated it had, in 1192, made an acquisition of immense importance by getting possession of the duchy of Styria, together with a portion of Carniola. The acquisition was not by conquest, but by inheritance, and the first step was thereby taken in that long career of peaceful acquisition whereby the Austrian State, as distinct from the duchy of Austria, has gradually taken shape. A century earlier the house of Arpad, which ruled Hungary, had made an equally important addition to the limits of its sway, through the election of the king of Hungary to the crown of Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia. Hungary thereby obtained access to the sea. But there was this difference between the two acquisitions: Styria was German, Croatia was Slavonic. The first therefore was the addition of a homogeneous territory; the second was the reverse, while the circumstances under which the former crown of the Slavonic kings was finally fixed on the brow of their Hungarian rivals were so full of dissension and strife, that it was an open question how far the acquisition was the result of conquest or of compact; and to this day the dispute whether the kingdom of Croatia is *pars adnexa* or *regnum socium* is the groundwork of an endless controversy of which the last has not yet been heard either at Pesth or at Agram, though the question is eight centuries old.

On the death of Frederic the Warlike, the Duke of Austria, who imprisoned King Richard Cœur de Lion in the castle of Durrenstein on his return from the Holy Land, the Austrian dominions passed by marriage to Ottokar Premysl the Second, the greatest of the native race of Bohemian kings, whose elder brother Vladislav had married Gertrude, the daughter of Frederic. But the union of Austria and Bohemia in this period was momentary only, for the struggle for supremacy in Germany which ensued between Ottokar and the Emperor Rodolph of Hapsburg led to their separation. The vast plains on the north of the Danube near Kressenbrunn, where in modern days Napoleon first found an adversary worthy of his skill in the Archduke Charles, became the scene of the shock of contending nations. The German, allied to the Magyar, triumphed over the Czech, and Rodolph obtained the Austrian dominions as the price of victory. Under his successors the course of territorial aggrandisement was pushed forward and steadily continued, even though at times the different lands themselves were for a time divided among more than one member of the ducal house. The duchy of Carinthia and the rest of Carniola, the counties of Tyrol and Goritz, and the lordship of the city of Trieste, were successively acquired, with numerous minor districts, which one by one fell like so many flies into the mouth of a spider, and gave the dukes of Austria a continuous territory from Vienna to the Istrian sea. These acquisitions were nearly all made in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The weight and influence thereby acquired made the House of Austria the natural champion of Europe against

the Turks, of Catholicism against the Reformation, and of Germany against the encroaching policy of the French kings; and, by a succession of events which it does not come within the limits of this article to describe, rendered the crowns of Bohemia and Hungary hereditary in it upon certain conditions, after the battle of Mohacz against the Turks, in which Louis the Second, king of both those countries, had perished, with nearly all that was great and illustrious in the two kingdoms.

War—long, fierce, and determined—against the infidel without and the Protestant within, is the leading feature of the succeeding period. No fact seems more generally to have dropped out of historical recollection than the immense hold which the Reformation obtained in its earlier stages on the hereditary dominions of the House of Austria. As in every European country, the Reformed religion and political liberty were inseparable companions,¹ and the new tenets found many of their strongest supporters among the members of the Provincial Estates or Diets, which met in each of the Hereditary Provinces or Crown Lands, and were composed in the main of the holders of knightly fees, with the addition of a certain number of representatives from the principal municipal towns and of the high ecclesiastics. When the Reformed religion had everywhere, except in Hungary, been stamped out by the success of the counter-reformation, devised by the Jesuits and directed by Ferdinand the Second, it became the settled policy of the House of Hapsburg to curtail, and if possible to destroy, the privileges of the Diets, and thereby prevent their development into real popular assemblies, of which, under the influence of the Reformed doctrines, there had been so many inconvenient symptoms. Deprived of all political backbone by the ruin of the Protestant nobles and towns, the Diets gradually became the docile instruments of Leopold and Joseph the First, and, losing all power of self-reform, finally degenerated into the last refuge of antiquated abuses. In this condition of affairs, the keen eye of the Empress Maria Theresa, anxious to weld her provinces into a centralised State like France, detected her advantage. She accordingly commenced a steady course of warfare against them, first limiting, then destroying their privileges. Hitherto they had possessed the right of making the laws imposing indirect taxation. This right was now denied them. The budgets which had been under their own exclusive control were ordered to be submitted to the approval of the Board of Account and Audit, at Vienna. The standing committees chosen out of their own number, by means of the appointment of which they had possessed the right of controlling the administration within the province, if not of actually keeping it in their own hands, were suppressed. Lieutenants and intendants were sent to replace the local treasurers and collectors from Vienna; the Diets were strictly confined to voting the taxes asked for by the

¹ See Ranke, vol. ii, pp 10-28, 415-430; Miss Austin's translation, ed. 1840.

government ; and the taxes so imposed were collected by the Imperial Civil Service, and paid directly into the Imperial Exchequer at Vienna, which became a department of the Imperial Chancellery, into which even the independent Chancellery of Bohemia, hitherto a separate office, was merged. The old local courts of justice were also abolished, and an incorporated body of magistrates, with its head-quarters at Vienna, was organised to replace it. On all these questions the opposition of the members of the local Diets was paralysed by the identification of the members with the maintenance of the abuses of the feudal land system and other unpopular privileges. Armed with the formidable weapon given to her by her adversaries, the energetic Empress was able to proclaim herself a popular reformer, and, backed by public opinion, she in a few brief years swept away a whole mass of cumbrous and antiquated customs. A new land law freed the peasantry from at least the worst of the abuses in their tenure, and a criminal code was passed, which, barbarous as many of its provisions may appear at the present day, was nevertheless an immense step in advance, as it abolished torture, put a practical end to prosecutions for witchcraft, limited the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts, rendered penal the interference of the clergy with the making of wills, and, though not interfering with the educational activity of the Jesuits, placed it under State control. 'Das Schulwesen ist und bleibt ein Politicum.' Such is the language of an Imperial order of the 24th of September, 1770, and in these words lies the key to the whole policy of the Empress. There were very few things which in her view were not to be 'politica'—in other words, within the sphere of the central Government. The same objects were held in view by the Emperor Joseph the Second, who devoted his especial energy to the destruction of the privileges of the towns and their submission to Imperial bailiffs. He also destroyed whatever remained of the rights of the Diets, and introduced further reforms in a liberal direction into the laws relating to land tenure and the criminal code. It is the fashion to speak of the work of the Emperor Joseph as having failed, and having had to be abandoned. This, however, is only true within certain limits. He failed in Hungary and in the Austrian Low Countries, in both of which he was opposed by men trained in the school of political resistance ; but in the Austrian Crown Lands his work was permanent ; the general result being that, while the German half of the dominions of the House of Hapsburg lost all political liberty, the material and social condition of the masses of the people was immensely improved. In Hungary, on the other hand, the old régime on the whole held its ground. Its very abuses came to be identified with patriotic resistance to the foreigner, thereby obtaining a long lease of life, and adjourning the era of reform till men arose like Kossuth and Deak, who understood that, if the

freedom of the country was to be permanently maintained against force and fraud, the masses of the people must be given a tangible interest in the struggle, and be identified with it.

The possible future of the Diets, had they been allowed to develop and reform themselves, is an interesting problem. Carlyle has attempted to overwhelm them with ridicule, denouncing them as mere talking-shops, nor does he conceal his satisfaction at their practical destruction in another part of Germany by a monarch of a totally different character from Ferdinand the Second. As a matter of fact, however, there is no evidence—nor indeed does Carlyle attempt to adduce any—that these assemblies were particularly given to loquacity or waste of time. Their disappearance before the clerical despots of the seventeenth century and the reforming despots of the eighteenth, and the consequent interruption of the normal development of free institutions in every European country except England and Hungary, deprived the people of whatever chance they might otherwise have had of political training, and left them to be the victims of alternate outbreaks of democratic revolution and military despotism.

The period which followed the death of Joseph the Second was not favourable to the restoration of political liberty. The excesses of the French Revolution discredited the popular cause on the Continent, and the anarchy in Poland, carefully fostered by foreign enemies, led to the destruction of another of the old free constitutions of Europe, at the very moment when the party of progress in that country, influenced by French ideas, was beginning to be a power in the Diet; a fact thoroughly understood by the rulers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, who were determined that, whatever else might happen, an Oriental Paris should not be established in Warsaw.

Amid the din of the early Napoleonic wars the voice of the patriot and the statesman was silenced, and the apparent success which had crowned the centralising policy of Maria Theresa encouraged the Court of Vienna to annex the Italian possessions of the old Republic of Venice and Lombardy to the Austrian crown. But the partition of Poland and the annexation of Northern Italy had a consequence which the authors of these transactions failed to foresee. A large body of men who had inherited some of the traditions of independence and some notion of the right of resistance were thereby brought within the inert mass of the Empire. It is said that whenever a disturbance was reported from any portion of the realm, Metternich used to say: '*Cherchez le Polonais.*' Meanwhile the Diets slumbered and slept. A traveller in Bohemia thus describes a meeting of one of those ghostly assemblies at Prague in the early days of the present century:—

It was the 15th of August (he says) and the Diet of the kingdom was then sitting. The avenues to the Imperial castle, the courtyards, and the staircase

which leads into the sitting-chamber were lined with the national guards. The saloon is a square chamber with two entrances. Opposite the one through which the members of the Diet enter a platform is raised, on which a chair is placed, the whole surmounted by a canopy which was elevated; the Supreme Burggrave, as President of the Diet, being only a count by birth, had he been a prince, it would have been lowered. When the Imperial Commissaries entered, the whole assembly rose. The Supreme Burggrave, standing under the canopy, descended the three steps, and complimented them, after which the members of the Diet took their seats. To the right hand sat the Archbishop, as Primate of the kingdom, covered with his pallium, and decorated with the insignia of an Imperial order; next to him, three bishops in their purple robes, the abbots, in black or white silk gowns, with gold chains and crosses. The benches in front of the canopy were occupied by the lords of the kingdom; the second order dressed in their national costume—a red coat, richly embroidered with silver, epaulettes of the same, white breeches, silk stockings, and a three-cornered hat with bullions. Many of them bore orders, almost all the insignia of an Imperial chamberlain—a golden key. The knights occupied the benches on the left, and were dressed in the same manner. The representatives of the city were in black.

The Supreme Burggrave addressed at first the Prince-Archbishop and the spiritual lords, in the Bohemian language, then the temporal lords of the kingdom, princes, counts, and barons, afterwards the knights (Ritterstand), and, last, the representatives of the cities. Then, complimentary addresses being over, one of the secretaries read the Imperial proposition respecting the taxes to be laid upon the kingdom for the ensuing year. They were received in silence with a low bow. The Supreme Burggrave asked finally whether any of the members had to propose matters respecting the good of the kingdom. A deep silence reigned throughout the splendid assembly: at last the Burggrave thanked them in the name of their august sovereign for their ready attendance, and the assembly broke up.

‘This pageant,’ the writer continues, ‘is the remains of the constitution which Bohemia enjoyed for more than 300 years: its form is still the same, but the spirit is gone. Regularly there are two Diets held every year: Postulate and Extraordinary Diets. For both, the Imperial invitation is issued to the different members, viz. the prelates of the kingdom as the first order, composed of the archbishop of Prague, the bishops of Leitmeritz, Koniggratz and Budweis, with several abbots. The second are the lords possessed of domains, whose number may amount to a hundred. The knights possessed of domains constitute the third class. The fourth are the four cities, Prague, Budweis, Pilzen, and Koniggratz, whose citizens have the right to buy or possess domains, and the privilege of being represented by their burghmasters and aldermen. Two commissaries from among the lords and knights are chosen by the emperor to represent him. They are brought in the state carriage and six of the Supreme Burggrave to the sitting chamber. The real power of the States is now limited to the repartition of the taxes, and a certain jurisdiction which they still exercise through a committee of eight members, chosen from among the four orders, and confirmed by the Emperor. The Austrian monarchs thought it necessary to spare the feelings of a nobility and a nation which cling with cherishing fondness to their ancient liberty, or rather national existence; for it is but fair to state that

the condition of the peasantry has been improved, especially since the times of Joseph. The real constitutional liberty before rested entirely in the hands of the nobility.'²

The impetus given by the events of 1814-15 to a revival of national feeling caused the first beginnings of a reaction against the *régime* of centralisation. In the Tirol, by a statute of the 24th of March, 1816, in Galicia by a patent of the 13th of April, 1817, and in Salzburg by a statute of 1826, the Diets were reconstituted; but the powers accorded to them were of the slightest, and, though similar concessions were made in the other Crown Lands, the events of 1848 still found the government of the Austrian Empire consisting of a huge system of bureaucratic centralisation, engaged in the direction of a heterogeneous assembly of peoples, speaking different languages, and imbued with various historical traditions, in only one of which—Hungary—had the mediæval liberties succeeded in escaping the general destruction. But even in Hungary the Diet had only met twice since 1812. Metternich, having studied the English constitution in order to learn how to destroy it, had made the ingenious discovery that the taxes once collected could be spent without any appropriation by the Diet, as in the days of the Tudors and the early Stuarts, and that the expenses of billeting the army on the population were not matters necessarily requiring a money vote. The constitution existed in theory; in practice it was constantly evaded, and the army was the real ruler of the country.

In the Hereditary Provinces, or Crown Lands, public opinion was divided between those who wished to reform on the basis of the autonomy of the several provinces, and make Austria practically a Federal State, and those who wished to make her a centralised but liberal State, in which the German element should preponderate. The movement of 1848 and 1849 in Austria and Hungary differed accordingly from those which took place at the same date in other European countries, inasmuch as the contest was not between an old-established despotism and modern ideas contending for supremacy within the limits of a homogeneous kingdom, but between the former and a medley of races animated by different and even opposite aspirations, some liberal, others reactionary. The result was that the Court of Vienna was able to play one part of its subjects off against the other, with the most fatal results to all. In apportioning to each his share of the responsibility for the ultimate failure of the Revolution of 1848-49, it would not be easy to say on whose shoulders most blame should lie—on the revolutionary party in Vienna, for their violence and want of sense; or on the leaders of the ultra-Magyar party, for continuing to seek from 1830 onwards to force their own ideas and language on the Slavonic and Rouman populations of the kingdom; or on the Croat and Czech generals, who, while declaring that they

² *Austria as it is*. 1828. By an Eye-witness.

desired equality of rights for all, became something which strongly resembled the willing dupes and docile instruments of the Court, and helped to destroy political liberty altogether in the shambles where perished Robert Blum, and Messenhauser, and Louis Batthyany, and other leading men of German and Hungarian nationality.

On the 25th of April, 1848, the Emperor promulgated a constitution for the German and Slavonic provinces, based on the Belgian constitution. But the pressure of events made it a dead letter, and on the 15th of May an Imperial patent appeared, convoking a Constituent Assembly to revise it. Immediately after the Revolution broke out. The events of June and July, 1848, in Bohemia and Croatia, were a partial and ill-defined attempt of the Slavonic party to assert their own independence, with Prague and Agram as the capitals of a north and a south Slavonic kingdom, ruled by the head of the House of Hapsburg. This movement was crushed by the troops of Windischgratz. Then followed the attempt of the Hungarian Diet and of the Vienna Radical party to overthrow the old system altogether, but with a too exclusive eye to German and Magyar interests. The siege of Vienna and the Hungarian war of independence followed. The Slavonic regiments of Jellachich ended the struggle. They destroyed the hopes of the Hungarian and the German, but for the cause of Slavonic liberty they gained absolutely nothing, except the hatred of those whose fathers they had butchered.

As the military struggle was still raging around the walls of Vienna, the Constituent Assembly, which had been originally summoned to the capital by the Emperor in hot haste, in order, if possible, to stave off the crisis, was ordered to quit the city and to meet in October in the ancient city of Kremsier, where it proceeded to appoint a committee to draw up the draft of a constitution for the Crown Lands, but without including Hungary in the category, as it was not represented, and was therefore considered not to be within the legitimate purview of the deliberations. The sittings of this body, carried on as they were amid the noise of contending hosts, attracted little attention outside the limits of the countries immediately affected; but, judged by the light of subsequent events, they at least appear to have been conducted in a far more practical spirit than those of the deputies of all Germany, who had assembled in the Paulskirche at Frankfurt. After some negotiations a union, based on mutual concessions, was agreed upon by the majority of the Slavonic and German members; the former, with the exception of Dr. Palatsky, the famous Czech historian, consenting to abate somewhat of their extreme national aspirations, and to co-operate with the German members in obtaining liberal reforms at the expense of the clerical, military, and bureaucratic absolutism; while the latter also consented to make concessions, and give up the stiff doctrinaire views of a pronounced anti-national

type which the German reformers had inherited from the school of Joseph the Second. On the 2nd of March, 1849, the committee had agreed to their report. The Assembly was known to be ready to accept it, and the 13th was fixed for its final discussion. But while the committee had been labouring, so had the generals and diplomatists, and after the treaty stipulating for the entry of the Russian troops into Hungary, the military party once more felt itself master of the situation. On the 7th of March, accordingly, the members of the Assembly became aware that the approaches to their place of meeting were blockaded by troops, and shortly after they ascertained that warrants of apprehension were out against most of the Liberal leaders. Stadion, the House Minister, a man credited with liberal views and enjoying some popularity from his former co-operation in the military reforms of the Archduke Charles, discovered in the absence of the Hungarians from the assembly a constitutional ground of action, sufficient, in his opinion, to satisfy his own conscience in consenting to be a party to these violent proceedings, while he was further deluded by being allowed to issue a paper constitution for the whole empire, including Hungary, together with an array of projected statutes of more or less liberal appearance. But nobody believed that, after the surrender at Vilagos, with the leaders of liberal opinion in Germany flying for their lives, with the Pope reinstated in Rome, with Haynau victorious in Hungary, and Radetzky triumphant in Italy, anything serious would come of the plans of the minister, whose mind, shaken by disappointment and vexation, shortly after gave way. The paper constitution, of which he was the author, was then put into a pigeon-hole, and finally received its obsequy in a circular from the Premier, Prince Felix Schwarzenberg, on the last day of December, 1851.³

The ten following years are the period of strict bureaucratic centralisation for ever associated with the name of the Minister of the Interior, Alexander Bach, who, after beginning life as a Radical, devoted his abilities to crushing every aspiration of a progressive character, whether German, Hungarian, or Slavonic, whether political, national, or religious, whether historical or modern. At home the army and the police kept down the physical energies of the population, while the Concordat with Rome sat heavy on men's souls. Abroad Austria crushed the liberties of Italy with one hand, and those of Germany with the other. A huge reactionary spider's web seemed spread over central Europe and Italy from Vienna, where Bach was ensconced in his glory. It required the Italian war and the collapse of the material forces on which he had relied to destroy this cunningly organised system. The blow was some time in coming, but when delivered was as effectual as it was sudden. From the

* As to these events, see Von Rogge, *Oesterreich von Vilagos bis zur Gegenwart*.

campaign of Magenta and Solferino it was impossible to recover. Absolutism had been tried, and had irremediably failed, though supported by arms of precision and blessed with holy water. The unpopular minister was dismissed and appointed ambassador to Rome. Count Goluchowski, a Pole, who had gained some reputation as an administrator in Galicia, but was on the whole not much known outside his own province, stepped into his place as Minister of the Interior. The era of change had begun.

An important evolution at this period made itself felt in the ranks of the feudal and clerical party. Hitherto they had been the chief supporters of the Court and the bureaucratic *régime*; but now, foreseeing that the old system was doomed, they began to show a tendency, which subsequent events have developed, to throw in their lot with the Federalist party, in the belief that legislation by the local Diets would be more favourable to their views than legislation by a central Parliament at Vienna, in which the views of the German Liberal party were likely to have a majority, especially on questions connected with religion and education. The new Minister of the Interior was believed to view their plans with favour.

On the 5th of March, 1860, an Imperial rescript appeared by which thirty-eight members, chosen so as to represent the different Crown Lands of the Empire, were added to the Imperial Council. Their mandate was to last for six years, though without legislative power. They were to have the budget and all Imperial legislation submitted to them, and were to meet periodically. But on the 11th of May Garibaldi landed at Marsala, and the events which followed in the summer quickened the slow pulse of the Austrian reformer. In the enlarged Council three of the leaders of the Hungarian Conservative party who were summoned had consented to sit—Count Apponyi, Baron Mailath, and Count Barkoczy. They had not been there a week before they showed the value of the parliamentary traditions of their country by reducing its deliberations to a dead lock by means of a clever coalition. The Council had been packed with Imperial nominees representing the feudal and clerical interests in the Crown Lands, a few Liberals being put in to keep up appearances. But the feudal and clerical parties, as just stated, feared nothing so much as the German Liberal party, because the German Liberal party wanted a Parliament based on a representative system for the whole of the Crown Lands, with the view of introducing reforms. The feudal and clerical parties, therefore, at once appeared as the champions of the historic rights of the Crown Lands. The Hungarian members saw their opportunity. Though for a different set of reasons, they also declared the Council incompetent, and on the 26th of September the united parties carried an address to the Emperor in that sense. On the Hungarian side of the Leitha, this address meant practically everything for which the nation had struggled. But on the Austrian side

it was far otherwise. There the German Liberals feared that the restoration of the Diets might simply mean the confirmation of the rule of the noble, the monk, and the sacristan, except perhaps in Lower Austria, by means of the votes of ignorant peasants in hole-and-corner local assemblies.

Public expectation had not long to wait. On the 20th of October another Imperial patent appeared by which it was announced that a Reichsrath, to be chosen from among the members of the Diets, was about to be summoned. A compromise of the ideas of the national and central parties was evidently aimed at; but the views of the former had on the whole prevailed, as was to be expected from the known views of the Minister of the Interior and from the recent vote of the Council of the Empire.

The legislative powers of the State were declared to be divided between this Central Parliament or Reichsrath and the Diets. The business of the Empire was to fall under three heads; the first of which was to comprise the matters common to all the Crown Lands and also to Hungary, the Diet of which was for these purposes to send delegates to the Parliament. This class of business was to comprise the army, navy, the currency, the ports, railways and telegraphs, commercial treaties, and the financial arrangements connected with these subjects; the second class was to include certain other heads of business which had always been common to the Crown Lands other than Hungary, and was to be dealt with by the delegates of the former alone. It was not clearly stated what these subjects were, though the question was vital. The third class included everything not comprised in the other two, and was to be dealt with by the local Diets—in Hungary, it was expressly added, according to the ancient constitution of the kingdom. Such were the principal provisions of the document known in history as the *October Diploma*.

In order to mark clearly the important part which the Diets were intended to play, the Ministries of Justice of the Interior and of Public Worship were abolished, the subjects with which they dealt being about, so it was stated, to be relegated to the decision of the local assemblies and to the authorities of the several Crown Lands.

The first question was, How would the plan be received in Hungary? Great concessions had been made to win support. The whole *personnel* of the Hungarian administration had been nationalised, and the county assemblies declared to be in possession of their ancient rights and privileges. To meet the demands of the national party, the Banat of Temesvar and the Servian Woivodina were proclaimed to be an integral part of the kingdom, though Croatia and Transylvania were not so recognised. Not only were the highest official places given to those who, like Vay, now created Chancellor, and Apponyi, the new *Judex Curixæ*, had prominently identified themselves with the earlier stages of the movement of 1848, but room

was found even for many of those who had taken an active part in the revolutionary war. The exiles returned from abroad, and a general amnesty was proclaimed. But, great as were these concessions, they were not sufficient. The constitutional liberalism of the country, under the guidance of Deak and Eotvos, refused to recognise the Central Parliament, which had originated in the mere will of the Emperor, and therefore ignored the sovereign independence of the kingdom of Hungary and the reforming legislation of 1848. The Hungary that was to be restored, it was said, was apparently to be the Hungary of 1847; the land of aristocratic privileges and feudal exactions. The more violent orators declared in the county assemblies which the October Diploma had restored to life that a plot existed between Goluchowski and the Hungarian magnates to destroy the liberties of the country. They further objected to the interference in the question of the treatment to be accorded to the languages of the kingdom, other than the Magyar, which was inculcated in an Imperial letter to the Chancellor:—

As I have ordained (said this letter) that the Hungarian shall be the official and business language of the judicial and political authorities in Hungary, I now direct that the town and country communes shall be at liberty to employ what language they please in business matters. The authorities will have to reply to petitions, &c, in the language which may be used by the applicants; the judicial and political authorities will also have to issue their orders in the language most commonly used by the people to whom such orders are addressed. . . . I am resolved not to allow any kind of pressure to be used in regard to language, and will energetically oppose any attempt to make mischief between the different nationalities.

It was also announced that the claims of the deputies from Croatia to the union of Dalmatia to that kingdom would be favourably considered by the Emperor. All this was so much gall and wormwood to the ultra-Magyar party.

Meanwhile Goluchowski had proceeded to publish a series of statutes for the organisation of the communal assemblies in the hereditary provinces of Austria, and for the election of the members of the local Diets, and other kindred matters. The exact functions of the Parliament, however, still remained to be defined, and this point was crucial. The financial confusion also grew worse confounded, and events abroad kept moving with a wonderful regularity in a direction hostile to the hopes of the reaction. By September 1860 Garibaldi's success in the south of Italy was no longer doubtful, and on the 18th of that month the battle of Castel Fidardo was fought. The clerical party was utterly confounded, and at last began to see it was beaten beyond all hope. It was felt on all sides that a more vigorous hand than that of the bureaucratic and rather clerical Goluchowski was needed at the helm. On the 13th of December he resigned. Count Schmerling, a German statesman who had played a distinguished part in the days of the Frankfurt Parliament,

and was credited with liberal views, was his successor. His first official act was a circular in which it was stated that the duties to be assigned to the Parliament would be important, and that the sittings must be public and the members be elective. The suppressed Ministries were also restored. An Imperial Council of State, consisting of all the ministers, was called into being, and by a new set of provincial statutes the franchise for the election of the members of the Diets was given to everybody who paid a certain amount in direct taxes.

On the 26th of February, 1861, the views of the ministers appeared in detail in the document known as the *February Patent*, in which the ideas of the Kremsier Constituent Assembly in regard to the position of the hereditary Provinces reappeared. This document, and its immediate forerunner, the October Diploma, afford the key to the whole tangled history of the subsequent period, each being the flag of the views of one of the two parties which have since contended for predominance in Austria. The October Diploma is the expression of the views of those who would give to the local Diets as large a share of power as possible; the February Patent represents the ideas of those who would limit the rights of the Diets and extend those of the Reichsrath; the former is the charter of the Federalists, the latter of the Centralists; each made some concessions to the views of the other; both failed to satisfy the Hungarians, because both failed to recognise the separate and distinct position of Hungary as a kingdom, and claimed to treat that country as simply one of the hereditary States and nothing more.

The February Patent aimed, on the one hand, at applying to Austria some at least of those ideas which prevailed in most other modern States; it was to mark definitely the end of the reign of the ideas of Metternich and of Bach. On the other hand, it had the same end in view as the bureaucratic system which it partially displaced, in so far as the object of those who framed it was to check national aspirations, except among the German sections of the population. It proposed the institution of an elective and constitutional Assembly, consisting of two Houses. The new Upper House was to consist of the princes of the Imperial family, and of certain high ecclesiastical functionaries sitting *virtute officii*; the remainder were to be nominated by the Emperor, some with hereditary titles, others to seats for life only. The members of the Lower House were to be chosen by the local Diets, which were themselves to consist of members chosen under a tolerably high franchise by direct election in the towns, and by indirect election in the rural districts; and of the representatives of the Chambers of Commerce, and of the large landowners voting in separate colleges. The districts were by way of being divided so as to give a fair representation to the different sections of the population; in reality, care was taken to secure the

predominance of the German vote, to which the limited franchise was also favourable.

The members of the lower house were allotted among the seventeen hereditary crown lands. Hungary was to have eighty-five members, who, however, were only to attend when the interests common to the kingdom and the crown lands were under consideration. Croatia received nine and Transylvania twenty members. Financial control and legislative power, at least in theory, were given to the Parliament so constituted. The Diets were left with various powers of an extensive character, but without the large legislative rights which the framers of the October Diploma had apparently contemplated. For each Diet a Provincial Statute and an electoral law were issued as an annexe to the February Patent.

In Hungary matters soon came to a crisis. The Emperor decided to accept the position of the Liberals, that the reforming legislation of 1848 was to be accepted and considered binding. But it was found impossible to agree as to the incorporation of Transylvania and Croatia, and the other countries claimed as 'partes adnexæ' of the crown of St. Stephen, or on the question of language, which both Hungarian parties, whether in favour of yielding to the legitimate claims of the other nationalities or opposed to that course, were unanimous in claiming to be matters belonging exclusively to the sphere of their own Diet; nor could they be persuaded to waive their objection to the origin of the February Patent, considering it tainted *ab initio*. They accordingly refused to send members to Vienna.

The Pesth Diet had first of all adopted an address drawn up in such a form that the King refused to receive it. Then at length a more moderate formula was adopted. To this a royal rescript replied, by declaring that the King recognised the laws of 1848 concerning the abolition of the privileges of the nobles as to the *corvées* and feudal burdens; as to general admissibility to public employment, and to the possession of landed property; as to the equality of taxation and recruiting, and those relating to the electoral rights of the humbler voters; but refused to sanction the laws which were hostile to the rights of the non-Magyar population of the Hungarian countries.

The union of Hungary and Transylvania (said the Rescript), determined upon in 1848 without the consent of the Roumans and Saxons and in opposition to their wishes, fell to pieces almost immediately. It is therefore necessary to re-establish in the first place the general representation of Transylvania; the relation of Croatia with Hungary can only be resolved by an understanding with the Croatian Diet. The Hungarian Diet is summoned to devote its attention to those conditions, the basis of which are the internal self-government of Croatia and its position towards the general Empire in accordance with the federal union between it and Hungary. It is summoned to take the initiative of a law guaranteeing the rights of the non-Magyar inhabitants of Hungary. The Emperor reserves the initiative concerning

the rights of the Serbs on the basis of the wishes of their National Congress. . . . He awaits the assembling of the Diet for the legal settlement of the points indicated.

This document was simply equivalent to hurling a lighted match into a powder-magazine.

We must regard (said the Diet in its reply) as unconstitutional and unbinding all acts or ordinances of the Reichsrath referring to Hungary or its annexed parts. We can neither accept the Imperial diploma of the 20th of October, 1860, nor the intended application to Hungary of the patent of the 26th of February.

But under the influence of Deak the reply went on to say :—

We know that the constantly developing feeling of nationality deserves respect, and must not be weighed by a measure derived from former times or older laws. We shall not forget that the non-Hungarian inhabitants are citizens of the country, and we are prepared sincerely and readily to secure to them by law whatever their own interest or that of the country demand.⁴

While such was the attitude of the Hungarian majority, the February Patent and the arrangement it proposed to introduce were not proving popular even in Transylvania and Croatia. The non-Magyar deputies of those countries, if opposed to centralisation at Pesth, were not opposed to it out of love for centralisation at Vienna. There was little love lost, indeed, between the Croat and the descendants of Arpad ; but the former at least recollected the events of 1849. ‘The Croat put down the Hungarians once,’ said one of the former about this time to Mr. Grant Duff, ‘but he will take uncommonly good care not to do it again.’ The Diet of Agram refused to send deputies to Vienna, and it was only after long negotiations that Schmerling succeeded in persuading the Transylvanians to be less recalcitrant.

The resignation of the Chancellor Vay and the *Judex Curie* Apponyi marked the final failure of the February Patent so far as Hungary was concerned. Patriotism now resorted to an old and familiar weapon, the refusal of the taxes imposed by the Reichsrath, which it declared to be an illegal levy. Military force had to be constantly called in to obtain even the uncertain and ever-diminishing payments which slowly and unwillingly dribbled into the treasury. The Diet and county assemblies were again dissolved, and the country once more practically passed under a military administration.

The end of the February Patent, therefore, in the countries east of the Leitha, was a clear and visible failure. In the Crown Lands the result was more encouraging ; though what had been actually accomplished was not much, yet the direction was clear. In the first place, the old system had received a blow from which it was not likely to recover. In the next place, even if the new Parliament was in many respects an unsatisfactory creation, yet the principle was at least admitted, however feebly worked out, that the people had a

⁴ *Francis Deak, Hungarian Statesman.* By Miss Arnold-Forster. Chap xxii.

right to govern themselves. If the Concordat was not abolished, it was now at least possible to agitate for its abolition; and, although the 'fundamental liberties' of every citizen, which the new constitution had proclaimed, might still too often be found a mere phrase, there was at least some chance of making them a reality in a not very distant future. What evidently remained to be done was first to reconcile Hungary and next to find some basis of agreement or compromise which would remove the antagonism of the Germans in the Crown Lands to the extension of the rights of the Diets, which they considered meant the destruction of liberal ideas, and of the Slaves to the Central Parliament, which they held implied their own subordination to the Germans.

The last quarter of a century has been occupied by the Hereditary Provinces of Austria and by the Kingdom of Hungary in the attempt to find a solution of these questions.

The resistance of Hungary again brought matters to a crisis in 1865, just at the moment when the Empire, by participating in the seizure of Schleswig-Holstein, had once more plunged into the dangerous arena of foreign war and diplomacy. Concessions, it was felt, must be made. Schmerling disappeared from office, and his place was taken by Belcredi, whose ideas were believed to be favourable to the October Diploma, and to concessions to Hungary. A manifesto and patent of the 20th of September, 1865, suspended the fundamental law of 1861, and submitted it to the Diet of Hungary and Croatia for discussion and advice. On the 10th of December following, the Hungarian Diet admitted the principle of recognising the existence of joint-legislation and administration on certain subjects admitted to be of common interest. The first steps to reconciliation were thus taken on both sides; but, the Austro-Prussian war ensuing, further delays took place, nor was it till 1867 that the final settlement took place, by the introduction of the Dual system of government, the dominating idea of which is the perfect equality of the two halves of the Empire-kingdom, each of which has its own parliament, ministers, and system of taxation and government, but also sends a certain number of members to the Delegations which regulate the army, navy, and diplomatic services. Transylvania was incorporated bodily into the Hungarian kingdom, while with Croatia Hungary entered into an agreement dictated by a spirit of conciliation, but making clear the subordination of the Diet of Agram to that of Pesth, to both houses of which it was to send representatives.⁵

In the hereditary Provinces, the struggle between the ideas of the October Diploma and those of the February Patent has continued. As above stated, the Belcredi ministry, which succeeded that of Schmerling, represented a return to nationalist views; but the Dual

⁵ Law of Nov 19, 1868, modified by the laws of 1873 and 1881

arrangement, being the outcome of the agreement of German and Hungarian Liberalism, under the auspices of Count Beust, Count Andrassy and Deak, as to the government of the country in internal affairs as much as upon other questions, necessitated the disappearance of Belcredi, the reappearance of the Reichsrath, and the amendment of the February Patent by a new fundamental law on the representation of the Empire, voted on the 21st of December, 1867, by that body. Simultaneously four other fundamental laws were voted on the general rights of all citizens of the Empire; on the exercise of the powers of the Government and of the Executive; on the creation of an Imperial tribunal; and on the exercise of the judicial power. These five statutes together form the Magna Charta of Austria.

The eleventh and twelfth clauses of the law on the representation of the Empire define the rights of the Reichsrath as follows: ⁶—

11. The sphere of the Reichsrath embraces all questions relative to the rights, obligations, and interests common to all the kingdoms and countries represented in it. . . . Consequently the following subjects belong to the sphere of the Reichsrath:

(a) The examination and approval of treaties of commerce and of such political treaties as may entail a charge on the Empire, or on any of the States composing it, or an obligation on individuals, or a modification of the territory of the kingdoms and countries represented in the Reichsrath.

(b) All matters relative to the performance of military service, its duration and length, and in particular the annual vote of the number of men, and the rules relating to the provisioning, commissariat, and quartering of troops.

(c) The settlement of the budgets of the public administration, and in particular the vote every year of the taxes, imposts and duties to be levied; the examination of the finance accounts of the State, and of the results of the financial administration, and of the audit and passing of those accounts; the issue of new loans, the conversion of the Old Debt; the alienation, exchange, and mortgage of the State Domains; legislation in regard to monopolies and regalian rights, and in general all financial affairs common to the kingdoms and countries represented in the Reichsrath.

(d) The regulation of the monetary system and of banks of issue; of questions relating to trade and customs; of the telegraphs, posts, railways, navigable ways, and other means of communication.

(e) Legislation concerning credit, banks, patents, industry, with the exception of the duties on liquor licences; weights and measures; and the guarantee of trade marks and patterns.

(f) Legislation in regard to medical questions, together with the precautions to be taken against epidemic and epizootic diseases.

(g) Legislation on the rights of citizenship and nationality; the supervision of strangers, passports and the census.

(h) Legislation on the position of religious bodies; on the right of combination and public meeting; on the press and copyright.

⁶ See *Taschenausgabe der österreichischen Gesetze*, vol. xix. 'Die Staatsgrundgesetze.' Collection Manz, Vienna, 1879. And *Recueil des Constitutions actuellement en vigueur dans les divers Etats d'Europe, d'Amérique et du monde civilisé*, par F. R. et P. Dareste, vol. i. pp. 361-387. Paris, chez Challengel aîné.

(i) The regulation of the bases of public elementary, middle-class, and university education.

(k) Legislation in regard to crimes and police offences, in regard to civil rights, with the exception of the preparation of the public registers and those subjects which, according to the terms of the provincial statutes and the present fundamental law, are within the sphere of the Diets, in regard to the law of commerce and exchange; maritime law, the law of minerals, and feudal law.

(l) Legislation on the bases of the organisation of the courts of law and the civil service.

(m) The laws to be made in virtue of and for the execution of the laws on the general rights of citizenship, on the Imperial tribunal; on the judicial power, and on the powers of the Government and Executive.

(n) Legislation on subjects concerning the duties and relations of the several provinces.

(o) Legislation on the procedure under which the affairs recognised by the agreement with the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen as being of common interest, are to be dealt with.

12. All legislative matters, other than those expressly reserved to the Reichsrath by the present law, come within the sphere of the Diets of the kingdoms and countries represented in the Reichsrath, and are regulated in the said Diets in accordance with the constitution. Nevertheless, should a Diet decide that any legislative question coming within its sphere should be discussed and decided by the Reichsrath, such question would thereupon in that particular instance, and so far as that Diet is concerned, be removed into the sphere of the Reichsrath.*

The members of the Lower House of the Reichsrath are allotted as follows among the seventeen provinces:—Bohemia, 92; Dalmatia, 9; Galicia and Lodomeria, with the Grand-Duchy of Cracow, 63; Lower Austria, 37; Upper Austria, 17; Salzburg, 5; Styria, 23; Carinthia, 9; Carniola, 10; Bukowina, 9; Moravia, 36; Silesia, 10; Tirol, 18; Vorarlberg, 3; Istria, 4; Gorz and Gradiska, 4; the city of Trieste and territory adjoining, 4.

The number of representatives to be elected in each province is distributed proportionally among the several categories of elective colleges mentioned in each Provincial Statute, according to a schedule set out in the fundamental law itself. By the law of 1867 the members of the Diets elected the members of the Reichsrath; but in 1873 the elections to the latter were confided to the direct vote of the constituencies which elected the Diets.

The Provincial Statute for Lower Austria may be taken as the type of the whole class of those statutes issued in 1861 and modified in a liberal direction in 1867. The Diet consists of (1) the Archbishop of Vienna and the bishop of St. Polten; (2) the rector of the University of Vienna; (3) sixty-five elective deputies—fifteen representing the class of great proprietors, twenty-nine elected by direct suffrage in the towns, boroughs, and by the Chambers of Commerce, and twenty-one elected by indirect election in the country

* Under this power the laws relating to the establishment of registers of title in Upper and Lower Austria, Salzburg, Carinthia, Silesia and Moravia were transferred into the Reichsrath and passed in June 1874.

parishes. The Diet elects an administrative and executive standing committee of six members, representing the several categories of voters in class (3). The powers of the Diet are defined in the 18th and 19th clauses of the statute as follows :—

The following subjects are within the sphere of the Diet :

(a) All regulations (1) concerning agriculture ; (2), the public buildings of the province ; (3), the charitable institutions endowed from the provincial budget ; (4), the provincial budget and the accounts of the province, whether of receipt or expenditure.

(b) All measures of detail under the provisions of the general laws relating (1) to communal affairs ; (2), to ecclesiastical and educational matters ; (3), the provisioning, quartering, and commissariat of troops.

(c) The regulation of every other subject interesting the prosperity or needs of the country, which may be submitted to the Diet by special order.

19. The Diet is summoned—

(1) to deliberate and formulate Bills (a) on the laws and regulations already existing, considered in their bearing on the good of the province ; (b), on the laws and general regulations required by the necessities of the province.

(2) To formulate Bills on every subject submitted to it by the Government.*

Clauses 20 and 21 give the Diet the right of superintending the administration of the public domain and the property of the duchy. Under Clause 22, when the ordinary revenue of the province is insufficient, the Diet may order a levy of ten centimes on the valuation list of the land tax. If it requires more than that sum, it must first obtain Imperial sanction. The Diet also possesses powers in regard to communal affairs, and the assessment and collection of the taxes, particularly in regard to the land tax ; but these powers are defined by the general communal law, and the communal statute issued under it. The Diet also determines the number and salaries of the provincial administration.

For eleven years after the events of 1867 the German Liberal party was at the helm of affairs, with the brief interlude of the Hohenwarth ministry in 1871 and the abortive attempt then made to satisfy the aspirations of the Nationalist party. The so-called Bürger Ministerium or Middle-class Ministry which preceded, and that of Prince Auersperg which followed the Hohenwarth ministry, turned Austria into a modern State. The Concordat was abolished ; a national and unsectarian system of education was established ; the religious rights of all the great non-Catholic communities were recognised ; the codes of procedure and of substantive law were radically reformed ; direct elections to the Reichsrath were substituted for indirect ; liberty of the press was established. But the very success and extent of these measures proved fatal to the German Liberals. Powerful interests were offended ; the Church, above all, by the religious and educational reforms ; the great nobles by their loss of

* The Diet has independent legislative initiative as well for strictly provincial purposes (Clause 17)

power and influence; the non-German nationalists by the neglect of their aspirations to autonomy. Over and over again the proceedings of the Reichsrath were brought to a standstill, or almost so, by the refusal of the Bohemian deputies to sit and the consequent absence of the proper quorum for the transaction of business. Finally, the question of Bosnia and the Herzegovina came as an apple of discord thrown into the ranks of the German Liberals, most of whom viewed with distrust the practical admission into the Empire of two more non-German States, while some justified it by the argument with which M. Tisza, the Hungarian Premier, met the hostility of the Magyar Radicals, viz. that the annexation was necessary in order 'to crush the Slavonic serpent.' Thus it came to pass that, in 1878, the Auersperg ministry fell, and, after a brief interval, Count Taaffe succeeding to power, inaugurated what has been termed the era of 'reconciliation' with the non-German elements. A large extension of the suffrage, of which the certain effect, as the event proved, was to weaken German Liberalism at the polls, was passed; concessions on the education question were made which were acceptable to the clergy; the use of languages other than German received a real, as distinct from a nominal, recognition; a Czech University has been established at Prague; and a measure introduced to reorganise the army on the territorial system, so that the divisions will be mainly composed of persons speaking the same language and of the same nationality. Most of Count Taaffe's leading colleagues represent the Slavonic nationalities, and under their guidance Austria bids fair to become a Slavonic State, and to see her foreign policy undergo important changes in consequence. The concessions made, however, have not satisfied the nationalities, who, excited by the concessions already made, ask for more and yet more. The tension between the German and the Czech population of Bohemia has, in consequence, reached a point which constitutes a public danger, and has recently, on at least one occasion, led to riot and bloodshed. On the other hand, Hungarian opinion, always suspicious of its Slavonic neighbours, and aroused by its own troubles with the Croat Diet of Agram, is becoming anxious at the transformation scene now going on across the Leitha.

It is of the utmost importance to Hungary (said Dr. Julius Horvath in the Hungarian Parliament on the 18th of January) that the Federalist policy now being pursued in Austria shall not be pushed to a point which will keep the two halves of the Monarchy in chronic estrangement, and prepare the inevitable dissolution of the Empire. . . . Our union, we must remember, was originally with a German people, not with a Slav; and I will conclude by quoting the words of our Hungarian Joseph Eotvos, who said that, if ever we had to choose between Germanism and Slavism, we must pronounce for the former.

The Soldier's Song in *Faust* makes the pertinent inquiry—

The Holy old Roman Empire,
How holds she herself together?

and prudently abstains from replying to the question. The same inquiry is often made about Austria, and persons are never wanting to give the unhesitating reply that her immediate dissolution is at hand; that Prince Bismarck has quite made up his mind to take the German provinces; that Roumania will annex Transylvania and the Bukowina; that Russia will seize Galicia, and so on. The rearrangement of the map of Europe on a large scale is always a tempting and interesting occupation, but it is well to bear in mind the old saying that, if Austria did not exist, she would have to be invented; and that if the recent reforms seem to threaten the unity of the Empire, without them the Empire would probably before now have ceased to exist.

Meanwhile, the experiment in constitutional government now being carried on is an interesting study, especially at the present moment, when the attention of Englishmen is being forced into the study of the methods by which other nations have tried the task of governing distinct nationalities under the same Sovereign. The relation between Austria and Hungary constitutes a Confederation of two independent States, as distinct from a Federal Union, using as a test to distinguish those two forms of government the question whether, in the event of either of the contracting parties refusing to take notice of the legal rights of the National Government, a sufficient power exists anywhere to enforce obedience and collect taxes. The tie under the Dual arrangement is in reality of the slightest, the whole system being based on the assumption of the existence of a perfect parity between the territories on the eastern and those on the western bank of the Leitha. Justice and police are distinct; the army, navy, and diplomatic services, though common charges, are paid by votes from the separate exchequers, the central treasury simply serving a precept on the two ministers of finance for the amount due; there are no common revenue officers; the Austrian tax-gatherer has nothing to say to Hungary; the Hungarian tax-gatherer has nothing to do with Austria; the custom-houses are subject to the government on whose territory they lie. If either Parliament chose to refuse the legal quota to the common expenses, the machine of the government would instantly stop, and no power exists sufficient to compel obedience to the demands of the Delegations. A civil war between equally balanced forces would be the result, were the Austrian half of the country to seek to compel the Hungarian half to carry out the clauses of the arrangement against the will of the latter, or *vice versa*.

The relation between Hungary and Croatia is federal. Not only are the rights reserved to the National Government important and extensive, but in theory it has the right, and in practice has the strength, to compel obedience on the part of the Croatian Diet, if the latter is recalcitrant. Recent events have proved this, as, notwithstanding the liberal terms of the laws of 1868 and 1873, recourse

has been necessary to very strong measures on more than one occasion, owing to the tactics of the Croatian nationalists.

The hereditary Provinces of Austria are evidently not a Confederation, for the attributions of the local Diets are limited; and abundant power exists in the National Government to compel obedience on their part. Neither can the reforms of the Taafé administration as yet be said to have brought these countries within the category of Federal States, although it is evident that they tend in that direction. As yet so much remains of the result of the ideas which from the days of Maria Theresa to those of Schmerling, and from those of Schmerling to Prince Auersperg, have dominated the rulers of Austria, that it would be premature to say that the hereditary Provinces have ceased in the theory of their institutions to form a homogeneous State. The February Patent and not the October Diploma still has the upper hand, but for how long it would be rash to prophesy.

EDMOND FITZMAURICE.

III.

FOR SCOTLAND.

MR. PARNELL, in a speech made last autumn, whilst advocating a policy of separate government for Ireland, informed his hearers that 'Scotland had lost her nationality,' and held up her fate, so it seemed, as a warning to Ireland of what degradation and misfortune might be in store for his countrymen should they become thoroughly merged and incorporated with the British people. What is this nationality, which it is said Scotland has lost, and Ireland is in danger of losing, and to which we sometimes hear that even Wales has a claim? Scotchmen have recently been told, much to their own astonishment, that they, forsooth, like the Irish and the Welsh, deserve to be treated as a separate people. The English are quite ready to give us in Scotland an independent parliament for our local affairs, if we only wish it! So it is said; and there are some Englishmen, and here and there, may be, even an odd Scotchman, so out of sympathy with general Scottish sentiment as to think such talk grateful to Scottish ears. Every Scotchman takes a pride in the history of his country. When at the union the separate existence of the 'ancient kingdom' came to an end for ever, we entered the Union on equal terms with the people of England. The eloquence of Lord Belhaven, the mistaken patriotic sentiments of many Scotchmen, and the Jacobite sympathies of too many others, raised indeed at the time some natural opposition to the action of the last of the Scottish parliaments. The nationality of Scotland as totally distinct from that of England was of course not a mere sentiment, it was a fact. Scotchmen at the time of the Union did not, and they never will, forget their national history, of which the main feature was the struggle, and the successful struggle, they had carried on for so many centuries with their 'auld enemies of England.'

They had had their own monarchs, their own independent parliaments, their own courts of law and separate legal system, their separate religious establishment, their own universities. Scotland was no mere 'geographical expression.' Its inhabitants were bound together by those institutions and laws which 'teach the act of order to a peopled kingdom.' They were accounted an independent nation by the nations of Europe. Scottish ambassadors represented their sovereign at Paris and Madrid as well as in London; and ambassadors

from England and the Continental nations were received on the same terms at Holyrood. The effect of the two Unions (first that of the Crowns in 1603, secondly that of the Parliaments and Governments in 1707) was to bring all this to an end. No Scottish army would ever again take the field, nor a Scottish ship of war sail the seas. The patriotism of Scotchmen has not, however, ceased with the Union, though it has widened its scope; for wherever British armies and British fleets are engaged, Scotland feels, and has, thanks to the Union, as much right as England to feel, that she, as well as England, is sharing the danger and the glory on behalf of a common country and a united people.

Whatever nationality Ireland may have lost, it certainly was not a nationality marked by any of the ordinary signs of independent national existence. The Irish never *acted* as an independent nation, and if they really ever considered themselves an independent nation, they certainly were not so considered by any other nation of the world. Was ambassador ever sent by a foreign power to an Irish Government? Was the Irish flag ever seen upon the seas? Reference need hardly be made to Wales. A Welsh ambassador! A Welsh man-of-war! A Welsh alliance with a continental power! Possibly before long Scotland will be having held up to it as an example, the independence of the Isle of Man! That island is, no doubt, blessed with a local parliament—the House of Keys. If the Scotch only wish it, the English will be quite willing that Scotland also should have its House of Keys! For heaven's sake, let there be some consideration among Englishmen for historical facts, to say nothing of Scotch susceptibilities, and let there be an end of this talk of indulging us with semi-national institutions since Scotchmen, Irishmen, and Welshmen form three separate nations! Scotchmen will assuredly resent an apparently growing tendency to thrust upon them new institutions, not because the Scotch want them, nor because they are suited to Scotland, but because some persons think that party advantage is to be obtained by likening the cases of Scotland and Ireland, and that Scotland may possibly be conveniently made use of as a stalking-horse, under which English politicians may advance with greater safety to meet the demands of Messrs. Parnell and Biggar for Irish Home Rule.

The Irish question must be judged upon its own merits and so must the Scotch. And whenever the relations between England and Scotland are discussed, it will be found that Scotchmen still choose to compare themselves and their privileges, as they did at the time of the Union, *not* with those of Ireland and Wales, but with those of England. Scotland and England then entered into partnership and became one nation. But it seems to occur too seldom to the English mind, when the project is mooted of reviving separate legislatures in the two countries, each devoted to its own local affairs, that on one

subject there is still not absolute reciprocity of feeling between Englishmen and Scotchmen. If Englishmen do not care to interest themselves in Scotch affairs, if they look upon Scotland as only a remote corner of the kingdom whose concerns cannot much matter to them, and are of intrinsically little importance, they should remember that a similar feeling as to English affairs is not reciprocated by Scotchmen.

For my part, though a Scotchman and a Scotch member of Parliament, I think it of the greatest importance and interest to myself and other Scotchmen that England should be well governed. The local affairs of England are the local affairs of seven-eighths of the people of this island. England is the home of hundreds of thousands of Scotchmen. Home Rule for England is a proposal which every Scotchman who has inherited one spark of true Scotch feeling will resist to the uttermost; he claims as a Scotchman and by virtue of the Union to take his part in governing England. Were England to have a separate parliament for English affairs, and Scotland a separate parliament for Scotch affairs, the importance of Scotland in the kingdom as a whole would inevitably be very seriously diminished. It is easy enough on paper to describe English affairs as local. The fact is that England constitutes such a large portion of the kingdom that its affairs are necessarily of more than local importance.

Scotch Home Rule for Scotch affairs would necessitate English Home Rule for English affairs; and Scotchmen are very unlikely to forget that English Home Rule means the exclusion of Scotchmen from the chief internal politics of Great Britain.

It is difficult to conceive how any severer blow could be given to the importance of Scotland than by separating its legislature from that of the sister country. And how it comes that any such retrograde step should at the present time be contemplated as the barest possibility only shows what mighty pressure the return to the House of Commons of eighty-six separatist Irish members has brought upon the minds of men, especially of those—and they are unfortunately many—who care much more for the temporary position of political parties, than for the permanent position which Scotland should hold in the United Kingdom. What reason is there (except the return of the eighty-six Parnellite members) for these ostentatious offers of Home Rule to Scotland by patronising English newspapers and their more simple-minded correspondents? Has the complete merging of the two nations undergone lately any sudden check? On the contrary, never was there so much intercourse between the two. As for legislation, the tendency of recent years towards assimilation of laws has been stronger than ever. In recent legislation the practice of dealing by the same Act of Parliament with the whole island is increasing. The strongest instance probably of this was the passing of *one* Reform Act for the three kingdoms—an entirely unprecedented example of

the identity of political sentiment as regards electoral qualifications, and of the similarity of circumstances in the three countries.

And not merely is the assimilating tendency of the times observable in the statute law; the same tendency is observed in the case law of the two countries. The highest Court of Appeal, constituted of the most eminent lawyers of Scotland, England, and Ireland, applies, no doubt, Scotch law in the decision of Scotch appeals, English law in appeals from England; but the presence and consultation together of eminent judges trained in the different systems, hearing the arguments of Scottish advocates and English barristers, acquainting themselves with the decisions of the courts and the writings of learned authors in both countries, must tend to the advantage of law in each country, and to a kind of assimilation at which every liberal-minded man must rejoice.

Instead of there having been lately any check to the process of merging of English and Scotch, the fusion between the two nations has been becoming more complete than ever. The distinction between Englishmen and Scotchmen, between the English nation and the Scottish nation, has become of as little practical importance, and is almost as little considered, as the geographical boundary between the two countries. It has become, fortunately, as impossible really to revive the two separate nations as to give back their old glories to the Carter Fell and the Kershope Burn. Why, then, should we play at doing so? The Scotch Borders are full of recollections of the old wars with our southern enemies. Old houses in Hawick tell by their architecture of days when English foes were the chief danger to the burgh householder, and the ruined abbeys of Jedburgh, Melrose, and Kelso still attest the ruthless nature of the warfare carried on by the armies of Henry the Eighth. If the spirit to keep up ancient hatreds, to foster the remembrance of old wrongs, and to perpetuate bitter animosities between races, existed on the Borders as it does amongst Irishmen, both in and out of Ireland, there are few parts of the United Kingdom where more material for maintaining it could be found than on the Borders. But the old feeling of hatred is absolutely dead, whilst the old feeling of patriotic pride in the deeds of an heroic ancestry is as strong as ever. In March 1799, in debate in the House of Lords on the Irish Union, the Lord Minto of that day spoke of the sentiment then existing on the Borders:—

I will venture to assure your Lordships, and to speak for my neighbours as well as for myself, that at this day we see without humiliation or regret those towers and beacons which were very necessary appendages of our independence at least before the union of the Crowns, when we had a predatory enemy within ten miles of us; we behold, I say, without mortification or concern those badges of Imperial dignity mouldering and in ruin on our rocks, while we can see the plain below covered with crops, which he who sows is now sure of reaping, and while we can extend our views of national instinct and dignity, and all our public feelings, whether of pride or of affection, not only beyond the little range of hills that we look upon, but to the remotest extremities of the habitable globe.

Home Rule for Scotland and Ireland must be taken to mean the breaking up of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and the establishment of a separate parliament in each of the three kingdoms. The expression is synonymous with the 'Repeal of the Union' phrase of O'Connell's time. To each of these parliaments would be entrusted, if the thing was to be a reality, the ordinary parliamentary functions within local limits, of legislation, taxation, and choice and control of the executive. Each parliament would, of course, be chosen on the basis of the present franchise, *i.e.* by a householder electorate, and it can hardly be imagined that an assembly so elected would be slow to claim any of the advantages and powers attaching to an independent parliament.

'Home Rule' and 'Repeal of the Union' have always at least included, in the mouths of Irish politicians, the establishment of an Irish Parliament on College Green. Grattan's formula, afterwards approved by O'Connell, is well known: 'Only the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland have a right to legislate for the Irish people.' In his day, however, the Repeal movement was of a purely Irish home-grown character, whilst now the Home Rule agitation derives its main support from transatlantic sources. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Parnell should aim at severing the last link which connects together the two nations. For the moment, possibly, in the House of Commons little may be heard of these extremer views. It may not at present suit those who have hitherto avowedly been working for separation to reject as inadequate, temporary accommodation in a half-way house on the high road to their goal. We have it on the authority of Mr. Trevelyan, speaking in Warwickshire on the 30th of December, that 'as far as law and order and the peace of the country are concerned, there is no half-way house between entire separation and absolute Imperial control.'

A short time ago the somewhat remarkable discovery was made that Home Rule and Local Government were but different expressions with the same signification. It may be that each expression is capable of being applied, without doing absolute violence to the English language, so as to cover what is usually intended by the other. But, as a matter of fact, what was intended by the expression Home Rule was absolutely distinct from and unlike what was intended by the expression Local Government. 'Home Rule' was, till a few weeks ago, exclusively applied to the demand made by Mr. Parnell and his followers, that Ireland should have a parliament of its own in Ireland to legislate for Ireland, and presumably to exercise the other functions which in this country are generally supposed to belong to an assembly calling itself a parliament.

Local Government had a very different meaning, as might be supposed from the fact that at the recent general election every Liberal Scotch and English member declared in favour of extending

it, while all Liberal statesmen and the vast majority of their followers were believed to be hostile to Home Rule.

The Duke of Argyll, in a very able letter to the *Times* of the 29th of December, has cautioned the public 'against the loose and slovenly habit of thinking on the true functions of government, and warned them that this light talk on Home Rule means something very like an attempt to frame a new constitution, a kind of undertaking for which in the past neither British statesmen nor people have shown inclination or aptitude. In the Queen's Speech at the opening of the session of 1884, after promising 'a judicious extension of the franchise' which would bring about 'a still closer attachment of the nation to the throne, the law, and the institutions of the country,' Her Majesty went on 'to anticipate a like effect from the extension and reform of Local Government,' and to define what that expression covered. 'This comprehensive subject' (local government) 'embraces all that relates locally to the greater efficiency of administration, to the alleviation of burdens by improved arrangements, and to the enlargement of the powers of ratepayers through the representative system, including among them the regulation of the traffic in intoxicating liquors.' At that time, at all events, the policy of extending Local Government and the policy of Home Rule were not only not the same, but were as dissimilar as two policies could well be. Liberal candidates have lately been expounding on platforms their views of what was desirable in an improved local government. The general idea has been that the self-governing powers, enjoyed in towns since the Municipal Reform Act, and largely added to from time to time, should be extended to inhabitants of counties. That as town and county householders now enjoy the same franchise for Imperial purposes, the distinction which gives local representative institutions to the former and denies them to the latter, should be swept away. No one dreamt of including the breaking up of the legislative union of the three countries in the demand of the county householders for the local privileges of borough householders. The wide distinction that exists between entrusting local bodies with legislative and entrusting them with administrative functions is constantly lost sight of. Hitherto when asking for extended local government, Liberals have been seeking a better administration of local business, and an administrative system based upon representative principles. They have never yet asked that locally elected bodies should have the power to make laws. Yet the latter demand has lately been supposed to have been included in the former.

An instance of the desire felt to give improved local administration in Scotland was witnessed in the last session of the last parliament in the rearrangement made in regard to Scotch departmental business. The Scotch Secretary Bill was passed, under which a minister responsible to parliament was appointed with the special charge of Scotch business. When this Bill was passing through the House of Commons

Sir John Lubbock described the measure as tending to Home Rule, a remark which called forth immediate protests from various Scotch members, who though anxiously looking for a better administration of Scotch business, had no kind of desire to weaken the authority of the Imperial Parliament by attacking the parliamentary union of the two countries. Home Rule is a plant entirely of Irish growth, and any attempt to transplant it to the very different soil of Scotland will quickly show how little suited it is to thrive on this side of the Irish Channel.

By all means let us try to extend local self-government, and let us, as far as we can, follow the example that has been set with regard to cities and large towns. But to break up the Imperial Parliament is a very different matter. It is certain that, however limited by statute the powers of a local parliament may be, it will assuredly continually be endeavouring to increase its authority. A Scotch or an English House of Commons elected on the household franchise electorate would each feel its own strength. It would be absurd to deny to such assemblies, if they demanded them, as they certainly would, the full privileges and powers incident to parliament. The House of Commons in each country would legislate for itself; it would tax its own people, it would choose, and having chosen would control, its own executive. Sir Henry Maine has lately pointed out the tendency of the House of Commons to acquire the executive authority more properly belonging to the Cabinet, and of the Cabinet (the sole originator of the most important bills) to acquire the legislative powers formally belonging to parliament. How would three executives in the three countries, each in command of the physical force of the country, work together?

If an English parliament democratically elected is to sit at Westminster, a Scotch one similarly chosen at Edinburgh, and an Irish one in Dublin, it will clearly be impossible to keep from these bodies the control of the local executive. How, moreover, can the command of local forces be withheld from the local executive? In Ireland it may be that the control by a College Green parliament of the Irish police, constabulary, militia, and volunteers (who would no doubt soon be established) would prove dangerous to the unity of the kingdoms. So in Ireland the control by an Irish parliament of the ordinary action of the Irish executive might not answer in practice. Those who have heard in Parliament the persistent denunciation by Irish members of every grade of representative of authority and law in that country, whether English or Irish, Protestant or Catholic, from Lord Spencer and Mr. Trevelyan down to the judges, magistrates, and policemen, cannot feel sure that it would answer to give supreme authority over the appointment and maintenance of all Irish officials to the majority of an Irish parliament. In Scotland and England quite different considerations arise. No one doubts that in each country law and order would be efficiently

maintained; and everyone knows that there would be no feeling in either country in favour of completely severing the union between them. But how would either country be benefited by the change? We should undoubtedly weaken government by dividing it; and is there any reason to suppose that the legislation of two local parliaments would be of a superior character to that which one could accomplish? My own experience leads me to think that where there is a prevalent opinion in Scotland and among Scotch members in favour of any particular legislation for that country, English prejudice cannot prevail against it. Scotch members are left a good deal to themselves in discussing Scotch bills; but far from looking grudgingly at interference on the part of English members in our business, I believe Scotch representatives almost always welcome the assistance of the few Englishmen who are inclined to interest themselves in our affairs, and who bring to the discussion fresh and unbiassed minds. But when I look to the other half of the question, viz. Scotch interference in English affairs, I confess I cannot help, as a Liberal, trembling for the result, should Scotchmen be ordered home to give exclusive attention to their own business. Why, where would Liberal majorities have been since 1832 but for Scotland? Once more let it be remembered that, if English interference with Scotland is possible under the Union, so is Scotch interference with England, and it is not quite clear that the latter country has the best of the bargain.

Among the Scottish members are fortunately many who interest themselves not merely in Scottish business but also in the affairs of the Empire. So it is with the electors, as well as with the representatives. Mr. Goschen, Mr. Childers, and Mr. Trevelyan are Englishmen, and Mr. Gladstone himself, though a Scotchman, owes his Scotch seat and his popularity in Scotland to the high renown he has acquired as a statesman in the wide field of Imperial politics, rather than to his special connection with Scotland. It is certainly pleasant to our Scottish pride to be able to claim the Prime Minister, three out of the five Secretaries of State, the Secretary for Scotland, and the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, as either Scotchman or Scotch members. It is undoubtedly a proof of the important part which Scotland plays in guiding the destinies of the Empire. But these statesmen would hardly sit in a purely Scottish assembly, whilst probably many other less distinguished Scotchmen would be unwilling to limit their aspirations and the scope of their services to an Edinburgh or Glasgow parliament. It may be said there will still be an Imperial parliament, and the local assemblies will be in addition to, not in lieu of, the Imperial Legislature. These distinguished statesmen would find a place as before in the Imperial Parliament, and they would be relieved from troubling themselves with our local affairs. Again as a Scotchman, I protest. No statesmen are too distinguished to give attention to Scotch legislation and to assist good government

in Scotland. If we lose these men from among our members, inferior men will take their places, with unfortunate consequences to Scotch interests.

It is sometimes urged that local parliaments are required, in order that the Imperial Parliament may be relieved of the stress of work now falling on it. As regards private bill legislation, undoubtedly much might be done to relieve parliament by transferring some of its authority to local bodies or officials, as contemplated in the proposals of Mr. Craig Sellar. But as regards public legislation, and the ordinary business of the House of Commons, there seems to be much more to hope from carrying out Mr. Gladstone's 'principle of delegation' (that is, the House as a whole delegating to portions of itself its own authority) than from any multiplication of parliaments.

By carrying out, in short, the system of standing committees and by introducing a procedure under which the House of Commons would become the master of its own time, instead of being the victim of individuals and small minorities, Parliament would be once more rendered competent for all the various duties it has to perform.

We insure by preserving the unity of Parliament that legislation should progress steadily in accordance with the judgment of the whole nation. How would a Tory majority in England and a Liberal majority in Scotland keep the legislation of the two countries at all on the same lines? Differences and divergences would necessarily tend to increase, at a period of our history when there is less reason than ever before for maintaining and perpetuating them.

It is not my wish in this article to say a word to discourage attempts to extend local government for local affairs. The more that county business can be done in the county, the more that the dwellers in counties can be got to interest themselves in county business, the better; but this is entirely distinct from appealing to national instinct to create subordinate national legislatures. Again, I do not think it worth while here, even were there space to do so, to discuss many of the difficulties which would have to be encountered in an attempt to build up local national parliaments. Is each parliament to consist of two houses or of one? Is the National Debt to be apportioned among the several nations of the kingdom? Is the taxation of Scotchmen a Scotch or an Imperial affair? These and many other difficult questions will have to be answered before practical effect can be given to the loose talk which has lately been so common. My object has been to point out the way in which patriotic and intelligent Scotchmen may be expected to regard the question. The fact is that, if the language recently used in reference to Ireland is to be taken seriously, nothing less is contemplated than the substitution of a federal system of government for a constitution in which 'the one fundamental dogma of constitutional law is the absolute legislative sovereignty or despotism of the king in Parlia-

ment.'¹ A Federal Union, if it is to be a reality, necessitates the distribution of the powers now concentrated in Parliament among other authorities. Are we to have a fixed constitution, and a Supreme Court, the equal, or rather the superior of Parliament, to interpret it? One is forced to believe that a great deal that has lately been said and written has not been seriously intended, and that modern statesmen will not in a fit of natural impatience give up the old object for which their predecessors had long been working—viz. by the removal of inequalities, the remedying of grievances, and the firm administration of the law, at last to weld together all the inhabitants of these islands into *one* contented and united nation.

ARTHUR D. ELLIOT.

¹ See Professor Dicey's 'Law of the Constitution'

IV.

THE IMPENDING ENGLISH ANSWER.

THE Irish Question has long been put. What people are now waiting for is the English Answer; and that will presently have to be given. The problem, which is as grave as any that a free nation was ever called upon to solve, is at present in the condition which Mr. Browning describes in *The Ring and the Book*. We are listening to the 'world's outcry about the rush and ripple of the fact, fallen, stone-wise, plump on the smooth face of things,' the fact being the twofold phenomenon of Mr. Parnell's demand for Home Rule and Mr. Gladstone's admission that that demand must be met, and, within the limits of justice and expediency, conceded.

At present England is in the screaming and shouting stage. Her speech has not become articulate, and there is little evidence of any thinking at all. There is no sign that the Tory-Whig Coalition so much as desire to understand the issue. They do not wish to know what it is that Mr. Parnell asks or will accept. Whatever it is, it must be refused. A more rational temper will presently succeed this effervescence. When partisans have shouted themselves hoarse they will begin to listen and reflect. Just now the words 'Separatist,' 'Unionist,' 'Loyalist,' 'Traitor,' hurtle in the air. Partisans are engaged in the easy task of convicting each other of inconsistency—that inconsistency resolving itself into the fact, that at different stages of the problem the same politicians have used language not absolutely identical, and have suggested dissimilar arrangements.

The blockhead demand for an inflexible policy is a demand that in a moving world statesmen shall stand still, and that in the face of new facts emerging to-day they should take into account only the state of things as it existed the day before yesterday. Mr. Newdegate is the only inflexible politician of our time. His personal uprightness is universally acknowledged, but even in his own party he is not considered the type of political sagacity. When Burke was charged with not pursuing an inflexible policy, he replied that he varied his means in order to secure the essential unity of his end. That is a reply which Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury may make with equal truth. Both these statesmen are in advance of the parties of which they are the leaders. Lord Salisbury's Newport manifesto showed that he was prepared to consider fairly, if not hopefully, the suggestion put forward by the man

whom he recognised as the Irish chief, for a reconstruction of the union between England and Ireland on the model presented by the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Two members of his late Cabinet who were most directly responsible for Irish affairs—the Lord-Lieutenant and the Lord Chancellor of Ireland—were, it is an open secret, prepared to recommend a plan such as, they had reason to think, would satisfy Mr. Parnell, or, if it did not satisfy him, would satisfy the Irish people. The project was discussed in a Cabinet expressly summoned for the purpose. The weight of authority and argument was on one side; the weight of numbers was on the other. The men who were in direct touch with Irish affairs were outvoted by the men who viewed them from a distance, through the mists of passion and prejudice. There was reason to fear that the more numerous and less intelligent portion of the Conservative party was in accord with the more numerous and less intelligent section of the Cabinet. Lord Salisbury dared not face the secessions from the Ministry and the split in the party which would have followed on his resolution to carry out the something more than half-promise intimated in his Newport speech, fairly to weigh the practicability of modifying the terms of union between England and Ireland on the basis which has secured Austria and Hungary from dissension, civil war, and separation. The other side of the alternative was clear. If Ireland was not to be appeased, she must be coerced. If she was not to have a Parliament of her own, which would have superseded the National League, the National League must be suppressed by an Act of Parliament made for that special purpose. The necessity of this special legislation shows that the League, whatever the mischief may be which it effects, is not in itself an illegal association, and that its operations do not fall under the ban of the ordinary law.

Mr. Gladstone in forming his Government has had to contend with difficulties precisely similar to those which Lord Salisbury shrank from confronting. It was for some time doubtful whether he would be able to execute the commission entrusted to him by the Queen. He was threatened with formidable secessions, and, though they have not proved as numerous and as important as was at one time anticipated, they are serious. It is remarkable that those members of his third Administration who were at the head of the Irish executive, and who may therefore be supposed to have the most direct knowledge and the clearest appreciation of Irish facts, have associated themselves with Mr. Gladstone's enterprise. Lord Spencer, the latest Liberal Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, who was Chief Secretary when Mr. Gladstone retired, and Mr. Trevelyan, who preceded Mr. Campbell-Bannerman in that office, are members of the present Cabinet. They may not be pledged to any clearly defined solution of the problem which the present Government has come into existence to settle, but they are pledged to consider favourably,

and, if there be any hope of success, to attempt its solution on the principle laid down in Mr. Gladstone's Midlothian letter, and stated with more amplitude and precision in his speech on the Address. In both Cabinets, therefore, the authority of the Prime Minister and of the Ministers who were most directly responsible for the conduct of Irish affairs is in favour of essaying a certain measure of Home Rule.

Lord Cowper, who preceded Lord Spencer in the Lord-Lieutenancy, and Mr. Forster, who preceded Mr. Trevelyan in the Irish Secretaryship, are of a different way of thinking. But their knowledge of Ireland belongs to an earlier stage of its recent history; and events march fast. Lord Cowper is an estimable and amiable man; but as his position as Lord-Lieutenant, without a seat in the Cabinet, made him little more than the chief figure in a pageant, he scarcely counts as an element in the opinion of his party. Mr. Forster, whose declaration is very emphatic against any form of Home Rule, is, for reasons which it is to be hoped will presently disappear, debarred from the opportunity of reconsidering his view in the light of present circumstances. Lord Hartington's refusal to join Mr. Gladstone's Government is of course the most conspicuous advertisement of division in the party. But Lord Hartington is chronically in a state of misgiving. His doubts are as historical as Lord Eldon's. With a personal courage and uprightness which every one respects, and to which, aided by his social rank, he owes his well-earned position in the Liberal party, he is a timid and faltering politician. He shies at every new and strange object which he meets on the road, though a little encouragement and soothing usually abate his alarms. Brought close to the figure which terrified him, he sees it is harmless. Hitherto, saying he would ne'er consent, he has ultimately consented. An honourable reluctance to sever himself from the party with which his House has been connected during centuries, has no doubt induced him to silence scruples on matters which he did not feel to be vital. In other cases further consideration has convinced him that his originally adverse impressions were mistaken. The example which he has now given of fidelity to opinion is of more value in political life than his adhesion to Mr. Gladstone's Ministry would be. It is quite possible—we venture, judging from the past, to think even probable—that when the scheme of the Ministry is produced, Lord Hartington may recognise in it a just and safe settlement, and give it his valuable aid as an independent member. Lord Derby stands aloof; but that is Lord Derby's habit. His great qualities as a statesman, his calmness, equity, and largeness of knowledge, are often paralysed by an excess of caution, which leads him to shrink from responsibility, and renders great enterprises impossible to him. The hostility of three or four dukes, who are dukes first, Whigs secondly, and, with one exception statesmen not at all, counts for little. England is not a dukery.

Lord Hartington has been assured by carefully misinformed writers that in the attitude which he has now adopted he is in harmony with the traditions of his party, and that Mr. Gladstone, and those who are prepared to follow him, have rudely broken with those traditions. Lord Hartington is perfectly justified in not allowing his opinions to be held in any dead hand, and in enlarging and amending the wisdom of his ancestors; but, as a matter of fact, the traditions of his party, and those we believe of his family, would lead him to associate himself with Mr. Gladstone. Fox, Sheridan, and Plunket were vehement opponents of the Act of Union; and the Mr. Charles Grey of eighty-five years ago—afterwards the Earl Grey of the first Reform Bill—expressed opinions which were precisely the reverse of those which have given to Mr. Albert Grey a momentary prominence in Parliamentary discussion, to which his abilities and character might easily establish a better and more permanent title. Lord John Cavendish, to whom Lord Hartington bears a strong family likeness in character, was an opponent of the Act of Union. The Whig tradition of an earlier age and of bolder spirits was in this instance, as in so many others, in harmony with the Radical theory of our time. What is denounced as a new departure is really a return to old paths.

The consent of the ablest and most authoritative statesmen of both political parties, and the traditions of Liberal policy, are, then, alike in favour of the restoration to Ireland of a certain degree of legislative independence. If Lord Salisbury had considered his country first and his party afterwards, and himself last, he would have imitated the course which Sir Robert Peel took in 1845-46. If he had resigned on the ground that he felt himself pledged to give effect to the doctrine of his Newport speech, he might possibly have returned to power after a brief ministerial interregnum. He might have had the honour of settling the Irish question with the help of Mr. Gladstone and the Liberals, as Sir Robert Peel established Free Trade with the assistance of Lord John Russell and the Whigs. But, for the moment at least, he has let the opportunity pass of associating his name with a great historic pacification. He may possibly help Mr. Gladstone to do what he shrank from attempting himself: or, thwarting Mr. Gladstone, his own chance may recur. A settlement sooner or later is inevitable in the sense which Mr. Gladstone contemplates, and which Lord Salisbury contemplated until the revolt of his Cabinet suspended his project. The doubt is only as to the hour and the man.

Though the Irish question is first in the order of time, and gives urgency to the demand for legislation, it is a part, and only a small part, of a much greater question. To restore internal tranquillity to Ireland is an object for which great sacrifices might be made. But though important as an end in itself, it is still more important

as a means to another end, and that is the strengthening of the union between the two countries, and the obtaining of further guarantees for the authority of the Imperial Parliament in matters of Imperial concern, and for the supremacy of the Crown throughout the United Kingdom. This is the ultimate end to which Home Rule is a means.

The Act of Union has completely failed. After eighty-five years it has given us an Ireland more hostile to England than at any period of its history, and has created another Ireland across the Atlantic, which feeds animosity at home, and supplies it with means and instruments, and which in conceivable circumstances might give an unfriendly direction to the policy of the United States, and involve us in war. The supremacy of the Crown does not exist in Ireland, except as a constitutional fiction. The authority of the Imperial Parliament is set at nought; the National League is the executive and Parliament of the country. Let it be granted for argument's sake that it is necessary to put it down. Force, as Mr. Bright said in a wise sentence which has been foolishly ridiculed, is no remedy. It may, however, be the condition under which alone a remedy can be tried. The patient may need to be put under restraint before the proper treatment can be applied. But that treatment surely will not consist in a recurrence to the methods by which the malady has been engendered and fostered. If the Irish have not a lawful Parliament in Dublin, they will have a lawless one, as they have now. They have got Home Rule and local self-government already, but it is the Home Rule of the National League, and local self-government is exercised by its branches. Great alarm is expressed at the idea of giving Ireland control over her own police; but the real police is completely in her hands, and the official police is practically helpless. Nor is this all. In default of a Parliament in Dublin, the Irish have succeeded in establishing a Parliament in Westminster. The Imperial Parliament deals with little else than Irish business, and it deals with that unsatisfactorily. Scarcely anything else can be attended to. Imperial affairs are neglected because Ministers are absorbed in the eternal Irish difficulty. Self-rule in Ireland is the condition of self-rule in England and Scotland. Great Britain is practically governed, or deprived of its power of government, by Ireland. The votes of Irishmen in the constituencies determine the balance of party representation in the House of Commons. The Irish Parliamentary party decides the fate of Governments. Mr. Parnell is the dictator not only of Ireland, but of the United Kingdom—the maker and unmaker of Ministries, choosing between Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone for Downing Street, as he chose the other day between Mr. Lynch and Captain O'Shea for Galway.

There are only two ways in which this scandal, which would be ludicrous if it were not serious, can be abated and removed. One is by the abolition of Parliamentary representation in Ireland, a

measure which to be consistent should be accompanied by the disfranchisement of Irish voters in the constituencies of the United Kingdom; and by governing Ireland as a Crown Colony through that pure and beneficent institution, the Castle in Dublin. Talk of this kind is angry nonsense. It is the safety-valve of irritated tempers. The position of a Crown Colony suits very well a certain stage in the development of a distant dependency, which through scantiness of population and failure of other resources has not within itself the instruments of self-rule. The essential condition of its salutary character is, however, the acquiescence of the population. The penal reduction of a nation of several millions of people, with a long though unhappy Parliamentary history, to the rank of a Crown Colony, would mean rebellion, war, subjugation; and, in spite of all these things, the real government of the country by secret societies, by *Vehm-gerichte* and National Leagues. It is absurd, however, to discuss this suggestion seriously. The English people—though some among them may talk foolishly at times and be the more applauded—has made up its mind as to the true principles of government. When these principles seem to fail in their operation, it is more natural to believe that they have been improperly applied than that they are in themselves faulty.

I repeat that the main object of granting Home Rule to Ireland is to strengthen the union between that country and Great Britain, to give force on Imperial matters to the authority of the Imperial Parliament, to supply further guarantees for the supremacy of the Crown. To these things may be added the restoration of self-government to Great Britain, now deprived of it by the control exercised by Irish members over British legislation and administration. Home Rule, it must be remembered, does not mean repeal of the Union or the restoration of Grattan's Parliament. Mr. Butt invented the phrase to distinguish the purpose and scope of his agitation from that of O'Connell. Grattan's Parliament, which it was O'Connell's aim to restore, made Ireland in theory as independent of England as Hanover was. The title to the throne was in the same family and person, and that was all. Ireland under this system might have remained at war while England was at peace; and might indeed, except for the absurdity of the common sovereign going to war, as King of England, with himself, as King of Ireland, have engaged in hostilities with this country. During the insanity of George the Third there was a theoretical possibility of the golden link of the Crown being snapped by the election of different persons to the regency in the two countries. The Irish Parliament was, in fact, ready to grant to the Prince of Wales, as Regent, powers greatly in excess of those which the English Parliament was prepared to concede to him. The system was unmanageable, and Mr. Pitt was wise in bringing it to a close, and establishing a Parliamentary union. But, as the whole history of

Ireland in the nineteenth century suggests, it would have been better if it had been practicable to retain the Irish Parliament, while limiting its functions strictly to Irish affairs, and reserving the common concerns of the United Kingdom to the Parliament at Westminster. Mr. Pitt is not to be blamed for not trying this experiment. The precedent of Scotland was against it, and though the union with that kingdom was not a very brilliant success until after the Reform Act of 1832, he naturally followed the example which it gave. He cannot be blamed for not foreseeing the eighty-five years of calamity and discord on which we look back.

Mr. Parnell has suggested a revision of the Act of Union which shall place England and Ireland in the same relation to each other as that which subsists between Austria and Hungary, and Lord Salisbury, reserving the question of practicability, has confessed himself to be rather taken with the idea. Austria and Hungary are perfectly independent of each other in all matters except those which relate to the common external affairs of the empire. They have their separate Parliaments and Ministries; the Parliament of the Austro-Hungarian Empire consisting of Delegations from the two national Parliaments, with a Ministry which deals with foreign affairs, the army and navy, and the finance of diplomacy and war. An arrangement such as this is possible under the conditions of geography, history, and population which Austria and Hungary present. Their connection, however, though neither term correctly describes it, is rather alliance or federation than union. Great Britain and Ireland must remain a United Kingdom; the object of granting Home Rule is to make the union more real and cordial by disembarassing it of irritating details, and leaving greater freedom of movement and action among its constituent parts. In the case of our colonies, the extension of local liberties has saved the Empire. But Imperial concerns are not simply external concerns. Certain principles lie at the basis of our constitutional system, and local Parliaments, while allowed discretion in the application of those principles, could not be permitted to set them aside. Illustrations of the restraint necessary may be found in the constitution of the United States. It guarantees freedom of trade between all the States of the Union, and any law imposing export or import duties upon articles passing from one State to another is invalid. Laws violating the obligation of contracts are equally void or voidable. Both of these conditions might fairly form new articles in a revised Act of Union. Provisions securing the equality before the law of all religious confessions, and of persons of no religious confession, would be essential. A power of veto, to be exercised by the Crown under the advice of the Imperial Ministers, would, as a general rule, sufficiently check Parliamentary encroachments on the Act of Union, without having recourse to the supreme judicial tribunal, which would naturally be the Privy Council. No doubt

there would be conflicts and hitches. A measure might be vetoed and re-enacted, and once more vetoed and re-enacted, and vetoed again; and then there would be acquiescence or compromise. Human affairs are carried on in this give-and-take, rough-and-tumble fashion, and in no other. It may be said that Irish members have not shown in the English Parliament a capacity for the working of Parliamentary institutions. They have not been sent to Westminster to help in working our Parliamentary system. They have been sent there to hinder and obstruct it; and in doing so they have shown a remarkable capacity of debate and an understanding of Parliamentary rules and forms—using them, it is true, as abusing them. Their mandate is to obstruct; and they have obeyed their mandate. In Dublin Irish opinion would require productive work from them. Things cannot be worse than they are, and they may be a good deal better. Even if Irish business were not better done in Dublin than in Westminster, English, Scotch, and Imperial business would have some chance of being satisfactorily performed, or at any rate of being done in some fashion or other. A separate Parliament for the internal affairs of Great Britain meeting in Westminster, or two separate Parliaments—one for Scotland meeting at Edinburgh, one for England meeting at Westminster—with an Imperial Parliament, either elected by specially constructed constituencies or chosen by delegation from the national Parliaments, would be the natural completion of the system. The Imperial Parliament need not consist of more than three hundred members. It would be composed mainly of men of proved capacity for statesmanship, trained in the national Parliaments.

The precedents of the great Parliamentary nations of the contemporary world, with the exception of France and Italy, favour the redistribution of legislative work between Imperial and Local Parliaments. The examples of the German Empire, of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, of the Austrian Empire proper, with its Imperial Parliament and its Provincial Diets, the Austrian Duchies, Bohemia, Moravia, the Tyrol, &c., and of the United States, marshal us the way that we should go. France and Italy are negative instances to the same purport. The undue suppression of provincial liberties is the great political calamity of the two great Latin nations. The attempt to legislate for the United Kingdom, and to conduct its business in a single central Parliament, has broken down. Even if there were no disaffection in Ireland, the institution of local Legislatures for local work would be desirable. Only by this division of labour can the work be satisfactorily done. The institution of Grand Committees, the extension of the powers of Municipalities, the establishment of County Boards, would not sufficiently relieve the pressure of Parliamentary work. The proposal of the late Ministry to establish a system of local self-government, as nearly as possible identical in

the three kingdoms, may be good in itself, but it would not meet the necessities of the case. While Ireland remains disaffected, it would enable her to use these local bodies and boards as a part of the organisation of offence and hindrance. The quarrel with England being abated by the establishment of an Irish Parliament for purely Irish business in Dublin, it is probable that healthy divisions of class feeling, and the play of dissimilar interests and ideas, would find expression, diversifying the monotony of the national life. The war of the cottage against the hall which marked the French Revolution may be clearly traced to the policy of Louis the Fourteenth and Louis the Fifteenth in withdrawing the French nobility from their estates to the *salons* and ante-chambers of Versailles. The Act of Union, which has brought Irish peers and squires to London, and swollen, if it did not create, the class of absentees, has had a good deal to do with the peasants' war against the landlords which has marked the recent history of the country. If a local Parliament had kept them in their country, matters might have gone on better. If it should restore them in any degree to it, there may be some chance of improvement. But probably, for good or evil, matters have gone too far; in Ireland as in France the owner of the land is likely to become its cultivator, or rather the cultivator is likely to become its owner. This solution is perhaps in the main the best, though the partial qualification of a predominant agrarian system by a different element would have its economic and still more its social advantages. But whatever the process adopted, the redistribution of functions between a central legislature and local chambers is a necessity of efficient Parliamentary government in a great and varied State such as the United Kingdom. Mr. Parnell's agitation and the Irish revolt are the immediate challenge to reform; but they are not the sole or even the main reason for it.

FRANK H. HILL.

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY.

No. CXI.—MAY 1886.

THE NADIR OF LIBERALISM.

'DEMAS hath forsaken me'—so the deserted and dejected Muse of Literature may say—'Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and hath betaken himself to this or that constituency.' It is now more than fifteen years since I exhorted my young literary and intellectual friends, the lights of Liberalism, not to be rushing into the arena of politics themselves, but rather to work inwardly upon the predominant force in our politics—the great middle class—and to cure its spirit. From their Parliamentary mind, I said, there is little hope; it is in getting at their real mind, and making it work honestly, that all our hope lies. For from the boundedness and backwardness of their spirit, I urged, came the inadequacy of our politics; and by no Parliamentary action, but by an inward working only, could this spirit and our politics be made better. My exhortations were as fruitless as good advice usually is. The great Parliamentary machine has gone creaking and grinding on, grinding to much the same result as formerly. But instead of keeping aloof, and trying to set up an inward working on the middle-class spirit, more and more of one's promising young friends of former days have been tempted to put their hands to the machine; and there one sees them now, helping to grind—all of them zealous, all of them intelligent, some of them brilliant and leading.

What has been ground, what has been produced with their help? Really very much the same sort of thing which was produced without it. Certainly our situation has not improved, has not become more solid and prosperous, since I addressed to my friends, fifteen years ago, that well-meant but unavailing advice to work inwardly on the

great Philistine middle class, the master-force in our politics, and to curé its spirit. At that time I had recently been abroad, and the criticism which I heard abroad on England's politics and prospects was what I took for my text in the first political essay with which I ventured to approach my friends and the public. The middle class and its Parliament were then in their glory. Liberal newspapers heaped praise on the middle-class mind, 'which penetrates through sophisms, ignores commonplaces, and gives to conventional illusions their true value;' ministers of State heaped praise on 'the great, the heroic work' performed by the middle-class Parliament. But the foreigners made light of our middle-class mind, and, instead of finding our political performance admirable and successful, declared that it seemed to them, on the other hand, that the era for which we had possessed the secret was over, and that a new era, for which we had not the secret, was beginning. Just now I have again been abroad, and under present circumstances I found that the estimate of England's action and success under a Liberal Government had, not unnaturally, sunk lower still. The hesitancy, imbecility, and failure of England's action abroad, it was said, have become such as to delight all her enemies, and to throw all her friends into consternation. England's foreign policy, said some clever man, reminds me of nothing so much as of Retz's character of the Duke of Orleans, brother to Louis the Thirteenth: 'There was a wide distance, with him, between wishing and willing, between willing and resolving, between resolving and the choice of means, between the choice of means and the putting them in execution. But what was most wonderful of all, it frequently happened that *he came to a sudden stop even in the midst of the putting into execution.*' There, said the speaker, is a perfect prophecy of England in Egypt! At home we had Ireland; to name Ireland is enough. We had the obstructed and paralysed House of Commons. Then, finally, came the news one morning of the London street-mobs and street-riots, heightening yet further the impression of our impotence and disarray. The recent trial and acquittal of the mob-orators will probably complete it.

With very many of those who thus spoke, with all the best and most important of them at any rate, malicious pleasure in our misfortunes, and gratified envy, were not the uppermost feelings; indeed, they were not their feelings at all. Do not think, they earnestly said, that we rejoice at the confusion and disablement of England; there may be some, no doubt, who do; perhaps there are many. We do not. England has been to us a cynosure, a tower, a pride, a consolation; we rejoiced in her strength; we rested much of our hope for the Continent upon her weight and influence there. The decline of her weight and influence we feel as a personal loss and sorrow. That they have declined, have well-nigh disappeared, no one who uses his eyes can doubt. And now, in addition, what are we to

think of the posture of your affairs at home? What is it all coming to? It seems as if you were more and more getting among the breakers, drifting towards the shoals and the rocks. Can it really be so? and is the great and noble ship going to break to pieces?

No, I answered; it is not going to break to pieces. There are sources, I trust, of deliverance and safety which you do not perceive. I agree with you, however, that our foreign policy has been that of people who fumble because they cannot make up their mind, and who cannot make up their mind because they do not know what to be after. I have said so, and I have said why it is and must be so: because this policy reflects the dispositions of middle-class Liberalism, with its likes and dislikes, its effusion and confusion, its hot and cold fits, its want of dignity and of the steadfastness which comes from dignity, its want of ideas and of the steadfastness which comes from ideas. I agree, too, that the House of Commons is a scandal, and Ireland a crying danger. I agree that monster processions and monster meetings in the public streets and parks are the letting out of anarchy, and that our weak dealing with them is deplorable. I myself think all this, and have often, too often, said it. But the mass of our Liberals of the middle and lower classes do not see it at all. Their range of vision and of knowledge is too bounded. They are hardly even conscious that the House of Commons is a scandal or that Ireland is a crying danger. If it suited their favourite minister to tell them that neither the one nor the other allegation is true, they would believe him. As to foreign policy, of course it does suit him to tell them that the allegation that England has lost weight and influence is not true. And when the minister, or when one of his ardent young officials on their promotion, more dauntless than the minister himself, boldly assures them that England has not at all lost weight and influence abroad, and that our foreign policy has been sagacious, consistent, and successful, they joyfully believe him. Or when one of their minister's colleagues assures them that the late disturbances were of no importance, a mere accident which will never happen again, and that monster processions and monster meetings in the public streets and parks are proper and necessary things, which neither can be prohibited nor ought to be prohibited, they joyfully believe him. And with us in England, although not in the great world outside of England, those who thus think or say that all is well are the majority. They may say it, replied the speaker already mentioned, who has a turn for quotation; they may say it. But the answer for them is the answer made by Sainte-Beuve to M. Rouher asserting that all was well with the Second Empire in its closing years: 'He may say so if he pleases, but he deceives himself, and he thinks contrary to the general opinion.'

Yet surely there must be something to give ground to our prevalent notion of Mr. Gladstone as a great and successful minister. Not only the rank and file, the unthinking multitude, of the Liberal

party, have it and proclaim it, but the leaders, the intelligent and educated men, embrace it just as confidently. Lord Ripon speaks of 'the policy we might expect from the glorious antecedents of Mr. Gladstone.' Professor Thorold Rogers calls him 'that veteran statesman with fifty years of victory behind him.' Mr. Reginald Brett says that any scheme for Ireland which he produces will be 'a scheme based on his unrivalled experience of the art of government.' Mr. John Morley says that 'in his great abilities and human sympathy will be found the only means capable of solving the great Irish question.' Sir Horace Davey 'will not hesitate to say that he has confidence in Mr. Gladstone, and that he believes the country also has confidence in Mr. Gladstone. The Liberals of England would not soon withdraw their confidence from that illustrious statesman, who had so often led them to victory.' Surely there must be some foundation or other for this chorus of eulogy and confidence. Surely there must have been great success of some kind, surely there must have been victory.

Most certainly there has been victory. But has there been success? The two things are often confounded together, and in the popular estimate of Mr. Gladstone we have a signal instance of the confusion. He has been victorious, true; he has conquered, he has carried his measures. But he has not been successful. For what is success for a statesman; is it merely carrying his measures? The vulgar may think so, but a moment's reflection will tell us that the vulgar are wrong; that success for a statesman is succeeding in what his measures are designed to do.

This is the test of a statesman's success, and the great and successful statesmen are those whose work will bear trying by it. Cavour and Prince Bismarck are statesmen of our own time who are really great, because their work did what it was meant to do. Cavour's design was to make a united Italy, Prince Bismarck's to make a strong Germany; and they made it. No minor success, no success of vanity, no success of which the issue is still problematical and which requires other successes for its accomplishment, will suffice to assure this title of *successful* to a statesman. To some people Prince Bismarck seems great because he can snub all the world, and has even been enabled, by an incredible good fortune, to snub the proudest of countries and the one country against which, above all others, he was powerless—England. These successes of vanity are nothing. Neither is he to be called a successful statesman because he carried the May laws, for it is as yet uncertain whether the end which those laws were designed to attain they will accomplish. But let us see, then, what it is which does indeed make Prince Bismarck a great and successful statesman, a statesman whose 'antecedents,' to take Lord Ripon's phrase, are indeed 'glorious.' He is successful because, finding his country with certain dangers and certain needs, he has

laboured for forty years, at first as a subordinate, but for the far greater part of the time as principal, to remove the one and to satisfy the other.

Germany had needs, she found impediments or she found perils to her national life, on the side of Denmark, Austria, Russia, France. First her needs on the side of Denmark were satisfied, in spite of the opposition of France and England. Graver difficulties had to be faced next. A strong Germany was impossible without a strong Prussia. But Prussia seemed to be one of the Great Powers only in name; Austria, thwarting and supercilious, checked her movements at every turn, frustrated all efforts to consolidate Germany. Except by Prussia's beating Austria, the consolidation of Germany could not go forward; but a war with Austria—what a difficult war was that for a Prussian minister to make! Prince Bismarck made it, and the victory of Sadowa gave Prussia free action in Germany. But except free action in Germany, Prince Bismarck demanded nothing from Austria; no territory, no indemnity—not a village, not a shilling.

Russia had saved Austria from the Hungarians, why did she not save her from the Prussians? Because the Prussian Government, foreseeing the future, foreseeing the inevitable struggle with Austria, had refused to take part with the Western Powers in the Crimean War—a foolish and prejudicial war for England, but which would have been still more foolish and prejudicial for Prussia. Austria had in a half-hearted way taken part with the Western Powers; Russia's neutrality in Austria's war with Prussia was Prussia's reward for the past and Austria's punishment.

Meanwhile at Prussia's success France looked on, palpitating with anger and jealousy. A strong Germany was a defiance to all French traditions, and the inevitable collision soon came. France was defeated, and the provinces required to give military security to Germany were taken from her. Why had not Austria now sought to wreak her revenge on Prussia by siding with France? She had Russia to still reckon with in attempting to do so. But what was of yet more avail to stay her hand was that Prince Bismarck, as has been already mentioned, had with admirable wisdom entirely forborne to amerce and humiliate her after Sadowa, and had thus made it possible for the feelings of German Austria to tend to his side.

For the last fifteen years he has constantly developed and increased friendly relations with Austria and Russia. As regards France, whose friendship was impossible, he has kept Germany watchful and strong. Those legitimate needs and that security of Germany, which thirty years ago seemed unattainable for her, he has attained. Germany, which thirty years ago was hampered, weak, and in low esteem, is now esteemed, strong, and with her powers all at command. It was a great object, and the great *Reichslanzler* has attained it. Such are Prince Bismarck's victories.

I observe that Mr. John Morley, like many people in this country, speaks of the work of Prince Bismarck as something extremely precarious, and likely to crumble away and vanish as soon as the Emperor William dies. 'When the disappearance of Kaiser Wilhelm dissolves the fabric of the Triple Alliance, new light will be thrown on the stability of governments which are anti-democratic.' In my opinion, Mr. Morley deceives himself. Advanced Liberals are always apt to think that a condition of things where the people cannot hold whatever meetings and processions they like, and wherever they like, is an unnatural condition and likely to dissolve. But I see no signs which show that Prince Bismarck and his policy will disappear with the Emperor William. The Crown Prince is too judicious a man to desire it; even if he desired it, I doubt whether he could bring it about. The state of Germany is, unless I am much mistaken, more solid than our own. Prince Bismarck commits errors, the German character has faults, German life has deficiencies; but the situation there is a great deal more solid, and Prince Bismarck far more fixed in the national affections, than our Radicals suppose.

But now let us come to the victories of Mr. Gladstone. Are they not victories only, but successes? that is, have they really satisfied vital needs and removed vital dangers of the nation? Sir Robert Peel's abolition of the Corn Laws may be said to have removed a risk of social revolt. But the general development of Free Trade cannot absolutely, as we are all coming to see, be said to have satisfied vital needs and removed vital dangers of the nation; free trade is not, it is now evident, a machinery making us by its own sole operation prosperous and safe; it requires, in order to do this, many things to supplement it, many conditions to accompany it. The general development of free trade we cannot, therefore, reckon to Mr. Gladstone as a success of the sort which stamps a statesman as gloriously successful. The case was one not admitting of a success of the kind. On foreign affairs I shall not touch; his best friends will not allege his successes there. But at home for a success of the kind wanted, a true and splendid success, Mr. Gladstone has had three great opportunities. He had them in dealing with the Irish Church, with the Irish land question, with obstruction in Parliament. In each case he won a victory. But did he achieve not only a victory, but that which is the only real and true success for a statesman? did he, by his victory, satisfy vital needs and remove vital dangers of his country? Did he in the case of the Irish Church? The object there for a statesman was to conciliate the Catholic sentiment of Ireland; did his measure do this? The Liberal party affirmed that it did, the Liberal newspapers proclaimed it 'a great and genial policy of conciliation,' and one of Mr. Gladstone's colleagues told us that the Ministry had 'resolved to knit the hearts of the empire into one harmonious concord, and knitted they were accordingly.' True, there were voices

(mine was one of them) which said differently. 'It is fatal to the English nation,' I wrote in *Culture and Anarchy*, 'to be told by its flatterers, and to believe, that it is abolishing the Irish Church through reason and justice when it is really abolishing it through the Nonconformists' antipathy to establishments; fatal to expect the fruits of reason and justice from anything but the spirit of reason and justice.' This was unpopular language from an insignificant person, and was not listened to. But who doubts now that the Catholic sentiment of Ireland was not in the very least conciliated by the measure of 1868, and that the reason why it was not and could not be conciliated by it was that the measure was of the nature above described?

The Irish Land Act, in like manner, was a victory but not a success. It was carried, it was applauded; the Liberal party duly extolled it as 'a scheme based on Mr. Gladstone's unrivalled experience in the art of government.' But did it satisfy vital needs and remove vital dangers? Evidently not; the legislation now proposed for Ireland is impregnable proof of it. Did the victory, again, achieved in the reform of procedure, achieved by Mr. Gladstone wielding a great majority and spending the time of Parliament without any stunt, did this victory succeed? Did it satisfy the nation's needs and remove the nation's dangers as regards obstruction in the House of Commons? Why, the Conservatives have had to devise a fresh scheme, and the Liberal Government has had to adopt it from them and is at this moment working in concert with them to mature it!

Well then, 'our veteran statesman with his fifty years of victory behind him,' with his 'glorious antecedents,' with his 'unrivalled experience in the art of government,' turns out, in the three crucial instances by which we can test him, not to have succeeded as a statesman at all, but on the contrary to have failed. 'Let me try again,' he is now saying. And Mr. Morley assures us that in 'Mr. Gladstone's great abilities and human sympathy will be found the only means capable of solving the great Irish problem.' The mass of Liberal voices chime eagerly in with Mr. Morley. I do not deny the great abilities and the human sympathy; I admit them to the fullest extent. I do not even say that Mr. Gladstone is to be blamed for not having succeeded. But succeeded, in the true sense of the word, he has not; his work as a statesman has hitherto failed to satisfy the country's vital needs, to remove the country's vital dangers. When, therefore, he proposes, in a most critical condition of things, to fall to work again on a bigger scale than ever, we may well feel anxious. We may well ask ourselves what are the causes which have kept him back from a statesman's true success hitherto, and whether they will not also keep him back from it in what he purposes to do now.

The reason why Mr. Gladstone has not succeeded hitherto in the

real and high work of a statesman is that he is in truth not a statesman; properly so called, at all, but an unrivalled parliamentary leader and manager. A little development is needed to bring out clearly what I mean.

Mr. Gladstone is the minister of a party and a period of expansion, the minister of the Liberals—the Liberals whose work it should be to bring about the modern development of English society. He has many requisites for that leadership. Everybody will admit that in effectiveness as a public speaker and debater he cannot be surpassed, can hardly be equalled. Philosophers may prefer coolness and brevity to his heat and copiousness; but the many are not philosophers, and his heat and copiousness are just what is needed for popular assemblies. His heat and copiousness, moreover, are joined with powers and accomplishments, with qualities of mind and character, as admirable as they are rare. The absence in him of aristocratical exclusiveness is one of the causes of his popularity. But not only is he free from *morgue*, he has also that rarest and crowning charm in a man who has triumphed as he has, been praised as he has: he is genuinely modest. Every one should read in proof of this a beautiful and touching letter from him in Hope Scott's *Life*, a letter so deeply modest, and yet breathing, at the same time, the very spirit of sincerity. If one could be astonished at anything in political partisans, I should be astonished at the insensibility of his opponents to the charm of Mr. Gladstone. I think him an unsuccessful, a dangerous minister; but he is a captivating, a fascinating personality.

Why then, with all these gifts and graces, does he fail as a statesman? Probably because, having to be the minister of the modern development of English society, he was born in 1809. The minister of a period of concentration, resistance, and war, may be spiritually rooted in the past; not so the minister of a work of civil development in a modern age. I once ventured to say to Lord Salisbury, before he became the leading personage he is now, that he interested me because, though a Conservative, he was reared in a post-Philistine epoch and influenced by it. I meant that his training had fallen on a time when a man of his powers and cultivation must needs get a sense of how the world is really going, a sense which the old time of routine and fictions was without. Lord Salisbury is a Conservative leader; his business is to procure stability and prominence for that which already exists, much of it undeniably precious. He may have a sense in his own inner mind of what is mere survival of routine and fiction from the past and of how the modern world is really going, but that knowledge has not to be the grand spring and motor of his public action. A Liberal leader here in England is, on the other hand, a man of movement and change, called expressly to the task of bringing about a modern organisation

of society. To do this, he should see clearly how the world is going, what our modern tendencies and needs really are, and what is routine and fiction in that which we have inherited from the past. But of how few men of Mr. Gladstone's age can it be said that they see this! Certainly not of Mr. Gladstone. Some of whom it cannot be said may be more interesting figures than those of whom it can; Cardinal Newman is a more interesting figure, Mr. Gladstone himself is a more interesting figure, than John Stuart Mill. But a Liberal leader of whom it cannot be said that he sees how the world is really going is in a false situation. And Mr. Gladstone's perception and criticism of modern tendencies is fantastic and unsound, as his criticism of Homer is fantastic and unsound, or his criticism of Genesis. But he loves liberty, expansion; with his wonderful gifts for parliamentary and public life he has naturally an irresistible bent to political leadership; he will lead the Liberal party. And he will lead it, he will lead this great party of movement and change, by watching their mind, adapting his programme to it, and relying on their support and his own inexhaustible resources of energy, eloquence, and management, to give him the victory.

But the task of providing light and leading is thus shifted upon men yet more incompetent for it than Mr. Gladstone. It is thrown upon the middle class in English society, the class where lay the strength of the Liberal party until the other day, and upon the working class, which conjointly with the middle class makes its strength now. Both are singularly bounded, our working class reproducing, in a way unusual in other countries, the boundedness of the middle. Both have invaluable qualities, closely allied, as generally happens, with their defects. The sense for conduct in our middle class is worth far more than the superior intellectual lucidity to be found in divorce from that sense among middle classes elsewhere; the English workman, as a great Swiss employer of labour testified to me the other day, is still the best in the world; the English peasant is patient, faithful, respectful, kindly, as no other. But range of mind, large and clear views, insight—we must not go to our middle and lower class for these. Yet it is on our middle and lower class that the task is really thrown, Mr. Gladstone's gifts and deficiencies being what they are, of determining the programme of Liberal movement for our community, and indeed of determining the programme of our foreign policy also; while Mr. Gladstone finds the management and talents for insuring victory to the programmes so determined. Thus it is that our foreign policy has been what we have seen it; thus it came about that the Irish Church was abolished by the power of the Dissenters' antipathy to Church Establishments. And so we find that precisely the reverse happens of what Mr. Frederic Harrison bids us expect; the minister, says he, initiates, the untrained elector simply finds a good minister. 'Now very plain

men know how to find the set of ministers who wish them well and will bring them good.' But we see that in fact our Liberal electorate has the task thrown upon it not only of choosing a good minister, but also of determining what the good shall be which this minister is to bring us.

Such, then, is our situation. A captivating Liberal leader, generous and earnest, full of eloquence, ingenuity, and resource, and a consummate parliamentary manager—but without insight, and who as a statesman has hitherto not succeeded, but failed. A Liberal party, of which the strength and substance is furnished by two great classes, with sterling merits and of good intentions, but bounded and backward. A third factor in our situation must not be unnoticed—an element of Jacobinism. It is small, but it is active and visible. It is a sinister apparition. We know its works from having seen them so abundantly in France; it has the temper of hatred and the aim of destruction. There are two varieties of Jacobin, the hysterical Jacobin and the pedantic Jacobin; we possess both, and both are dangerous.

At such a moment Ireland sends eighty-five Home Rulers to the House of Commons; and the Irish question, which had previously given to Mr. Gladstone so much occasion for showing how he can conquer without succeeding, must be dealt with seriously at last. What grand scope is here offered for the talents of the great Parliamentary manager! The thing is, to have the eighty-five Home Rulers voting solid with the Liberal party. How is it to be effected? The generous and ardent feelings of Mr. Gladstone rush to his aid. Ireland has been abominably governed! True. Ireland desires autonomy more hotly than any other part of these islands desires it! Very naturally. Why then should we not give to the Irish what they so hotly desire? Why not indeed? responds the Liberal party. Only there must be no endowment of religion, no endowment, above all, of Popish superstition! There shall be none, says Mr. Gladstone. In that case, replies his Liberal following, go on and prosper! Let the Irish have what the majority of them like. It is the great blessedness for man to do as he likes; if men very much wish for a thing, we ought to give it them if possible. This is the cardinal principle of Liberalism; Mr. Fox proclaimed it.

Yes, Mr. Fox proclaimed it—the brilliant and generous school-boy! But what would Burke have said to it? Nay, even a sagacious woman, who had closely watched a time of civil trouble, knew better. '*Quand les hommes se révoltent, ils sont poussés par des causes qu'ils ignorent; et, pour l'ordinaire, ce qu'ils demandent n'est pas ce qu'il faut pour les apaiser.*' Men are driven to revolt by causes not clearly known to them; and in general the thing they call for is not the thing requisite to content them. The observation is profoundly just and true.

The project of giving a separate Parliament to Ireland has every fault which a project of State can have. It takes one's breath away to find an English statesman propounding it. With islands so closely and inextricably connected together by nature as these islands of ours, to go back in the at least formal political connection attained, to make the political tie not closer but much laxer, almost to undo it—what statesmanship! And when, estranged from us in feeling as Celtic Ireland unhappily is, we had yet in Ulster a bit of Great Britain, we had a friend there, you propose to merge Ulster in Celtic Ireland! you propose to efface and expunge your friend! Was there ever such madness heard of?

Those Irishmen, who may happen to know anything about so unimportant a person as I am, will know that I am no enemy of Ireland. They will therefore, I hope, have patience with me while I tell them the truth. The more intensely the Irish desire a separate Parliament, the more it proves that they ought not to have one. If they cry out for a separate Irish Parliament when Scotland and Wales do not cry out for a Scotch or Welsh Parliament, that is not a reason for giving such a Parliament to Ireland rather than to Scotland or Wales, but just the contrary. The Irish desire it so much because they are so exasperated against us. The exasperation is good neither for us nor for themselves. The thing is to do away with the sense of exasperation by removing its causes, to make them friends. The causes of the exasperation are not in our political tie with them, but in our behaviour and treatment. Amend the behaviour and treatment by all means. But simply to cut the Irish adrift in their present state of feeling, to send them away with the sense of exasperation rankling, with the memory of our behaviour and treatment fresh in their minds, what is it but to leave the sense of exasperation to last for ever, and to give them more full and free scope for indulging it? No gratitude for a measure which its supporters are already recommending by the ignoblest appeals to our fears will prevent this. To our fears the measure will be imputed; and to our fears or our foolishness, and to no more worthy or winning motive, will it indeed be due. Every guarantee we take, every limit we impose, will be an occasion for fret and friction. The temptation to the Irish legislature *ampliare jurisdictionem*, to extend and enlarge its range of action, will be irresistible; the very brilliancy and verve of Irishmen necessitate it. The proper public field for an Irishman of signal ability is the Imperial Parliament. There his faculties will find their right and healthful scope; he is good for us there, and we for him. But he will find scope for his faculties in an Irish Parliament only by making it what it was not meant to be, and what it cannot be without danger. It will be a sensation Parliament—a Parliament of shocks and surprises.

Ask those 'thoughtful Americans' who in conjunction with his

own terrors are the mighty persuaders of Mr. Whitbread's mind, ask them what they would think of a proposal to make the South one homogeneous political body distinct from the North, and with a separate Congress in Richmond. They will laugh. The South, they will say, is certainly much inferior in strength and population to the North. But such a Congress would inevitably come to regard itself as a rival to the Congress at Washington, the Southern States which are in sympathy with the North would be swamped by those which are not; it would be a perpetual stimulus to secession. And then let Mr. Whitbread, if his tremors have left him any voice, ask his 'thoughtful Americans' what it is which they are so thoughtfully and kindly exhorting him to do in Ireland!

This brings me to the challenge constantly thrown out to those who condemn Mr. Gladstone's plan of an Irish Parliament, to produce an alternative policy of their own. Why, really such a policy, in its main lines, which are all the state of the case at present requires, produces itself! Let us give to our South, not a single central Congress, but provincial legislatures. Local government is the great need for us just now throughout these islands; the House of Commons is far too large a body, and is weighted with much work which it ought not to have. But in Great Britain we have this difficulty: the counties would give us local legislatures too numerous, and not strong enough; and we have no provinces. The difficulty may be overcome, but a difficulty it is. But in Ireland it does not present itself; Ireland has four provinces. Ireland's strong desire for local government is no good reason for giving Ireland an Irish Parliament; but it is a good reason for seizing as promptly as possible any fit means for organising local government there, and for so organising it even before we organise it in Great Britain; and such means the Irish provinces supply. Munster and Connaught may probably be considered as of one character, and some of western Ulster, as being of the same character, might go naturally with them. But we have at least three divisions in Ireland, each of them with a distinct stamp and character of its own, and affording, each of them, materials for a separate provincial assembly: Ulster proper, or British Ireland; Leinster, or metropolitan Ireland; Munster and Connaught, or Celtic Ireland. Evidently the assembly representing British Ireland would be one thing, the assembly representing Celtic Ireland quite another. Perhaps Leinster, the old seat of the capital and of metropolitan life, would give us an assembly different in character from either. So much the better. Each real and distinct part of Ireland would have its own legislature, and would govern its own local affairs; each part would be independent of the others, neither of them would be swamped by the others. The common centre would be the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. There the foremost Irish-

men would represent Ireland, while for the notables of each province the provincial legislatures would afford a field.

It is deemed enough to say, in condemnation of any scheme of this kind, that it is not what the majority of the Irish are demanding, and that the eighty-five members who follow Mr. Parnell would not accept it. But carry it, and what would happen? Would not Ulster accept it? It is just what Ulster desires, while a general Irish Parliament is just what Ulster fears. Would Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, metropolitan and Celtic Ireland, refuse to accept? How would they carry their refusal into effect? They could only do so by the majority abstaining from the election of members for the provincial legislatures. But this would leave those assemblies to be elected by the minority, who would assuredly elect them gladly enough, but how would that suit the majority? No, the Home Rulers may say that nothing less than an Irish Parliament will they accept, and no wonder that, with Mr. Gladstone's offer before them, they should say so; but once carry a plan for establishing provincial legislatures, and they will come into it before long.

And indeed one cannot but at first feel astonishment that Mr. Gladstone should have preferred to such a plan his plan for an Irish Parliament. Last year I was often and often inclined to say as to Egypt: With one tenth of the ingenuity and pains which Mr. Gladstone spends to prove, what neither he nor any one else ever *can* prove, that his Egyptian policy has been sagacious, consistent, and successful, he might have produced an Egyptian policy sagacious, consistent, and successful. So one may say now as to Ireland: With one tenth of the ingenuity and pains which Mr. Gladstone is expending upon a bad and dangerous measure for Ireland, he might have produced a good and safe one. But alas, he is above all a great Parliamentary manager! Probably he is of the same opinion with Cardinal de Retz, who has been already mentioned; he thinks 'that it takes higher qualities to make a good party-leader than to make a good emperor of the universe.' The eighty-five Parnellite members added to the Liberal majority, and enabling him, as he hopes, to defy opposition and to carry his measure victoriously, are irresistible to him. To the difficult work of a statesman he prefers the work for which he has such a matchless talent—the seemingly facile but really dangerous strokes of the Parliamentary tactician and party manager.

Not that he himself foresees danger from it. No, that is the grave thing. He does not foresee danger. Statesmen foresee, Mr. Gladstone does not. He no more foresees danger from his Irish Parliament than he foresaw that his abolition of the Irish Church would not conciliate Catholic sentiment in Ireland, or that his Land Act would not conciliate the Irish peasant. He has no foresight because he has no insight. With all his admirable gifts he has little

more real insight than the rank and file of his Liberal majority, people who think that if men very much want a thing they ought to have it, and that Mr. Fox's dictum makes this certain. It is this confiding majority under this unforeseeing leader which makes me tremble. Will anything ever awaken either the leader or the followers to a sense of danger? When the vessel of State is actually grinding on the rocks, will Mr. Gladstone be still cheerfully devising fresh strokes of management; and, when not engaged in applauding him, will Mr. Illingworth be still prattling about disestablishment and Mr. Stansfeld about contagious disease?

I have long been urging 'that the performance of our Liberals was far less valuable than they supposed, that their doings wanted more of simple and sincere thought to direct them, and that by their actual practice, however prosperous they might fancy themselves, they could not really succeed.' But now they do really seem to have done what the puzzled foreigners imagine England altogether has done—to have reached the nadir. They have shown us about the worst that a party of movement can do, when that party is bounded and backward and without insight, and is led by a manager of astounding skill and energy, but himself without insight likewise. The danger of our situation is so grave that it can hardly be exaggerated. People are shocked at even the mention of the contingency of civil war. But the danger of civil war inevitably arises whenever two impossible parties, full of hatred and contempt for each other, with no mediating power of reason to reconcile them, are in presence. So the English civil war arose when, facing and scornfully hating one another, were two impossibilities: the prerogative of the King and the license of the Cavaliers on the one side, the hideousness and immense *ennui* of the Puritans on the other. The Vendean war arose out of a like collision between two implacable impossibilities: the old *régime* and Jacobinism. Here lies the danger of civil war in Ireland, if the situation cannot find rational treatment; Protestant ascendancy is impossible, but the Ulster men will not let bunglers, in removing it, drag them down to a lower civilisation without a struggle. Nay, the like danger exists for England itself. Change we must; but if a Liberal party with no insight, led by a victorious manager who is no statesman, brings us to failure and chaos, the existing England will not let itself be ruined without a struggle.

Therefore at the present time that need for us, on which I have so often and so vainly insisted, to let our minds have free and fair play, no longer to deceive ourselves, to brush aside the claptrap and fictions of our public and party life, to be lucid, to get at the plain simple truth, to see things as they really are, becomes more urgent, more the one thing needful for us, than ever. That sentence of Butler, which I have more than once quoted in past times, acquires now a heightened, an almost awful significance. **Things are what they*

are, and the consequences of them will be what they will be; why then should we desire to be deceived?' The laws which govern the course of human affairs, which make this thing salutary to a nation and that thing pernicious, are not of our making or under our power. Our wishing and asserting can avail nothing against them. Lord Ripon's calling Mr. Gladstone's antecedents glorious cannot make them other than what they are—Parliamentary victories, but a statesman's failures. Mr. Morley's 'great triumph' in the election of '330 Liberal members, more or less, who without excessive arrogance may be taken to be the best men in the way of intelligence and honesty that the Liberal party can produce,' cannot make the Liberal party, both in and out of Parliament, other than what it is—a party of bounded and backward mind, without insight. Deluders and deluded, the utterers of these phrases may fancy them solid while they utter them, the hearers while they hear them. But solid they cannot make them; and it is not on the thing being asserted and believed, but on its being really true or false, that our welfare turns.

Whatever may be the faults of the Liberal party, 'the Conservative party at any rate,' says Mr. Bradlaugh, 'is blind;' and here, too, of course, there is danger. The Conservative party is the party of stability and permanence, the party of resistance to change; and when the Liberal party, the party of movement, moves unwise and dangerous changes, recourse will naturally be had, by sensible men, to the Conservative party. After all, our country as it is, as the past has made it, as it stands there before us, is something; it is precious, it shall not lightly be imperilled by the bungling work of rash hands. Burke from such a motive threw himself on the Conservative forces in this country to resist Jacobinism. But no solution of the problems of national life is to be reached by resting on those forces absolutely. Burke would have been far more edifying for us to-day if he had rested on them less absolutely. What has been said of the urgent need of seeing things as they really are is of general application, and applies to Conservative action as well as Liberal. If Conservative action is blind, we are undone. True, for the moment our pressing danger is just now from the Liberal party and its leader. If they cannot be stopped and defeated, the thing is over, and we need not trouble ourselves about the Conservative party and its blindness. But supposing them defeated, the Conservative programme requires to be treated just like the Liberal, to be surveyed with a resolutely clear and fair mind.

Now there is always a likelihood that this programme will be just to maintain things as they are, and nothing further. Already there are symptoms of danger in the exhortations, earnestly made and often repeated, to keep faith with the Irish proprietor to whose security England, it is said, has pledged herself; to secure the Irish landowners and to prevent the scandal and peril of Catholic supremacy in Ireland.

As to Catholicism, it has been the great stone of stumbling to us

in Ireland, and so it will continue to be while we treat it inequitably. Mr. Gladstone's Bill treats it inequitably. His Bill withholds from the Irish the power to endow or establish Catholicism. That, he well knows, is the one exception which his Liberal followers make to their rule, borrowed from Mr. Fox, that if men very much wish to do a thing we should let them do it. To endow Catholicism they must not be permitted, however much they may wish it. That provision alone would be fatal to any sincere and lasting gratitude in Ireland for Mr. Gladstone's measure. If his measure is defeated it would be fatal to repeat his mistake. Why should not the majority in Ireland be suffered to endow and establish its religion just as much as in England or Scotland? It is precisely one of those cases where the provincial legislatures should have the power to do as they think proper. Mr. Whitbread's 'thoughtful Americans' will tell him that in the United States there is this power, although to the notions and practice of America, sprung out of the loins of Nonconformity, religious establishments are unfamiliar. But even in this century, I think, Connecticut had an established Congregational Church, and it might have an Established Church again to-morrow if it chose. Ulster would most certainly not establish Catholicism. If it chose to establish Presbyterianism it should be free to do so. If the Celtic and Catholic provinces chose to establish Catholicism, they should be free to do so. So long as we have two sets of weights and measures in this matter, one for Great Britain and another for Ireland, there can never be concord.

The land question presents most grave and formidable difficulties, but undoubtedly they are not to be got rid of by holding ourselves pledged to make the present Irish landlords' tenure and rents as secure as those of a landlord in England. We ought not to do it if we could, and in the long run we could not do it if we would. How greatly is a clear and fair mind needed here! and perhaps such a mind on such a subject the Conservatives, the landed party, do not easily attain. We have always meant and endeavoured to give to the Irish landlord the same security that the English has. But the thing is impossible. Why? Because at bottom the acquiescence of the community makes the security of property. The land-system of England has, in my opinion, grave disadvantages; but it has this acquiescence. It has it partly from the moderation of the people, but more from the general conduct and moderation of the landlords. If many English landlords had borne such a reputation as that which the first Lord Lonsdale, for instance, acquired for himself in the north, the English landed system would not have had this acquiescence. In Scotland it has it in a less degree, and is therefore less secure; and, whatever the Duke of Argyll may think, deservedly. Let him consult the Tory Johnson for the past, and weigh, as to the present, the fact that Mr. Winans is possible. But it has it in a

considerable degree, though in a lower degree than England. Ireland has it in the degree to be expected from its history of confiscation, penal laws, absenteeism—that is to say, hardly at all. And we are bound in good faith, we are pledged to obtain, by force if necessary, for the Irish landlord the acquiescence and security which in England come naturally! We are bound to do it for a landed system where the landowners have been a class with whom, in Burke's words, 'the melancholy and invidious title of grantees of confiscation was a favourite;' who 'would not let Time draw his oblivious veil over the unpleasant means by which their domains were acquired;' who 'abandoned all pretext of the general good of the community'! But there has been great improvement, you say: the present landowners give in general little cause for complaint. Absenteeism has continued, but ah! even if the improvement had been ten times greater than it has, Butler's memorable and stern sentence would still be true: 'Real reformation is in many cases of no avail at all towards preventing the miseries annexed to folly *exceeding a certain degree*. There is a certain bound to misbehaviour, which being transgressed, there remains no place for repentance in the natural course of things.' But a class of altogether new and innocent owners has arisen. Alas! every one who has bought land in Ireland has bought it with a lien of Nemesis upon it. It is of no use deceiving ourselves. To make the landowner in the Celtic and Catholic parts of Ireland secure as the English landowner is impossible for us.

What is possible is to bear our part in his loss; for loss he must incur. He must incur loss for folly and misbehaviour, whether on his own part or on that of his predecessors, *exceeding a certain degree*. But most certainly we ought to share his loss with him. For when complaints were addressed to England, 'the double name of the complainants,' says Burke, 'Irish and Papist (it would be hard to say which singly was the more odious), shut up the hearts of every one against them.' All classes in Great Britain are guilty in this matter; perhaps the middle class, the stronghold of Protestant prejudice, most. And, therefore, though the Irish landlords can, I think, be now no more maintained than were the planters, yet to some extent this country is bound to indemnify them as it did the planters. They must choose between making their own terms with their own community, or making them with the Imperial Parliament. In the latter case, part of their indemnity should be contributed by Ireland, part, most certainly, by ourselves. Loss they must, however, expect to suffer, the landowners of the Celtic and Catholic provinces at any rate. To this the English Conservatives, whatever natural sympathy and compassion they may entertain for them, must clearly make up their minds.

On the reasonableness of the Conservative party our best hope at present depends. In that nadir of Liberalism which we seem to

have reached, there are not wanting some signs and promise of better things to come. Lord Rosebery, with his freshness, spirit, and intelligence, one cannot but with pleasure see at the Foreign Office. Then the action of Lord Hartington and Mr. Trevelyan inspires hope: that of Mr. Chamberlain inspired high hope at first, but presently his attitude seemed to become equivocal. He has, however, instincts of government—what M. Guizot used to call ‘the governmental mind.’ But the mass of the great Liberal party has no such instincts; it is crude and without insight. Yet for the modern development of our society, great changes are required, changes not certainly finding a place in the programme of our Conservatives, but not in that of our Liberals either. Because I firmly believe in the need of such changes, I have often called myself a Liberal of the future. They must come gradually, however; we are not ripe for them yet. What we are ripe for, what ought to be the work of the next few years, is the development of a complete and rational system of local government for these islands. And in this work all reasonable Conservatives may heartily bear part with all reasonable Liberals. That is the work for the immediate future, and besides its own great importance, it offers us a respite from burning questions which we are not ripe to treat, and a basis of union for all good men. The development of the working class amongst us follows the development of the middle. But development for our bounded and backward middle class can be gained only by their improved education and by the practice of a rational, large, and elevating system of local government. The reasonableness and co-operation of the Conservatives are needed to attain this system. By reasonableness, by co-operation with reasonable Liberals, they have it in their power to do two good things: they can keep off many dangers in the present, and they will be helping to rear up a Liberalism of more insight for the future.

But is it possible, and is there time? Will not the great Parliamentary manager, with his crude Liberal party of the present, sweep everything before him now? The omens are not good. At Munich a few weeks ago I had the honour to converse with a wise and famous man, as pleasing as he is learned, Dr. Dollinger. He is an old friend of Mr. Gladstone. We talked of Mr. Gladstone, with the interest and admiration which he deserves, but with misgiving. His letter to Lord de Vesci had just then appeared. ‘Does it not remind you,’ Dr. Dollinger asked me, ‘of that unfortunate French ministry on the eve of the Revolution, applying to the nation for criticisms and suggestions?’ Certainly the omens are not good. However, that best of all omens, as Homer calls it, ourselves to do our part for our country, is in our own power. The circumstances are such that desponding and melancholy thoughts cannot be banished entirely. After all, we may sometimes be tempted to say mournfully to ourselves, nations do not go on for ever. In the immense procession

of ages, what countless communities have arisen and sunk unknown, and even the most famous nation, perhaps, is only for its day. Human nature will have in dark hours its haunting apprehensions of this kind. But till the fall has actually come, no firm English mind will consent to believe of the fall that it is inevitable, and of 'the ancient and inbred integrity, piety, good-nature, and good-humour of the English people,' that their place in the world will know them no more.

MATTHEW ARNOLD.

A FEW MORE WORDS ABOUT NAMES.

THE plea that I made in the January number of this Review for the familiar forms of historic names has met with so much support, that I am encouraged to add some fresh observations; and I will take occasion to notice the only criticism of which I have heard. My contention was that, since a mass of names derived from all ages and languages has become embedded in our literature in familiar forms, it would cause needless confusion to recast the whole of them in the exact contemporary forms, and in the spelling of many different languages. Specialists are continually pressing us to write names in the forms found in distant ages, or in other tongues. The true answer is that which I set forth: that to admit all these separate claims (each plausible by itself) would turn our language into a chaos, and I appealed to what is almost the only effective argument in such a case, the laughable consequences of adopting all these claims together. The Court which must decide this matter will be formed out of common sense, general culture, and the best types of English literature.

To that plea as a whole I have heard no answer. It is plainly one to which no answer on any single line is possible; and where scholars dealing with their special subject alone have really no right to sit as judges. They are the persons on their trial. It is not a matter of research or any special learning at all. The question cannot be limited to any particular subject, to one language, or any one epoch. It must be argued as a whole; as a matter, not of research, but of literature. What will become of the English language, if all the schools of research have their way together? This question, I say, will ultimately be settled by common sense, general culture, and the practice of English literature in its best types.

The article by Mr. Freeman, in the April number of the *Contemporary Review*, is therefore no reply at all. He does not allude to the true question, the confusion in the language which general change would cause. He defends his own practice and deals with his own subject exclusively; and leaves Orientalists and Elizabethans to deal with theirs. He rates me for meddling with what I know nothing about. He makes a series of assertions about what I know and do not know, what I have read or have not read, and what he supposes I

think. In fact, he is Professor Freeman, in the Old-English war-paint that we all know and have so long enjoyed as Saturday night came round. I shall presently show that no one of these assumptions about myself is true. But, supposing they were true: that is, assuming that I had never seen a Saxon Charter, or that I took *Mathildis* for an Old-English name, or that I ever supposed *Guelf* to be an hereditary surname (every one of which assertions is a mere invention), it could have no effect on the general argument, or in any way weaken my contention.

The case stands thus. I say, that in a history of England intended for children it is a pity to cumber the pages with such forms as *Ælfthryth* and *Ælfgifu*. Mr. Freeman in effect answers, You don't know what *Ælf* means. Surely, that is no answer, even if it were true. Again, I say, it is a pity to have our language interlarded with Orientalisms and Mediævalisms. Go to, says Mr. Freeman, you are not a serious scholar. Well! I am warning people against letting the rather too serious scholars murder the Queen's English. Suppose I find a builder discharging a cartload of bricks in the Queen's highway, I remonstrate and appeal to the public authorities. You're not a builder, cries the culprit; you know nothing about bricks, and were never in a brickfield in your life. That may or may not be true; but my immediate purpose is to ask the Court if every builder in the mighty Temple of Research is free to discharge bricks of his own baking into the midst of the Queen's English.

Mr. Freeman is much scandalised with me for beguiling the tedium of discussion with a jest or two; and he says my style of controversy is not that of 'a serious scholar.' I cannot undertake to be always in full academicals; and I think that, if an argument is sound, it is none the worse for being presented in a pleasant way. A great master told us it was best always to mix the *dulce* with the *utile*. I can remember how poor Robson used to preface his immortal 'Villikins' with the warning: '*This is not a comic song!*' but the warning was always lost on me. Why is it to be assumed that, if we are merry, we cannot be wise? I know that in this age of Teutonic *Gründlichkeit*, unless a man will school himself to be as dull as Professor Gneist, he is supposed not to have an ounce of Research in him. It used not to be so in the glorious eighteenth century. Hume and Gibbon, Diderot and Turgot, did not find learning incompatible with a lively manner or with good English and good French.

The line which Mr. Freeman adopts is the one with which his readers are quite familiar. He behaves like a tutor correcting a pupil's exercise, and giving him what schoolboys call a 'ballaraging' for false concord and quantities. He cries out, Read what I have written in So-and-so! I suppose you think this? and, Why do you not read the other? Every one knows that to cross Mr. Freeman in

one of his linguistic fads is to risk being treated as my little boy was treated in the Zoological Gardens, when he offered a bun to the porcupine. But I have had some experience with the *fera naturæ*; and I have been conversant with the English language for a good many years. Of his work as an historian I have spoken with the great respect I unfeignedly feel; but in the matter of the best mode of writing our native tongue I cannot accept the authority of the most serious of scholars. Were I to put on my own cap and gown, and had I the Professor before me to examine in the history of law, or of modern philosophy, or of the industrial movement, or the like, I should do my best to give him his '*Testamur*' politely, and I certainly should try not to look as if I were about to give him a caning.

To employ such a tone to me is surely a little out of place. I have been occupied all my life, just as Mr. Freeman has, in learning, teaching, and studying; and, if my special periods or subjects are not quite the same as his, we are on fair terms in a question of general literature. Moreover, it so happens that, in my professional duty as professor of constitutional history, these books which he tells me to go and look into are the ordinary text-books of my daily work. It would seem as if no one is a scholar serious enough for Mr. Freeman, unless his life is spent over the *Saxon Chronicle* and the *Codex Diplomaticus*. He says that I will not stop to hear what he has to say; that I have not stopped to learn the simplest facts about these matters that I wrote purely at a venture; and have made a reckless raid into regions where I do not know the road.

None of these assertions are true. I have very carefully studied all that he has written on the subject. I well know all the reasons he gives for his practice in writing English names; and they do not seem to me good reasons. I re-read them again before writing about them. He hardly knows how diligent a student of his works he has in myself. I study them all—large and small, scientific and popular, old and new; and I had them all before my eyes at every step in my remarks on spelling. My examples are all drawn from his own books and those of his immediate followers, and I will give him chapter and verse. Kemble, Stubbs, Skeat, Freeman, Green, were in my hands at almost every sentence that I wrote about the forms of Old-English names. I do not find that I cited any of them incorrectly. The blunders, which he supposes and infers me to have made, I did not make.

My topic was the form of names to be used in familiar English; but I took care in speaking of the *Battle of Senlac*, or of Orderic, or of the title of Edward the Elder, to go again to the authorities, and not to speak without book. I did not quote the Bayeux Tapestry or the Continuation of Wace's *Brut*, or the poem of Guy of Amiens without examining them for myself. And before saying one word about the Battle of Hastings, I again read all that I could find in

Mr. Freeman, as well as in most of the best authorities. Yes! I perfectly knew that Orderic was born in England, having had all that Mr. Freeman tells us about him before my eyes when writing. But as Orderic left England at the age of ten, and passed his whole life in Normandy, I did not find it needful to mention the place of his birth. I state all these trifles in order to show that I did not write at a venture; and I said nothing for which I had not a first-rate authority.

I mention a few points whereon he declares me to have blundered: but where the blunders are not mine, but his. Where, he asks, did I get the form *Knud*, for *Cnut*? '*Knud*,' says Mr. Freeman, 'is quite beyond me.' Well! I got the form *Knud* from Mr. Freeman himself. In his *Old-English History*, edition of 1878, p. 222 (a little book expressly written for children), I read as follows:—'*Cnut* or *Knud* is his real name. He is often called *Canutus* or *Canute*. . . . It is better to call him by his own name.' Again, in the *Norman Conquest*, vol. i. p. 442 (edition of 1867), I find as follows:—'*Cnut* or *Knud*, in one syllable, is this king's true name.' Having these passages under my eye, I wrote:—'*Cnut* or *Knud* . . . had rather a queer look.' I did not say that Mr. Freeman constantly used *Knud*. He tells children it is better to call the king by his own name; and that *Cnut* or *Knud* is his real name. And now, he says, *Knud* is quite beyond him; and that it would indeed look odd to talk about *Knud*. So I said.

Next he says that I used the term *Kaiserinn Mathillis*, as a contemporary English form. I did nothing of the kind. I used it as a German form. It chanced that I had taken a note of a piece by the German historian, Treitschke, about another Empress Matilda, '*Heinrich I. und Mathildis*,' he using the Latin form with the title *Kaiserinn*. My argument was that, if Edward the Confessor has to be *Eadward*, Stephen of Blois ought to be *Estienne*, as a Frenchman, and Maud ought to be *Kaiserinn Mathildis*, as a German. As she married a German, and retained a German title, the highest of all titles, I was arguing that, to be consistent, she should keep the German style in full.

Then about Edward the Elder. Mr. Freeman reproves me for saying that Edward called himself '*Rex Anglo-Saxonum*'; that it ought to be '*Rex Angul-Saxonum*.' It so happens, that to be quite safe, I had before me, when I was writing this sentence, that admirable little book, *Old-English History*, by E. A. Freeman, p. 139, edition of 1878; where I read that, 'He [*i.e.* Edward] commonly calls himself *Rex Anglo-Saxonum*' (*sic*). I simply copied out those words, as I was dealing with Mr. Freeman about a popular mode of speech. I was quite aware that the spelling of the Charters is '*Rex Angul-Saxonum*,' because, in writing, I had under my eye as well Mr. Green's *Conquest of England*, pp. 192, 193, and Bishop

Stubbs's *History*, vol. i. p. 173, both of which so spell the title. But since the matter in hand was the name *Anglo-Saxon* itself, not the spelling of the name, I was satisfied to follow Mr. Freeman's '*Rex Anglo-Saxonum*.'

By the way, I venture to ask if Mr. Freeman's 'commonly' here is not a little too strong. And I ought perhaps to warn him that I have read all the charters of the *Rex invictissimus Eadwardus* both in Kemble and in Thorpe. I did not say that a succession of historians and scholars have used the *Latin phrase*, '*Rex Anglo-Saxonum*,' but that they had '*used the term*' (*i.e.* Anglo-Saxon). This is a fair specimen of how Mr. Freeman tries to screw blunders out of perfectly plain and accurate language.

Then, says Mr. Freeman to me, whence do I get my *Karl*; and where for twenty years past has he himself said anything about *Karl*? I did not assert that Mr. Freeman usually writes of *Charlemagne* as *Karl*. On the contrary, I wrote—'Professor Freeman taught us to speak of *Charles the Great*.' When, later on, I wrote—'we have all learned to speak by the card of *Karl*,' I had in my mind and under my eye a very famous Essay, where I read the name *Karl*, six times in twenty lines of print, all about the '*legend of Charlemagne*,' and the '*history of Karl*.' My edition of this Essay bears the date 1872. I cannot undertake to remember all the editions of all Mr. Freeman's books; or when he first dropped *Karl*. But having written that '*Professor Freeman taught us to speak of Charles the Great*,' I felt amply justified by this Essay in adding in a merry vein, 'we have all learned to speak by the card of *Karl*.' Professor Freeman's lessons are not so soon forgotten as he thinks.

And now about *Charlemagne*. Of course the whole world knows all that Mr. Freeman has been telling us for twenty years about *Karl*, *Charles*, and *Charlemagne*, and the important significance of these forms. *Charlemagne*, he says, is a '*French name*,' only to be used 'when one is speaking of him distinctly as a subject of French tales' (*Old-English History*, p. 332). That seems to me to be affectation. *Charlemagne* is now an English word, a word used of the historic *Charles* by the best scholars, and fixed indelibly in English literature by them. I think '*Charles the Great*' an excellent name, and often use it. But since Gibbon, Hallam, Milman, Sir H. Maine, and many other scholars, have used the name *Charlemagne* of the historical emperor, I maintain that it is a good English term. It came to us through the French, as thousands of words came; but it is now as good English as *Lombardy*, or *Normandy*, *Cologne*, or *Treves*. One might as well say that *mutton* and *beef* are French names; and tell children that it is good manners always to ask for *sheep* and *ox*. Mr. Freeman has explained that his objection to *Charlemagne* arises from this, that we shall never understand the Empire until 'all French influences are wholly cast aside and trampled under foot.' There is no more '*Truth*' in *Charles* than in *Charle-*

magne. Truth requires *Karl*. Etymology is not truth; nor is it history. If we are to take down Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary* before we may speak our mother tongue, and never use a word of French derivation for fear of awakening 'false ideas,' we shall never get our dinners at all. One would think Mr. Freeman can never bring himself to speak of the *Fortnightly Review* or the month of *December*; and not to awaken 'false ideas,' that he always speaks of our contemporary as the '*Monthly*,' and calls the twelfth month of the year—*Duodecember*.

Mr. Freeman makes it a great point that I said the Latinised form of *Edward* was not usually spelt with the double vowel; and he 'can only infer that I write purely at a venture.' Now it happens that I did refer to contemporary authorities to see at what date, and to what extent, the double vowel dropped out of the Latin form. The Latinised form of *Edward* is so continually quoted by eminent scholars in its modern shape, that it would be misleading to rely on citations. I accordingly consulted a good many chronicles in the *Rolls Series*. I should have been more correct had I written 'not uniformly,' instead of 'not usually.' But in *Thorpe's* collection of *Charters* there are scores¹ of examples of Saxon names written in Latin before the Conquest without the double vowel. I did not say that either practice was invariable. At no period was it invariable.

Mr. Freeman asks me if I object to physiologists changing 'musk-ox' into 'musk-sheep.' Not at all. 'Musk-ox' is rather a description than a name. But I should object very much to find in *Owen's Comparative Physiology* our old friend *Hippopotamus* turned into *Hyopotamus*, in the name of 'truth.' When Professor Freeman tells children not to say *Charlemagne*, because he was not a Frenchman, it is just as if Professor Huxley told them not to say *Hippopotamus*, because the animal is not a horse. Names are labels, not definitions.

In conclusion, I briefly answer a few questions. I do not strain at the forms in *Kemble*, because *Kemble's* works are technical text-books, not popular histories, and consist mainly of verbatim extracts. Nearly every one of my illustrations was purposely taken from Mr. Freeman's *Old-English History*, specially written for children. What I said of *Hrofesceaster*, *Cant-wara-byryg*, the *Hwiccas*, was, that they 'had rather a queer look.' All are found in the text of Mr. Green's admirable book, *The Making of England*. I spell the *Hwiccas* either as in the Latin *Wicii*, or with *Hw* transposed into *Wh*. We no longer write *Hwíticirice*, we write *Whitchurch*. As Mr. Freeman tells the children (*Old-English History*, Preface): '*Hw* is simply what we now write *wh*.' Precisely: then, say I, let us so write it. Since I had under my eyes, when I made a note of the name *Hwiccas*, Mr. Green's account of the battle of *Wanborough*, I suppose I knew who the *Hwiccas* were.

Certainly, Mr. Grote did begin the resetting of Greek names in *England*. As I was writing about English literature, it did not occur to me to speak about the practice of Germans, when writing German. I never said anything about *Kéκρυρα*, or *Corfu*. I said that Mr. Grote writes *Korkyra*. So he does. I wonder that Mr. Freeman did not assert that, in objecting to *Krete*, I thought *Candia* was the same word. All this reminds me of my old master at school, when determined to make out that one of us ought to be caned.

Mr. Freeman's reason for eviscerating English history of the *Battle of Hastings* is the 'danger' that somebody might think (as a critic once did) that Taillefer sang his song on the sea-shore. I can face even this danger, rather than cease to speak of the *Battle of Hastings*. And he asks me if I think it pedantic to speak of the *Battle of Stamford-bridge*. Certainly not: that is the name by which I have always heard of it. I might think it pedantic to write *Stantford-brigge*, as William of Malmesbury does.

As to *Buonaparte*, I was well aware that this was the original form of the family name, and was used by Napoleon in his early career. But the absolute *de facto* ruler of a nation has certainly the official right to change the spelling of his own name. And as Napoleon when Emperor did this, there is an end of the matter. Our grandfathers, Scott included, treating him as the 'Corsican bandit,' naturally stuck to the old name, by way of saying 'Corsican.' But to speak in 1886 of 'either *Buonaparte*,' is to carry lampoons into history. I neither said, nor implied, that *Capet* and *Guelf* are hereditary surnames. I suggested that Terrorists and O'Donovan Rossa possibly thought they were. With regard to the title under which my essay appeared in January, it happens that I did not so write it, nor did I see the actual title until the Review was published. Mr. Freeman seems inclined to give a new sense to the word 'pedantic.' He suggests that it means 'accurate,' the making words answer facts. Not so! No amount of 'accuracy' can be pedantic; but 'singularity' may be, when it is uncouth and needless. It is pedantic to twist old words into new forms, and to try to turn old names into battle-cries and badges.

Names and words are current coin of the realm; which, for public convenience, have definite values; and to clip and deface them is to debase the linguistic currency. It is the part of a good citizen and a sensible man to carry on his transactions in the current coin, taking them and counting them at their official value. If a man, in order to make his words answer to facts, and not to raise any 'false ideas,' were to cut a five-shilling piece in two, and to offer the bits as two half-crowns, the public would call him crazy, and the police would treat him as 'a smasher.' Mr. Freeman is really trying to pass amongst the lieges Saxon *scats* and *scillings*, as if they were good current coin. The first magistrate before whom he is brought

will tell him that *scats* and *scillings* are not now in circulation, and that private persons have not the right of coining.

Of course in this matter of spelling there are very real and important points behind. It is a serious evil to unsettle the language. It is unkind to throw fresh stumbling-blocks in the way of education. All singularity in forms, without motive or without adequate motive, is a fresh difficulty, and a source of offence. The plan of trampling under foot all French influences, or other influences, is a one-sided plan, a short-sighted plan. To give title of mint and anise in Old-English names, and to leave all the weightier names in universal history in their vulgar shapes, is a misleading purism. If we tried to torture *all* names in history out of their current forms and into their contemporary orthography, if we tried with the modern alphabet to represent the various sounds of a hundred different languages, to spell the same name in a dozen different forms, according to the century of which we are speaking—this would produce a literary chaos. And, since there is no adequate reason for specially selecting any one epoch or any one race for this equivocal distinction, it is the part of good sense, and good English, to be content with the current names long familiar to us in the best literature. These names, no doubt, do differ moderately, and from time to time, as language grows, changes in form are spontaneously adopted. But the claim of any scholar, however eminent, of any knot of scholars (and I look on the knot of Old-English scholars as amongst the most eminent of our time) to sweep the board of the familiar names for one particular epoch, and systematically to force on us and on our children another language in names—this is a bad claim and ought to be resisted.

And now let me say that I have no kind of quarrel with Mr. Freeman, of whose works I am a diligent student and a humble admirer. I am very much against any process of trampling under foot, and against all uncouth forms of good old names. In this matter I am the real conservative. It will not do for the Old-English people to say that they are merely reviving an ancient practice. Mr. Hyndman might as well declare that the meeting in Hyde Park was only a revival of the Witenagemot. It is I who am defending the practice of learned men, of the men of the widest learning, even in this particular subject. The idea that Mr. Freeman, in this debate, represents Truth, Fact, Scholarship, and Research, and that I represent nothing but frivolous trifling with serious learning, is a mere hallucination of his own. I am asking Mr. Freeman and his followers to conform to the practice of an authority at least as great as their own—that of the Bishop of Chester. Dr. Stubbs, in his great work, follows a form of names, eminently wise, practical, and decisive. He finds nothing difficult, nothing false, in writing *Alfred* and *Edward*, *Clowis* and *Canute*, *Anglo-Saxon* and the *Battle of*

Hastings. He has often introduced Old-English forms, such as Hume did not use; but then he makes no attempt to sweep the board of all the names in ordinary use.

I am asking for no rigid system of spelling, for no absolute fixity, for nothing which has not the sanction of the most eminent scholars and the best writers. When men of the learning of the Bishop of Chester, Sir Henry Maine, Sir James Stephen, and so many more of our contemporaries, to say nothing of Hallam, Milman, and those departed, can write *Alfred* and *Edward*, I think little children need not be crammed, in the name of 'truth,' with whole pages of *Ælfthryths* and *Ælfgifus*.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

*THE
JUBILEE OF THE REFORM CLUB.*

WRITERS about the London Club-houses, including the late Peter Cunningham who was usually most accurate and trustworthy, state that the Reform Club was founded between the years 1830 and 1832. They also assert that the club was designed to aid in carrying the measures for the improved representation of the people, which then agitated the country, and were hotly debated in Parliament. It is true that the Carlton Club was founded by the Duke of Wellington and his friends with the special object of opposing Parliamentary reform in all aspects and at all times; but the founders of the Reform Club had no reason to concern themselves about the Bills for the representation of the people which became law on the 7th of June, 1832. This memorable date preceded by four years the formation of the Reform Club. Between the years 1830 and 1832 Parliamentary reform owed nothing to the support of a political club, and lost nothing owing to opposition from one.

It is true that the authors and supporters of the Reform Bills which, after a protracted, an arduous, and embittered struggle, were incribed on the Statute Book, belonged to Brooks's Club, which was then, and still is, regarded as the headquarters of the Whig party. It is equally true, however, that Brooks's was not founded with any political purpose nor conducted to attain any political object. In former days its members were as deeply absorbed in the game of hazard as in the game of politics. Whilst the present members delight in maintaining the traditions of plain Whig principles, the club itself stands aloof now, as it has systematically done heretofore, from the drudgery of organising and marshalling the forces of the Liberal party.

The Westminster Reform Club was the first political club formed on the modern type with the express view of upholding the Liberal banner, and furthering the Liberal cause. Its members met together for the first time on the 7th of March, 1834, and they occupied the house numbered 24 Great George Street, Westminster, of which Mr. Alderman Wood was the owner. This club took an active part in the political affairs of the day: three months after its establishment a deputation of its members went to give good advice to Earl Grey. The members disdained any subordination to the Whigs. They plumed themselves upon being Radicals who saw no finality in the Reform Acts,

and who ardently desired legislation of a character so sweeping as to appear to the Whigs equivalent to revolution. This club ceased to exist two years after it was founded. Whigs could not join it, and the Radical party was not strong enough to maintain it. Among its members were the most conspicuous Radicals of the time—men like Daniel O'Connell and Feargus O'Connor, Colonel Perronet Thompson, and Joseph Hume. Another member, who afterwards became the leader and idol of the Tory party, was the Earl of Beaconsfield.

Two years after the Westminster Reform Club was founded, and when its prolonged existence seemed most improbable, several ardent politicians resolved to form a political club which should not be exclusively Whig like Brooks's, nor exclusively Radical like the Westminster, but which should offer a place of meeting and action for all shades and sections of the Liberal party. The Right Honourable Edward Ellice was the originator of the new club. Though a staunch Whig, he clearly read the signs of the times which indicated that, if the Whigs would retain their influence, they must not be too fastidious and exclusive in their demeanour towards other and equally sincere Liberals. He had been Secretary to the Treasury, Secretary at War, and for a short time a member of the Cabinet in Earl Grey's first Administration. As a party man he did good service. His advice was highly valued, being sought for and followed on critical occasions. He was unpopular as well as able—his temper was so trying that he was commonly known among his contemporaries by the nickname of 'Bear Ellice.'

Mr. Ellice was both a thoroughly practical man and a keen politician, and, having made up his mind to establish a new club, he set about the task with great energy. In the first place, however, he made an appeal to his fellow-members at Brooks's, to the effect that they should enlarge their club-house and elect six hundred new members. He probably contemplated that the club should leave St. James's Street and return to Pall Mall, where it was originally situated, and occupy a finer house than the one in St. James's Street. A large majority of the members rejected Mr. Ellice's proposition, whereupon he said, 'Well, gentlemen, we mean to start a club which will beat yours.' He summoned those who agreed with him to meet at his own house and discuss the establishment of a new club. At the meeting held in Mr. Ellice's drawing-room the Reform Club was constituted; rules were drawn up and agreed to, those present becoming the original members, and a committee being appointed to elect others. Mr. Coppock took minutes of the proceedings. The name of the club was the subject of much discussion and some difference of opinion. The names of Fox, Hampden, Grey, and Milton were proposed and rejected in succession. It was eventually found that the name 'Reform' divided the meeting the least, and most completely expressed the views of the founders of the club.

The club was commonly known for a time as the New Reform, to distinguish it from the Westminster Reform. The reason for this

soon ceased. During the two years of the Westminster's existence, the number of members did not exceed two hundred; debts were incurred which had afterwards to be paid by the few members who adhered to the club to the last. Nineteen-twentieths of them became members of the Reform Club.

The basis upon which, in the spring of 1836, the Reform Club was established, was broad and truly Liberal. It was then recognised that the work of reformers, so far from being ended when the royal assent was given to the Reform Bills, was, on the contrary, only beginning; and that these bills cleared the way for the work remaining to be accomplished. Though the way had been cleared, it might again be blocked. The danger of reaction was serious. Indeed, two years after the passing of the Reform Bills, a Tory Administration had been formed and held office. Thus, then, the necessity for reformers being united, in order that they should preserve as well as continue their work, was clear and imperative. A reformer was a politician who was ready to further all such constitutional changes as might be for the national benefit. As these changes could not well be limited in time or character, the members of the Reform Club could never be justified in saying that their work had been completed, and that, like the Lotus-eaters in Lord Tennyson's exquisite poem, they might declare, 'we have had enough of action and of motion,' and announce their intention of reclining in the hollow Lotus-land like gods 'careless of mankind.'

In accordance with these principles, and in order that those holding them might have a place of meeting where concerted action might take place in the pleasantest way, the preamble to the rules set forth that 'The Reform Club is instituted for the purpose of promoting the social intercourse of reformers of the United Kingdom.' Moreover, the rules distinctly provided that each candidate for admission should be a 'reformer,' and should be vouched for as such by his proposer and seconder. No one professing to be a reformer was rejected on the ground that his views were too extreme. Two years before the foundation of the club, Daniel O'Connell had spoken in the House of Commons for six hours in support of a motion designed to bring about the repeal of the union between Great Britain and Ireland, yet Daniel O'Connell was not only elected a member of the club, but he was elected a member of the committee which managed its affairs. His friends and supporters in Parliament, commonly known as his 'tail,' became members also. O'Connell's successors have deliberately separated themselves from the reformers of the United Kingdom. When the Home Rule party was formally constituted in Dublin, Mr. Butt distinctly stated that the members of that party should scrupulously refrain from joining any of the existing London political clubs.

The house of Mr. Angerstein in Pall Mall was the first club-house of the reformers. In 1824 the Government purchased Mr. Angerstein's collection of thirty-eight pictures for 57,000*l.* with a view to form

the nucleus of a National Gallery, and, whilst the Gallery was building, the public were admitted to see the pictures stored in Mr. Angerstein's house. On the reformers taking possession of the house, the joke of the day was that the National Gallery had been converted into a Reform Club. The house itself was a red brick structure bearing a resemblance to the College of Arms in Queen Victoria Street. On the one side was a private dwelling; on the other a grocer's shop. Pall Mall was then a street in which buildings of the meanest sort were in striking contrast to recently built club-houses like the University, the Senior United Service, the Athenæum, and the Travellers' Clubs. The first Carlton club-house was built in Pall Mall the year in which the Reform was founded, this being the first of three club-houses which have been erected on the same site, and the third house in which the members of the Carlton found shelter, the first being a house in Charles Street and the second Lord Kensington's house in Carlton Gardens.

Many of the original members of the Reform were opposed to the erection of a club-house in Pall Mall, preferring a site nearer the Houses of Parliament, and such a site they thought Gwydyr House to be. But the majority preferred Pall Mall, on the ground that it was the more fashionable quarter; hence it was resolved to buy Mr. Angerstein's house and the two houses adjoining it, to pull them down, and to erect on the spot they covered the most palatial club-house that had then been seen. A narrow street separated this site from that of the Carlton club-house. Whilst the Reform club-house was building the reformers occupied Gwydyr House.

Several architects submitted designs for the new club-house, and the two designs which pleased the members the best were those of Cockerell and Barry. The latter had the advantage of being the architect of the Travellers' Club, a building which was then, as it is still, greatly admired. The former had studied the comfort of members in the internal arrangements and had produced a more imposing elevation than Barry. However, Barry's design was the more artistic and, in several respects, the more novel of the two. When designing the Travellers' club-house, Barry sought inspiration from an Italian model; he did so, too, when designing the Reform, basing his design for it upon the Farnese Palace at Rome, of which Sangallo and Michael Angelo were the architects. It may be noted that the Carlton club-house, as we now see it, is the reproduction of an Italian building, the original being Sansovino's Old Library in St. Mark's Place, at Venice, a building which Mr. Ruskin styles 'a graceful one of the Central Renaissance.' The greatest novelty in Barry's design for the Reform club-house was providing several sets of chambers on the upper floor, these chambers having a separate entrance and staircase at the east end of the club-house. The idea, which was a new one then, has often been acted upon since. Owing to its adoption, a member can live in as well as use his club. In the case of the Reform, the plan

had the further advantage of reducing the sum paid as rent, as these chambers, which have always been in great request, produce an amount equal to two-thirds of the 968*l.* payable to the Crown as ground-rent.

When the Reform club-house was half built, its erection was on the point of being suspended. The foreman of the works called upon Mr. Martin Thackeray, a member of the finance committee, and told him that, if additional funds were not immediately put at his disposal, the workmen, numbering sixty, would be discharged. It was then the Long Vacation, and only two other members of the committee were in London: they were Lord Marcus Hill, the Liberal Whip, and Mr. Edward Ellice. These three gentlemen resolved to incur a personal liability rather than suffer the erection of the club-house to be retarded for a day; and they went to the club bankers, Messrs. Cocks & Biddulph, giving their personal guarantee for the advances necessary to continue building operations. A part of the building was opened for the reception of members on the 1st of March, 1841. It is a club tradition that the first member who entered on the morning of that day and breakfasted there was Mr. Charles De la Pryme.

Whilst the members occupied Gwydyr House, the Crown passed from King William the Fourth to Queen Victoria. On the afternoon of the 28th of June, 1838, the day of the Queen's coronation, the members gave a grand entertainment at which two thousand persons were present. Shortly after their club-house in Pall Mall was opened, they gave a reception in honour of the Duke of Sussex, the uncle of the Queen, and one of the original members of the club. The loyalty of the reformers has been manifested in other ways. The first piece of statuary placed in the hall of the club-house was a marble bust of the Queen, this bust being placed in so conspicuous a position that it is the first object which meets the visitor's eye on entering the hall. In later days, the portraits of Earl Russell and Viscount Palmerston, two of Her Majesty's greatest Ministers, were placed on either side of her marble bust.

Some time elapsed, however, after the opening of the club-house, before it was completed and furnished. The ground-floor was alone finished when the members were first admitted. Though so much remained to be done, the sum of money expended was very large—being 83,600*l.*, and being more than double the cost of any club-house up to that time. Much of the outlay was due to the thoroughness with which the architect did his part. Barry designed the furniture as well as the building. This was a far more expensive way of furnishing a club-house than ordering ready-made furniture, but it had the advantage of increasing the beauty and artistic effect of the whole. The prediction of Mr. Ellice was fully verified: the reformers secured for themselves a much finer club-house than the members of Brooks's.

The founders of the Reform desired to do more than provide its

members with a club-house such as should surpass any other then built as a piece of architecture; they were equally anxious to provide every possible comfort and luxury for the benefit and gratification of the members. Foremost amongst the advantages which they hoped to offer to the members was a library of which they might be as proud as of the club-house itself. In this matter they followed the example of the founders of the Athenæum, who looked forward to bringing together such a collection of books as should make the club renowned—a project in which they have perfectly succeeded. Though several London clubs have collections of books, the Athenæum and Reform are the only ones which possess really important libraries, such libraries as are indispensable to the scholar, the politician, the statesman, and the man of letters.

Barry had designed two of the largest rooms in the Reform for the reception of books—the one on the ground-floor being the Parliamentary library; another, on the first-floor, being the general library. On the 18th of November, 1841, a sub-committee, which had been appointed to make arrangements about the library, met and passed the following resolution:—

That as one of the objects contemplated at the establishment of the club was the formation of an extensive and complete library, especially on all political and Parliamentary subjects; and as the rooms appointed for its reception are now ready, the committee deem it expedient to take immediate measures for attaining an object so important to the ultimate prosperity of the club. That, therefore, a circular, be addressed to all the members, earnestly inviting them to aid the committee in this object, by presenting to the club maps, books, pamphlets, and documents—more particularly political and Parliamentary; all such will be of importance and value—the first object being the formation of an extensive and complete library of reference.

This sub-committee recognised that it was not enough to collect a mass of books, it being indispensable that a good plan should be followed in arranging and cataloguing the books. They took the advice of Mr. Vardon, then librarian to the House of Commons, and of a member of the club, Mr. Panizzi, of the British Museum. Panizzi drew up an elaborate plan for classifying the books and forming a catalogue, and this plan, which was gladly adopted by the library committee, has been strictly followed.

The library grew rapidly, the members vying with each other in making donations of books or of money wherewith to buy them. Ten years after the opening of the club-house it was found that the space provided for housing books was far too limited; and then it was resolved to convert the drawing-room—the largest and handsomest room in the club-house—into the principal library. In 1880, the collection of books numbered 40,000 volumes. It was resolved that the catalogue should be printed for circulation amongst the members. The printed catalogue is a large octavo of 622 pages, and its contents are varied as well as rich, consisting of the best books in English,

French, Italian, and German—in short, of the classics in the ancient and modern languages. Of topographical works the library has a large number, and the collection of pamphlets is very extensive, consisting of upwards of five thousand, many being extremely curious and valuable. In such a library there is little room for those curiosities of literature upon which the book-collector lays great store, yet there are several rare books in this one, the most notable being a first folio Shakespeare, presented by a member of the club.

Whilst the erection of a splendid edifice and the creation of a valuable library had a leading place in the scheme of the founders of the Reform Club, they were also desirous of making it attractive to those who set greater store upon good cooking than upon the most artistic building and the choicest books. The first cook engaged by the club contributed largely to making the club famous. This was Alexis Soyer, who entered the club's service in 1837, and under whose supervision the kitchens of the club-house were constructed.

Soyer's career had many romantic elements in it. He was born in 1809 at Meaux-en-Brie, where the cheese of that name is made. One of his brothers was brought up as a cook, another as a cabinet-maker; at the age of nine he became a chorister in the cathedral, and he was destined to be a priest. He objected to entering the service of the Church, and he succeeded in having his own way by playing so many tricks as to make his parents and relatives conclude that he was unfitted for the clerical vocation. In 1821 he was sent to Paris, where he was induced, by the example and counsel of his eldest brother, to become a cook. He served a regular apprenticeship to the culinary art, and made such rapid progress that, at the early age of seventeen, he was appointed chief cook in a large restaurant, with twelve cooks under his orders. Though his merits as a cook were recognised, he was not satisfied with his avocation. He had a good voice; he sang well; he was an excellent mimic, and he longed to become an actor. However, he yielded to his brother's persuasions against going on the stage. In 1830 he was appointed second cook at the Foreign Office, where he was engaged in preparing a sumptuous banquet to be given by Prince Polignac after the publication of the *Ordonnances* preceding the Revolution which drove Charles the Tenth into exile and seated Louis Philippe on the throne. The mob attacked the Foreign Office and invaded the kitchen, where the hungry rioters swallowed what they could and destroyed what they could not devour. The cooks fled for their lives. Two were shot dead. Soyer sang the *Marseillaise*, and his life was spared. He went to London, where his eldest brother was chief cook to the Duke of Cambridge, and served under his brother. He was afterwards in the service of the Duke of Sutherland, the Marquis of Waterford, and the Marquis of Ailsa. In 1837 he was appointed chief cook to

the Reform Club, and he entered upon his duties in the temporary premises at Gwydyr House. His first notable feat was preparing the great entertainment, already referred to, which was given on the day of the Queen's coronation. At that time none of the clubs had cooks of great note, with the exception of Crockford's, where Ude presided over the kitchen. It soon became known that a cook of extraordinary talent was at the Reform, where the kitchens had become one of the sights of London. Lord Melbourne visited them one day, and said to Soyer, 'How is it you have such a number of pretty female assistants?' His reply was neat and pointed, 'My Lord, we do not want plain cooks here.'

In addition to acting as cook, Soyer became an author, publishing the *Gastronomic Regenerator*, which had a great success. The critics eulogised, and the public bought the book. Within a year, upwards of 2,000 copies at a guinea each were sold. The book had been composed in the course of ten months. A review of it in the *Times* contains the following interesting passage:—

Talk of the labour of a Prime Minister or Lord Chancellor! Sir Robert Peel is not an idle man. Lord Brougham is a tolerably busy one. Could either, we ask, in the short space of ten months—ten 'little months'—have written the *Gastronomic Regenerator*, and furnished 25,000 dinners, 38 banquets of importance, comprising above 70,000 dishes, besides providing daily for 60 servants, and receiving the visits of 15,000 strangers, all too eager to inspect the renowned altar of a great Apician temple?

In 1847, when the distress was severe in Ireland, Soyer was commissioned by the Government to proceed to Dublin and establish a model soup-kitchen there. He succeeded in proving how much nourishing food could be prepared at a small cost. In the course of five months he supplied 2,863,187 pounds weight of well-cooked solid food for the sum of 7,768*l.*; had the old plan been in operation the cost would have been 15,536*l.* In the following year he established a model soup-kitchen in Spitalfields, where much distress prevailed among the weavers. Soyer's great merit as a cook was to be able to provide the daintiest or the plainest dishes in the most perfect fashion and at the lowest possible price. Once he was commissioned to furnish ten members of the Reform with the best dinner that he could possibly devise. The cost, exclusive of wine, was four guineas a head. A single dish cost seven guineas. These things were noised abroad, and the skill of Soyer as a cook contributed to enhance the fame of the Reform as a club.

When the Reform Club was first established it was contemplated that members should be allowed to entertain their friends. At the Carlton, hospitality to strangers has never been permitted. But the reformers made a mistake at the outset which they had to remedy before they had been long in the occupation of their club-house. This mistake consisted in framing a rule to the effect that the friends

entertained by members must be reformers also. Yet this rule was not much more restrictive and indefensible than one of the earliest rules of Brooks's, which was to the effect that 'any member of this society who shall become a candidate for any other club (old White's excepted) shall be *ipso facto* excluded and his name struck out of the book.'

The determination of the committee of the Reform Club in 1850 to allow members to entertain their friends daily instead of twice a week caused Soyer's resignation that year. He was afraid lest the members would suffer on account of the influx of strangers. His resignation was accepted with regret, as is shown in the following extract from a letter to Soyer written by Lord Marcus Hill, chairman of the committee:—

In reply to your letter, the committee have unanimously desired me to assure you of the great reluctance with which they accept that resignation; and to express to you the high sense which they entertain of your very valuable past services, as well as of the zeal, ability, perfect integrity, and uniform respectability of conduct which you have devoted to the well-being of the club during a period of nearly thirteen years' duration.

During Soyer's engagement at the Reform Club, and after its close, he did much to keep his name before the world. Besides writing the *Gastronomic Regenerator*, he invented a Magic Stove, he concocted a beverage which he styled 'Nectar,' and a sauce to which he gave his own name; he invented a model kitchen, and he tried to found a college for the teaching of 'domestic economy.' He prepared a sectional view of the kitchens of the Reform Club, and he sold 1,400 copies of them at a guinea, coloured, and half a guinea plain. After leaving the club his services were in request to prepare banquets on a large scale, and he did this with entire success in London, Exeter, and York. When the Great Exhibition of 1851 was opened he converted Gore House into a 'Universal Symposium.' In the course of the five months the Symposium was open as many as a thousand persons dined there daily; the receipts amounted to the large sum of 21,000*l.* and the expenses to the still larger one of 27,000*l.* Why this should have occurred was a mystery to Soyer. In 1855 he volunteered to go to the Crimea with the view of improving the culinary arrangements there. The Government of the day gladly accepted his offer. He effected great improvements in the manner of feeding the army. He remained till the end of the war, and on his return he received a present of money, in addition to his pay, to mark the appreciation of the authorities of the services he had rendered. He was asked by the Barrack and Hospital Commissioners to revise the dietary of the military hospitals, and he did so, to the great advantage of the patients. He died of an internal malady in 1858, when in his fiftieth year. He was an active and energetic man who was much talked of whilst he lived. If he chiefly

contributed to make the Reform Club famed for the excellence of its cookery, his connection with the club as its first and most famous cook will long keep his memory in remembrance. Francatelli, who left the service of the Queen to become cook at the Reform, was as able a cook as Soyer; but he failed to please the club so well.

The banquets at the Reform Club have sometimes been events of great political and public importance. The most noteworthy deserve a brief notice. The first was given on the 3rd of July, 1846, to Ibrahim Pacha, the son of Mehemet Ali, with whom we had been at war, but with whom we wished to cultivate amicable relations, and this banquet was regarded as a token of the general feeling. The *Times* pronounced it 'the best which any club ever gave.' Lord Panmure wrote to the effect that the bill of fare was worthy of *the great Soyer*. Shortly before the hour appointed for the banquet, the under-cooks threatened to strike, and Soyer had to exert himself not only to persuade them to do their duty, but to work in order to make up for the delay which had been caused. The members present numbered 150. Commodore Sir Charles Napier was in the chair and proposed many of the toasts; but one of the most important—the health of Mehemet Ali—was proposed by Palmerston, who also responded when 'the health of Her Majesty's Ministers' was drunk. The last toast but one was 'the health of the Lord Lieutenant, and prosperity to Ireland;' to which Sheil responded. It is curious to recall what that great patriot and orator said about his native land and its prospects forty years ago; the following passage has special interest now:—

The prosperity of Ireland was not long ago scarce the object of a hesitating hope, it has become an object of almost confident expectation. A new era has commenced. Forty-six years have elapsed since the Minister of one country purchased the Parliament of the other, and during those forty-six years, no matter how ponderous the fetters which the Minister had fabricated for Ireland, the Parliament of England took a disastrous course and with alacrity hastened to put them on. But, at last, a great innovation has taken place. The House of Commons has at length interrupted the monotony of oppression—a general conviction begins to prevail that it is only by conciliation that Ireland can be successfully governed. Of what character should that conciliation be? It should be large and comprehensive—it should embrace every wrong—it should consist of concessions, flowing largely and abundantly from the deep fountain of your justice, instead of being, from a sense of your necessities, drop by drop, ignominiously squeezed out. The pacification of Ireland is almost the last thing left for a Minister to accomplish.

Palmerston was the guest at the next great banquet, which took place on the 20th of June, 1850. This was given in honour of the victory when his foreign policy, which had been challenged and condemned in the House of Lords by a majority of thirty-seven, was approved and supported in the House of Commons by a majority of forty-six. Writing to his brother a few days afterwards, he said that 'two hundred and fifty members of the Reform Club have invited me to a

dinner next Saturday to celebrate my victory, and if we had not thought it better to limit the demonstration to a small scale, the dinner would have been given in Covent Garden Theatre, and would have been attended by a thousand people.' Mr. Bernal Osborne presided and proposed Palmerston's health in a most effective speech, concluding by presenting to him an address of congratulation from the members of the club. Palmerston's reply was a condensed exposition of the principles of foreign policy which he desired to prevail; he declared that 'The guiding objects of the policy of the Government with regard to our foreign relations have been the interests of England, interests which have their beginning in the well-being of this country, and which in their progress comprehend the well-being of every other country.' He maintained that, without acting as knights-errant in the cause of liberty, it was the right and duty of English statesmen to sympathise with nations struggling to be free, and to aid them as far as could be done without endangering the peace of the world. The last toast, proposed by Mr. Maurice O'Connell, was 'Civil and religious liberty all over the world.' The exclusion of the Jews from Parliament was signalled as a disgrace. Baron de Rothschild responded. If some of those who drank the toast could revisit the earth they would be pleased to see many Jewish members of the House of Commons, and a Lord Rothschild sitting in the House of Lords; while they might be surprised to find amongst the Jewish members of Parliament some of the warmest adherents of the Conservative party which so long kept the doors of the House of Commons closed against persons of their race and faith.

Palmerston was in the chair when, on March 7, 1854, the Reform Club gave a banquet in honour of Admiral Sir Charles Napier, who sailed in command of the Baltic fleet a few days afterwards. The most remarkable speech was not that of the chairman, proposing the toast of the evening, though he was never in a happier vein, nor the reply of Sir Charles Napier, though it was very interesting, but it was the speech of the chairman in proposing a toast which, he remarked, had never been proposed 'since the days of the Crusaders.' This toast was 'the allied English and French fleets and armies.' Both the chairman and Sir James Graham, the First Lord of the Admiralty, praised Sir Charles Napier for his foresight as well as his bravery; the general public considered the compliments well deserved; the *Times* commended the club for giving the banquet, but thought it right to recall the admonition of the wise man, 'Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off.' The wisdom of the warning was exemplified by results. When Sir Charles Napier returned from the Baltic no one was disposed to entertain him at a banquet.

In April 1864, Garibaldi visited England, and he was received with an enthusiasm which was almost overpowering; the demonstra-

tions in his honour taxed his strength so greatly that he had to shorten his stay. He was made an honorary member of the Reform Club, and he was present at a luncheon there on the 21st of April. Ladies were admitted that day to the club. The chorus of Her Majesty's Theatre volunteered to attend; the offer being accepted, the Garibaldi Hymn was given by them in a magnificent style under the leadership of Signor Arditì. Lord Ebury presided at the luncheon, which was really a sumptuous dinner given at an early hour, and he made a most complimentary speech to the great and magnanimous Italian patriot. Garibaldi's reply was delivered in English, and with much feeling; as it is short as well as interesting I may quote it in full:—

My gratitude to you for the great sympathy you have for me I think is very great; but I cannot express my feelings of gratitude for your kind sympathy to my poor country. I am almost an Englishman now, and certainly I am very proud to be so, and I invite you to a toast 'to the prosperity of my adopted country,' and I pray you to receive my thanks for your kindness. Never in my life will I forget the kindness I have received in this illustrious association.

The last of the great banquets which I shall notice took place on the 22nd of February, 1879. It was given in honour of the Earl of Dufferin, and in special acknowledgment of the brilliant and successful way in which he had acted as Governor-General of the Canadian Dominion. At none of the previous banquets did the list of speakers include so many illustrious members of the club and of the party. Earl Granville presided. The other speakers were Mr. W. E. Forster, the Marquis of Ripon, Lord Clarence Paget, Lord Waveney, Mr. Richard Baxter, the chairman of the club, Sir William Harcourt, the Duke of Westminster, the Earl of Rosebery, Sir Henry James, and the Marquis of Hartington, then the leader of the Liberal party. That the entertainment was very imposing and satisfactory was acknowledged by Mr. Baxter, who, in returning thanks for the toast of the Reform Club, said that he had been 'a member of the club forty-five years, and that out of the four or five similar entertainments which he remembered this was the most brilliant.'

In addition to these grand banquets many minor ones have been given to distinguished personages. But these can be called minor only in the sense that they were given in the strangers' dining-room instead of the club coffee-room, and that the members present were smaller in number; yet neither the compliment nor the comfort was lessened by the lessened scale of the entertainment. Amongst the many which might be named, it may suffice to mention those given to General Grant and to Midhat Pasha when they visited England.

The lavish hospitality of the Reform Club has made its name famous throughout the world. Moreover, the rules for the admission of strangers to honorary membership are most liberal; any foreigner

who is personally known to a member, and is a fit and proper person to join such a club, can easily find admittance to honorary membership for a month and to ordinary membership for a year. Those who are settled and reside in any British colony or dependency are also eligible for the like privilege; while foreigners who have resided in this country for three years, and who are in sympathy with the Liberal party, are eligible to become ordinary members for life.

Several changes have been made in the mode of electing members during the half-century of the club's existence. The number of members has also been altered. Sixteen of the original members still survive, and they must be more struck with such changes and alterations than any of those who are solely acquainted with things as they are.

At the outset the members numbered one thousand, exclusive of members of either House of Parliament and foreigners of distinction. At that time candidates who were members of Parliament were elected by the committee, while other candidates were elected by a general ballot of the club. Later, it was resolved that the total number of members should be fourteen hundred, that all candidates should be elected by the club, but that members of either House of Parliament should have precedence. Twenty years ago a council of forty elected candidates, and this was the practice for three years. It is noteworthy that the Reform is the only political club in London on either side of politics in which the election of candidates is not entrusted to a committee.

The Reform was originally managed by a committee of thirty.¹ The only surviving member of this committee is the venerable Viscount Eversley. Now, in addition to four trustees, there is a committee of fifteen to manage 'the general concerns of the club;' a political committee of fifty to manage 'the political affairs of the club,' and a library committee of five to whom 'the management of the library is referred.' I shall dispel a widespread delusion when I state that the political committee distribute no money and act merely as a board of conciliation and arbitration, their efforts being directed to promote harmony amongst the sections and members of the Liberal party, and to give good advice when asked.

¹ The names of the first trustees and of the first committee were thoroughly representative; it may interest some persons to read them. The trustees were—the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Mulgrave, the Earl of Durham, the Right Hon. Edward Ellice, M.P., and General Sir R. Ferguson, M.P. The committee consisted of H. A. Aghonby, M.P., Alexander Bannerman, M.P., Walter Campbell, M.P., William Clay, M.P., John Crawford, M.P., Edward Divett, M.P., Viscount Ebrington, M.P., Edward Ellice, George Grote, M.P., Joseph Hume, M.P., Henry Kingscote, M.P., Charles Shaw Lefevre, M.P., Henry Shaw Lefevre, Denis Le Marchant, William Marshall, M.P., Sir William Molesworth, Bart., M.P., James Morrison, M.P., Daniel O'Connell, M.P., O'Connor Don, M.P., Barry O'Meara, Hon. C. A. Pelham, M.P., Edward Pendarves, M.P., Edward Romilly, Sutton Sharpe, E. J. Stanley, M.P., Robert Stewart, M.P., Edward Strutt, M.P., Henry Warburton, M.P., H. G. Ward, M.P.

After flourishing for fifty years the Reform has amply fulfilled the design of its founders. It has now many rivals, but it is still, what it was at the beginning, one of the best clubs in London, if not in the world. As a club-house it remains a masterpiece. Foreign as well as home critics are at one on that point. The plans were so highly valued that they were reproduced in the French *Revue de l'Architecture* in 1857, and they were commended to the close attention and serious study of French architects. In an artistic sense the French writer's praise is just and discerning, but his acquaintance with localities is peculiar. After stating that Piccadilly is nearly as familiar to French readers as the Palais Royal, he says that the chief London clubs are situated in Piccadilly and that the Reform is the principal ornament of that street.

A handsome and deserved tribute to Barry as the architect of the Reform club-house was paid to him by Digby Wyatt, on the 21st of May, 1860, before the Institute of British Architects, when he said that the Reform exemplified how 'the most minute attention to comfort and the satisfactory working of utilitarian necessities, are compatible with the exercise of the most delicate sense of refinement and the hardihood of genius.'

Every original member of the Reform who has survived till its jubilee can appreciate the completeness of the architect's design far better than those who saw it immediately after the doors of the club-house were first thrown open for their reception. In this building, as in an Italian palace, the sculptor and the painter were expected to adorn and perfect the architect's design. Year after year since the building of the club-house the places appointed by Barry for the purpose have been filled with the busts or portraits of members of the club who were notable reformers.

On entering the club-house the most conspicuous object, as I have already stated, is the marble bust of the Queen as she appeared to gladden the eyes of her people at the beginning of her memorable reign. To the right, when looking towards this charming bust, is the portrait of Palmerston when he was prime minister, and on the left is that of Earl Russell when well advanced in years. Turning one's back upon these portraits, one sees on the opposite side facing Palmerston the portrait of the Marquis of Westminster wearing the robes and insignia of a Knight of the Garter, while a portrait of Daniel O'Connell faces that of Earl Russell. One of the other two sides is graced with portraits of Lord Saye and Sele and Mr. Denison, and between them, on a high pedestal, is a marble bust of Mr. Gladstone. On the opposite side, the portrait of Macaulay faces that of Lord Saye and Sele, and the portrait of the Right Hon. C. P. Villiers faces that of Mr. Denison. The bust of Mr. Gladstone and the portrait of Mr. Villiers have been specially exempted from the rule that no member of the club is to be honoured with a place in

its gallery of busts and portraits during his lifetime. Within the hall proper and at each of its four corners are the marble busts of Cromwell and Brougham, of Cobden and Palmerston, the bust of Palmerston representing him as he appeared at that stage in his career when he bore without objection or repining the nickname of 'Cupid.'

In the gallery on the first floor the portrait of Earl Grey, the Premier in the first Reform Administration, is flanked by those of the Earl of Durham and of Lord Sydenham and Toronto, the latter being the only English peer who bears a title borrowed from an English colony. In a niche close at hand is a bust of Daniel O'Connell. A bust of Hampden separates the portrait of Edward Dilke, the originator of the club, from that of Cobden, one of its greatest ornaments. The portrait of the Duke of Sussex, the most accomplished and liberal member of the Royal Family, is in the centre of another side of the gallery, while that of the third Lord Holland immediately adjoins it, the Lord Holland upon whom Macaulay passed a splendid eulogium, and whose own noble ambition was to do nothing to disgrace his position as the nephew of Charles James Fox, and the friend of Charles, Earl Grey. The portrait of Brougham fills a space near which there is a vacancy that may soon be filled with the portrait of the lamented W. E. Forster. On the same floor the marble bust of Charles James Fox stands in one room, that of Milton in another, while the portraits of the Earl of Dalhousie and Bernal Osborne hang on the walls of a third. A vacant space between Cobden and the Duke of Sussex could not be more appropriately filled than with the portrait of Mr. John Bright. Returning to the ground floor, the portrait of Thackeray, an early member of the club, hangs on the walls of a room there between the busts of two other esteemed members of the club and ardent reformers, Charles Buller and Sir William Molesworth. Nor have reformers on the other side of the Atlantic been forgotten. In a small reception room there is a large bronze medallion showing the profiles of Washington, Lincoln, and Grant, and below it is a facsimile of the Declaration of Independence. Several omissions may be noted. Chief among them is the absence of a portrait or bust of Viscount Melbourne, who was a member of the club from its foundation till his death, and who, as the Queen's first Prime Minister, rendered special service both to her and the State. The philosophical Radical and famous historian George Grote has been forgotten, while Sir William Molesworth, his fellow-labourer in the same field of politics, has been remembered. From the beginning of the club till now it has numbered among its members the principal conductors and editors of the Liberal press in London and throughout the country. No bust or portrait of any of these notable men is to be seen in the club-house, yet some of them, such as the late Mr. Russel of the *Scotsman* and the late

Mr. Delane of the *Times*, well merited any posthumous honour which the club can bestow.

The original members of the Reform Club were intensely proud of it, and they laboured diligently to render it attractive in all respects. Their successors have quite as good reason for cherishing the same feeling, and for striving to maintain unimpaired the high and widespread reputation of their magnificent club.

W. FRASER RAE.

WHENCE CAME THE COMETS?

ALTHOUGH the astronomer has achieved many successes in studying comets, yet these objects still remain outside the surveyed fields of astronomy—now, as in the old days when men spoke of sun and moon, planet and stars, as including all the members of the heavenly host. The two comets now shining in our skies illustrate the present position of cometic astronomy. They have appeared without warning, we know not whence; they have not until now been known to astronomers as travelling on recognised orbits and in definite periods; and even hereafter, though the astronomer may determine their orbital motions and calculate the time when either should return; he cannot be sure that they will not be dissipated into unrecognisable portions before that time arrives.

I do not propose to remark here upon the probable nature of comets, or upon the possible interpretation of the various phenomena they present. The only circumstance in regard to them which I shall take into account in what follows is that close relationship between comets and meteor-streams which was established in 1866 by the combined labours of Schiaparelli, Adams, and Tempel. I shall treat this kinship between comets and meteors as rendering certain or highly probable the following propositions:—

(1) Every meteoric stream follows in the train of some comet large or small, which either exists now or has been dissipated, as Biela's comet was, leaving only its meteoric trail to show where it once travelled.

(2) Every comet is followed or preceded by a train of meteors (this train has nothing to do with the comet's tail), extending over a greater or less portion of the comet's orbit, according to the length of time during which the comet has existed.

(3) All meteoric bodies, from those which exist as the finest dust to the largest meteorites, hundreds of pounds in weight, may be regarded as bodies of the same kind, differing from each other indeed in constitution as they obviously do in mass, just as planets and asteroids do, but all to be interpreted—if they can be interpreted at all—in the same general way.

We may in some degree illustrate the nature of the assumptions here made in the three following assumptions which an insect who

had observed the phenomena of rain, cloud, mist, snow, &c. might be supposed to make: (1) Every shower of rain implies the existence of a cloud; (2) every cloud implies the descent, at some time or other, of rain, greater or less in quantity and heaviness; and (3) all drops of water, from the tiniest water vesicles in a cloud to the heaviest rain drops, are of the same kind, differing only in shape or in size: snowflakes also, as formed of water particles in a changed form, must be put in the same class.

And as the insect by studying the relations which exist between clouds and rain might be led to form an opinion whence clouds come, which would tell him also (as we know) whence rain comes,¹ so perhaps may we by studying the relations which exist between meteor-streams and comets be led to form an opinion whence comets (which are meteor collections) have originally come.

The very first suggestion ever made respecting the origin of comets came, indeed, from such considerations as I have mentioned above. Schiaparelli, to whom we owe the happy guess, and the beginning of its confirmation as a useful truth, that meteors are bodies following in the tracks of comets, threw out the idea that comets, regarded as flights of meteors, may be travelling in multitudes through the interstellar depths, and be from time to time drawn out thence by the attraction of our sun. He pictured our sun, in his swift rush onward with his train of planetary attendants, as coming into ever-fresh regions of comet-strewn space. A comet or meteor flight drawn towards him by the sun would approach the solar system on a path which may be described as casual. It might cross the general plane near which all the planets travel at any point, the chance that that point would lie near a planetary orbit being very small indeed. Supposing the point where the meteor flight crossed that important plane—the life plane of the solar system—to be on or near a planetary orbit, the chance would still be very small that the meteor flight would cross there at a time when the planet to which that orbit belonged was near that particular point. The chances would, in fact, be millions of millions, or rather of billions, to one that the meteor flight would visit our solar system without coming near any planetary body, in which case it would pass out from our solar system again, never to return to it.² But, if a meteor flight did chance to come very close indeed to a planet of adequate mass, the flight might,

¹ To us, who know how clouds and rain are really produced, this imagined inquiry of the insect may seem trivial. But man had advanced far in scientific research before he had learned anything about the source and nature of rain, hail, snow, cloud, mist, and fog. The whole subject was as completely mysterious, for example, to all the writers whose works were included by the Jews among their sacred books (in probably *all* their ancient documents), as were the phenomena of comets, which with them were veritable angels or messengers from Yahveh.

² *Nerer*; because, by the nature of its supposed indrawing, it possessed relative motion of its own before it began to be drawn in; and the sun could not take from

said Schiaparelli, be captured. The planet might abstract so much of the comet's velocity as to leave only a balance corresponding to motion in a closed or elliptic path; and on such a path would the meteor flight or comet necessarily travel thereafter—unless, perhaps, after many revolutions of each, the planet at some subsequent encounter undid the work which it had accomplished when first it approached the comet. •

So far Schiaparelli reasoned soundly on the basis of his assumption. I say assumption of set purpose; for it is altogether a mistake to regard the idea thus thrown out by Schiaparelli as if it were a theory. His idea that meteors follow in the track of comets developed into a theory when it had been tested and confirmed by observation. But the case is different with the idea, that meteor flights are travelling amid the star depths like fish in the depths of ocean.

But Schiaparelli did not even reason quite correctly. A single meteoric mass, or even a small meteor flight, might be introduced into our solar system in the way suggested by Schiaparelli; for undoubtedly the giant planets possess the power he attributed to them, and if a body from without came near enough to any one of them, could so reduce its velocity as to change its path from the hyperbolic (or unclosed) form to an elliptic or closed orbit. And thenceforth such a body would travel around the sun systematically, on an eccentric path passing very near the orbit of the planet by whose influence it had been originally introduced into the system.

But a giant planet could do no more. It could not generate a meteor-stream in the way suggested by Schiaparelli. So soon as we test the matter by mathematical analysis, we find that very close approach would have to be made to a planet that a single body might be forced into a closed path, and it is certain that a flight of bodies large enough to produce any of the known meteor-streams would have its components very widely scattered by the planet's perturbing action, simply because the different components of the flight would be exposed to very different degrees of disturbing action. •

This I have shown mathematically, and my demonstration has not been questioned—though Professor Young, of Princeton, N.J., in admitting the validity of my reasoning, suggests the possibility that some way may hereafter be found for eluding the difficulty. But then Professor Young holds the strange idea that Schiaparelli's speculation as to the origin of comets and meteor-streams is an accepted theory; and labouring under this delusion, imagines that there *must* be some way of meeting objections to it.

But it is worthy of notice that Schiaparelli's fancy, even if accepted,

it that relative motion. He would impart motion, and take such imparted motion away again, leaving untouched the original motion.

would prove nothing about the origin of comets and meteors. To say that they came from out the interstellar depths on hyperbolic paths, is to assert what can be disproved by mathematical demonstration. But if it could be proved, what would it amount to? Merely to this—that comets which now travel on closed paths once travelled on endless paths. We are no whit nearer the explanation of their origin. If the interstellar depths are crowded with meteor flights, we have to ask whence the meteor flights came. To say that fish which have been drawn from the sea were originally swimming about in the sea, is surely not to add much to our knowledge about fish.

It may be urged, however, that comets and meteor-streams are simply the material left unused after the various solar systems in our galaxy had been formed, by processes of meteoric aggregation.

Unfortunately for this explanation, the comets and meteor systems we have to explain are precisely those which, had they existed from the earlier ages, when our solar system and its fellows were forming, would have been the first to be gathered up. For they are those which pass near the orbits of various planets, some near the orbit of Jupiter, some near that of Saturn, or of Uranus, or of Neptune, and about four hundred which pass near the orbit of our earth. These comets, with their associated meteor systems, would have had less chance of escape than any others, during the millions of years belonging to the formative processes of our solar system. Yet those are precisely the comets and meteor systems which we chiefly need to interpret.

Suppose that, instead of making mere guesses, we consider actual facts, and open our eyes to the views suggested by them.

I take first the millions of meteors encountered by the earth each year, and the hundreds of earth-crossing meteor systems already recognised. Taking for our guide proposition (1), we are led to the conclusion that in remote ages there were hundreds, if not thousands, of comets whose tracks crossed the track of the earth, or at any rate approached very near to it. That some of these comets thus crossed the earth's track casually, that is through mere chance coincidence, we may well believe. Nay, this is known, as will presently be seen. But if *all* did, then must there have been millions of millions of comets in remote times, to account for so many chancing to cross the earth's track;—with this startling circumstance to be considered in addition, that ninety-nine out of a hundred of those whose paths did not cross the earth's track have entirely disappeared, while a considerable proportion of those which do cross that track (and which, therefore, have been exposed for millions of years to an extra risk of destruction) remain.

This idea we may safely reject. But if we do, then we have to account for a special earth-crossing family of comets and meteor-streams, without going outside to look for the origin of such bodies; for the moment we go outside we encounter the difficulty which has just driven us from any merely casual interpretation.

In other words, we must look to the earth herself to explain the great majority of these earth-crossing systems.

In this way Meunier and Tschermak were driven to look to the earth herself for the origin of meteorites. Proposition (3) above enables us to extend their reasoning, specially directed to particular classes of aerolites, to all classes of such bodies, to all meteors, down even to the tiniest falling star, only visible perhaps in the field of a powerful telescope. Not all these bodies, but a goodly proportion, must have been generated in some specially terrene manner.

We have actually no possible way of explaining the terrestrial origin of any meteors but in volcanic outbursts. Moreover, we are obliged to set the time when such outbursts took place very far back in the past, seeing that at present the volcanic forces of the earth, even as manifested at Krakatoa recently, possess nothing like the power necessary for the ejection of matter beyond the range of the earth's back-drawing power. Looking, however, at the immense extrusive power of the volcanoes of the tertiary era, when basaltic lava covering hundreds of thousands of square miles to a depth of from 1,000 to 14,000 feet were poured forth, we can conceive the still mightier energies of volcanoes in the secondary era, their still more tremendous power in the primary era, and so, passing backwards to millions of years beyond the first beginnings of life on the earth, we can even picture to ourselves volcanoes ejecting matter with velocities of ten or twelve miles per second. With such velocities flights of ejected particles would pass beyond the earth's attraction, and if she were the only body in the universe, such ejected matter would travel away from her never to return.

But, although such expelled bodies would never return to the earth, they would not escape from the solar system. To drive them for ever away from her, the earth would have to impart a much larger velocity—an average of about twenty-six miles per second. The greater number of the expelled bodies would travel thenceforth on an orbit round the sun, crossing the earth's track at or near the place where they were first sent forth from their parent planet.

One may almost say that this origin of many meteorites and meteor systems is forced upon us by the evidence. Still it would be negatived if we found that volcanoes do not eject matter at all resembling meteorites in structure. The reverse, however, is the case. Ranging the products of volcanic ejection in order according to the amount of iron they contain, and ranging meteorites in like manner, we find the two series coinciding over the greater portion of the longer—the volcanic series. We might not indeed have known how closely the most ferruginous volcanic products resemble the iron meteorites in structure but for the accident that Nordenskjöld discovered a mass which he mistook for an iron meteorite, but which is found now to be really a volcanic ejection, akin in structure to the

field of basaltic lava (at Ovivak on the shores of Greenland), in the midst of which it had fallen while the lava was still plastic to retain this missile as it fell after its flight through many miles of air.

We may, therefore, regard the terrestrial origin of many meteorites as highly probable, if not in effect demonstrated.

Here Tschermak and Meunier pause, as also does Ball, who thus far had followed them. The last named does not even ask, in that singularly interrogative and irresponsive work the *Story of the Heavens*, whether we may not go further.

For my own part I find in this result the first step in a most interesting and suggestive path of inquiry.

Regarding a large proportion of the material visitants of the earth as originally earthborn, we may conclude that in the remote time when our earth was a baby world, sunlike in condition, her path was traversed by hundreds of comets, her own progeny. These comets were followed severally by their trains of meteoric attendants. They were exposed to the action of those solar forces by which, within the last half-century, a once promising member of another comet family became dissipated until it finally lost altogether its cometic character. Millions of years ago, probably, every one of them had been thus broken up until nothing remained but the streams of meteoric bodies, travelling round the orbit which had once been that of the earth-ejected comet.

But this being the case with the earth, was the case also no doubt with every planet. Even our little moon, whose scarred face still shows signs of the volcanic energies she once possessed, played her part in giving birth to such comets as she was equal to. If she possessed less volcanic power than the earth (at the same stage of the life of each), she required less power to eject matter for ever from her interior. On the other hand, the giant planets required greater power; but then they also possessed it. If Jupiter, for example, required power enough to eject bodies with a velocity of forty or fifty miles per second, yet it must be remembered that he is 310 times as massive, and therefore 310 times as strong as our earth. (For matter, 'inert matter' as many choose to call it, measures in reality the strength of the orbs in space, and not only possesses power, but a power acting so swiftly across vast distances that the velocity of light is rest by comparison. Moreover, this power possessed by 'inert' matter is the source of every form of energy of which we know, even of life itself.) So with the other giant planets.

Jupiter, then, and each one of his giant brethren, must during its sunlike stage have possessed the comet-ejecting power. Each giant planet must have had its comet family, at that remote time in the history of the solar system. And the comets thus formed by the giant planets, while no doubt very numerous, must, many of them, have been far more important than those to which our earth gave

birth. Those comets would have lasted much longer, before dissipation due to solar disturbances set in. Then, also, the sunlike state of the giant planets must have lasted long after the earth and all the terrestrial planets had passed that stage. For being so much larger, the giant planets must have longer lives—the stages of planetary life being in effect stages of cooling. In fact, there are clear signs that neither Jupiter nor Saturn has cooled down to the earth's condition; each is still too hot for the waters of its future seas to rest on its fiery surface. On this account also, then, we might expect to find that some comets, sprung from giant planets and forming their families, might have remained even to the present time.

Turning to the solar system, we find that this actually is the case. Nay, I myself, long before I had the least thought of attributing comets to planetary eruptive energies, had described the comets which hang about the orbits of the giant planets as 'The comet families of the giant planets.' Some of the members of these families are among those from which the association between meteors and comets came first to be known. For instance, the meteors of November 13–14 (the *Leonides*) are associated with a comet depending on the orbit of Uranus; and the meteors of November 27–28 are associated with a comet depending on the orbit of Jupiter—Biela's famous comet.

Of course the members of these comet families are exceedingly old. How old they are we cannot tell; but that they are very old indeed is shown by the way in which, while they are unmistakably associated with the paths of the several giant planets, their orbits yet diverge far enough from those of their respective planet parents to indicate hundreds of thousands of years of perturbing action, unless indeed in some cases we may suppose that not the slow perturbing action of bodies at a distance, but the very active influence of some orb coming very close to a comet may have shifted the comet's path. So many of their orbits pass through the widely spread zone of asteroids, that we may very well imagine occasional very close approach to one or other of these bodies, and consequently a considerable change of orbit. It was thus that Sir John Herschel for a time tried to explain the disappearance of Biela's comet; 'may it not,' he said, 'have got entangled in the zone of asteroids, and have had its course altered by the influence of one of these bodies?'

Encouraged by the confirmation of the expulsion theory of comets, which we have found at this our first step, may we not boldly proceed yet one step further?

The stars, like the giant planets, should have their part to play—a grander part of course—in the world of comet expulsion. They differ only from the giant planets, nay from the earth herself, in being in a different part of their orb life. It is probable, indeed, that among the stars there are orbs differing much less from Jupiter or

Saturn than either of these still hot and fiery planets differs from the earth. Of course an orb like our sun, the one star we are able to examine, will require much greater energy to expel from his interior a flight of bodies, to become presently a flight of meteors or a comet, than would a planet even of the giant type. Our sun, for example, would have to impart a velocity of 382 miles per second to a body ejected from his interior, that that body should pass away from his control for ever. But the sun possesses the required power. His mass, and therefore his might, exceeds that of the earth more than 320,000 times, that even of Jupiter 1,048 times.

We have no means of recognising by its orbital motion a star-expelled comet or meteor flight. But we need not seek for bodies to tell us of expulsion, ages on ages ago. The stars are *now* in their sunlike state. They must therefore be doing such work *now*, if there is any truth in the theory to which we have been led. Now there is one of the stars which is near enough to be asked whether it really possesses and uses such expulsive power—our own sun. His answer is unmistakable. In 1872 and at sundry times since, he has been caught in the act of ejecting bodies, probably liquid or solid, through the hydrogen atmosphere around his globe, with velocities so great that the matter thus expelled from his interior can never return to him—the velocities ranging to 450 miles per second at the least. What he is doing now he has doubtless done for millions, nay for tens of millions, of years in the past. What he has thus done, his fellow-suns the stars, thousands (if not millions) of millions in number, have doubtless done also. Uncounted billions then of ejected meteor flights or comets must be travelling through interstellar spaces, visiting system after system, flitting from sun to sun, in periods to be measured by millions of years.

The answer then to the question, Whence came the comets? would appear to be:—

(1) Comets which visit our system from without were expelled millions of years ago from the interior of suns.

(2) Comets which belong to our system were mostly expelled from the interior of a giant planet in the sunlike state, but a small proportion may have been captured from without.

(3) The comets of whose past existence meteor-streams tell us were for the most part expelled from our earth herself when she was in the sunlike state, but some of the more important were expelled from the giant planets, and a few may have been expelled from suns.

RICHARD A. PROCTOR.

*MR. DONNELLY'S SHAKESPEARE
CIPHER.*

ONE of the most remarkable features in what is known as the 'Baconian movement,' and to those who believe in the solidity of its foundations one of the most significant, is the large number of persons to whom the idea has suggested itself independently of the conclusions of others. There are not a few among the party which entertains the confident belief that Bacon was the author of the works which have come down to us under the name of Shakespeare, who, at the time when their suspicions were developed by further research into full conviction, believed that they had then for the first time lit upon the discovery, and only later learned, in some cases by mere chance, that others had been pursuing parallel but entirely independent paths which issued upon the same conclusion.

But, whereas the grounds upon which the adherents of this theory in England and Germany have hitherto based their belief may all be considered either internal or external testimony of the common type, the latest development of the movement is concerned with evidence which is not to be classed under either of these two heads in its ordinary sense. Till lately the confidence of the believers has rested upon the results—to speak in the most general terms—first, of a comparison of the works of Shakespeare with those of Bacon, and secondly, of an examination of the career and correspondence of the latter. A new light has suddenly burst upon the subject. What appears to be confirmatory evidence of an entirely novel nature is announced from beyond the Atlantic, and the 'Baconians' are startled by a report the confirmation of which they would be able to hail as a proof, no less final than unexpected, of the validity of their independent conclusions. It comes in the shape of a declaration from Mr. Ignatius Donnelly, of Hastings, Minnesota, ex-Member of Congress, that he has discovered, running through the Plays, a Cipher narrative in which Bacon claims their authorship, giving also a detailed account of a considerable portion of his own life and of the Court history during the period of his rise and greatness.

Too much prominence cannot be given to the fact that the 'Baconians' do not rely upon this Cipher for the unflinching belief

which they accord to their theory. Their convictions were established and their numbers on the steady increase before ever this astounding announcement reached England, and, as far as their creed is concerned, it is only as a most gratifying confirmation of the truth of their conclusions that they welcome the report of this discovery. But from another point of view it is to them an invaluable ally. They consider, and with reason, that the addition of this piece of evidence to that already published in Europe will, owing to its peculiar character, swell their numbers more rapidly than would otherwise be the case; for it must be borne in mind that the evidence already existing in this country and in Germany is of a nature that does not necessarily appeal to any not conversant with the life and writings of Bacon, whereas the Cipher, when published, will, through its comparative simplicity, enlist a far greater number of recruits to their ranks. Mr. Donnelly's work will shortly have reached a stage sufficiently advanced to enable him to make public in detail the methods and results of his task, which is at present known of by few, and by the majority of them through rumours only. It will then be easily within the reach of all; whereas a conviction based on the other evidence can only be attained after considerable labour. Another point that arises in connection with the two classes of evidence—for the ordinary internal and external may for this purpose be classed together—is the obvious fact that, whereas the Cipher must be either entirely conclusive or an unmitigated fraud, that already existing, through its essential character, does not stand or fall all in one piece. It is the collection of the independent work of several minds, and the discovery of a flaw in any one item of the evidence in no way affects the credence due to the rest. This will be plain to those conversant even with such proportion of the case for the 'Baconians' as is to be found in the writings already published on the subject from time to time. In other words, Mr. Donnelly's contribution to the Society's polemic literature is of a mathematical nature, and dependent each step on each for its validity; while that which it has come to supplement is circumstantial, and it is for each individual jurymen of the public to decide for himself how far the total of its items is to be considered conclusive. The 'Baconians' claim, however, and apparently with much reason, that, though the total eclipse of Mr. Donnelly and his work would not in any way injure their position, founded beforehand on evidence of an utterly different nature, yet that the establishment of the indisputable truth of the Cipher method would outweigh all arguments of whatever nature on the other side—that is its reward in case of victory for the uncompromising audacity of its claims.

Although for a full understanding even of the Cipher portion of the total evidence—such of it as is here stated—some knowledge of the rest is requisite, any reference to the latter that can be dispensed with will be rigorously excluded. That is, or shortly will be, avail-

able in its entirety to those interested, and the mass is far too large to justify even a near approach except when absolutely necessary. The following pages will be confined to a notice of the methods and results, as far as he has at present made them known, of the worker who has now been so long engaged over this Cipher.

Let it be at once stated that the key to its solution is not yet forthcoming. Mr. Donnelly writes that only after immense labour he has discovered it, and that its application to the Plays is a very slow and tedious operation. And he has not yet made such progress in the deciphering but that if the whole rule were to be given others might be able to anticipate the publication of his work. What he has at present thought it safe to divulge are the observations which first roused his suspicions and the confirmatory evidence which his researches brought to light. These will probably appear to many inadequate and far-fetched, but Mr. Donnelly has his own reasons for withholding at present a detailed statement of his case.

He had long been a 'Baconian,' and had thus taken a more than ordinary interest not only in the Plays, but also in the acknowledged works of Bacon. It struck him as curious that, while Bacon lived in an age when the state of the political and social world had habituated public men to an extensive use of cipher, there was no evidence on record in any of his biographies that he ever made any use of an art which he had taken the pains to acquire. For that he devoted considerable labour to the subject we learn from his philosophical writings, in which he not only dwells on the great usefulness of secret means of correspondence, but also gives samples and rules for the best kind of cipher work. For the perfect cipher he lays down that

the highest degree is to write *omnia per omnia*; which is undoubtedly possible, with a proportion quintuple at most of the writing infolding to the writing infolded.¹

Again—

The infolding writing shall contain at least five times as many letters as the writing infolded;²

and there follows a specimen of a cipher

which I devised myself when I was at Paris in my early youth, and which I still think worthy of preservation; for it has the perfection of a cipher, which is to make anything signify anything.

This is based on the rule just given.

With these passages he compared the following, which occurs in a notice of the 'enigmatical method' of delivery:—

¹ *Advancement of Learning*, ii. (in Spedding, Ellis, and Heath's edition, 1857, vol. iii. p. 402).

² *De Augmentis*, vi. l. (S., E., & H., vol. iv. p. 445).

This method was itself used among the ancients, and employed with judgment and discretion. But in later times it has been disgraced by many who have made it as a false and deceitful light to put forward their counterfeit merchandise. The intention of it, however, seems to be by obscurity of delivery to exclude the vulgar (that is, the profane vulgar) from the secrets of knowledges, and to admit those only who have either received the interpretation of the enigmas through the hands of their teachers, or have wits of such sharpness and discernment as can pierce the veil.³

Other passages of a kindred nature are to be found throughout his writings.

Having here not only a proof that Bacon was in this respect no exception among the statesmen of his day, but also what he took to be an encouraging though dark hint that his suspicions were well founded, Mr. Donnelly set to work to discover, if possible, a cipher in the Plays. The immediate reason of his applying himself to this department of Bacon's writings seems to have been his inability to believe that the writer of such works would for ever renounce them, and his opinion that in the Plays themselves would most probably be found the assertion of his authorship of them. He turned to the Folio of 1623, which Grant White had pronounced, in his edition of Shakespeare, to be 'the only authentic form in which the text of his dramatic works has reached us.' In this volume, while intending to investigate the matter of the text in the light of the above remarks on cipher work, he made discoveries of an entirely different nature.

The condition in which the Plays are presented to us in the Folio had been a source of amazement and regret to many generations of commentators, but nothing more satisfactory had been suggested by way of explanation than that it 'must be attributed merely to the lack of proper editorial supervision.' This is the conclusion of Grant White after an enumeration of the 'defects and blemishes' that disfigure 'that precious volume.'⁴ Mr. Donnelly's investigation resulted in his discovering, in addition to the items enumerated by Grant White (unless indeed these are the 'minor errors' referred to by the latter), what he characterises as 'irregular paging, arbitrary italicising, meaningless bracketing, and senseless hyphenation.' Now the book is known to have been brought out at great cost, and was evidently intended to be a first-rate edition of the Plays. Is it conceivable, argued Mr. Donnelly to himself, that the editorial supervision should have been carelessly conducted? Surely those

³ *De Augmentis*, vi. 2 (S., F., & H., vol. iv. p. 450).

⁴ He remarks (vol. i p. cclviii), 'Besides minor errors, the correction of which is obvious, words are in some cases so transformed as to be past recognition, even with the aid of the context; lines are transposed; sentences are sometimes broken by a full point followed by a capital letter, and at other times have their members displaced and mingled in incomprehensible confusion; verse is printed as prose, and prose as verse; speeches belonging to one character are given to another; and, in brief, all possible varieties of typographical derangement may be found in this volume, in the careful printing of which the after world had so deep an interest.'

who put forth so expensive a volume would have been at the pains to make it perfect in such common matters as are concerned with typographical correctness. If there is one thing in which printers are careful, it is the paging of the work which they do. This is not the author's work but the printer's, and surely the printer would have been called to sharp account for any incorrectness in this branch of his art. Can the irregularities in this respect and in the use of the italics, brackets, and hyphens be with any semblance of plausibility attributed to the carelessness of the editors? Is it not a far more natural supposition that this extraordinary derangement in matters so simple was the result of deliberate and jealously carried out intention—that these irregularities were purposely inserted? And is it not at least a fair hypothesis that these may in some way contain the key to the Cipher? The *De Augmentis* was published in the same year as the Folio. Is it altogether unwarrantable to suggest that in the simultaneous appearance of these two works Bacon with one hand presented to the world a locked-up secret, and with the other a key by means of which that secret could be unlocked? Would not this most amply justify the words of Sir Tobie Matthew, who, in a letter to Bacon, answering one which accompanied the gift of a 'great and noble token' of his 'Lordship's favour' (believed to have been a presentation copy of the Folio), remarks, 'The most prodigious wit that ever I knew of my nation, and of this side of the sea, is of your Lordship's name, though he be known by another'?'⁵

Such were the pregnant thoughts that at this time suggested themselves to Mr. Donnelly. It must be remembered by those who now hear of his work for the first time that, owing to his long-standing conviction that the Plays were Bacon's work, the notion did not appear to his mind one of extraordinary audacity.

The following are instances of the four points referred to:—

(1) The *pagination* of this volume is as follows: The Comedies come first, and are paged consecutively to page 303. Then follow the Histories, beginning again at page 1. Page 100 sees the end of the text of *II. Henry IV.* Two then follow unnumbered. Then comes *Henry V.*, beginning suddenly on page 69. *Henry VIII.* ends on page 232, and is succeeded by *Troilus and Cressida*, the third page of which is numbered 79, and the fourth 80. Here the pagination abruptly ceases, the remaining twenty-five pages of the play following unnumbered. Then comes *Coriolanus*, starting afresh with page 1. Soon after the beginning of *Hamlet* page 156 is followed by page 257, and from this number the pagination proceeds consecutively to the end of the volume, except that the last page of all, which follows 398, is numbered 993.

⁵ For this letter in full and its circumstances, see Holmes' *Authorship of Shakespeare*, pp. 172 ff. (3rd edition, New York, 1875).

(2) With respect to the *italics*, it must suffice here to quote one instance of their inconsistent use. Proper names are as a rule italicised, but sometimes, when no rational explanation for the change suggests itself, they appear in Roman type. Perhaps the most remarkable instance is to be found on page 56 of the Histories (*I. Henry IV.*). There the name 'Francis' occurs five times in italics and sixteen times in Roman letters.

(3) The irregularity in the use of *brackets* is well seen in comparing pages 70 and 71 and pages 72 and 73 of the Histories, in which occur respectively one and three bracketed words, with pages 74 and 75, immediately following, where there are eighty-six. For another example reference may be made to page 53 of the Comedies. *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is here in progress, the page containing the end of Act iii. and the beginning of Act iv. A study of this page will give a good idea of the curious use both of italics and of brackets.

(4) *Hyphenation* is most irregular and unaccountable throughout the volume. For instance, in *I. Henry IV.*, Act II., Scene 1 (page 53 in the Folio), Gadshull is made to remark—

I am ioyned with no Foot-land-Bakers, no Long-staffe
six-penny stokers, none of these mad Mustachio-purple-
hu'd-Maltwormes, but with Nobility, and Tranquilltie.

Again, in *II. Henry IV.*, at the end of the Induction (page 74), we read—

From *Rumours* Tongues

They bring smooth-Comforts-false, worse then True-wrongs.*

On pages 74 (a two-thirds page) and 75 occur twenty-one hyphens; on the two preceding them, 72 and 73 (a half page), are five. (This is reckoned excluding six that occur at the ends of the lines in prose diction on pages 72 and 73. There is no prose on 74 and 75.) How far the appearance of any of these is natural must be left to the judgment of each reader.

Mr. Donnelly was also struck with the strange use of capital letters. This needs no illustration to any one who has ever studied one page of the Folio carefully. Mr. Donnelly was, however, particularly interested in this matter from noticing the fact that in all the four places where the word 'Bacon' occurs in the Plays it is found with a capital letter.⁷ It will be noticed that these four passages are all in close connection with scenes to which Mr. Donnelly's attention had been called through other peculiarities. Further research convinced him that in suspecting the capitals throughout the volume he had hit on a true light.⁸

* There are none of these antics in the corresponding passages in the Quartos

⁷ The references are *Merry Wives of Windsor*, iv 1, *I Henry IV.* ii. 1; *I Henry IV* ii 2 (twice—once in the composition 'Bacon-fed')

⁸ For the use of capitals in Shakespeare cf. the remarks of Mr. Allan Park Paton in his (*Hamnet*) edition of *Macbeth* (Edinburgh, 1877).

With a mind fully bent upon the discovery of a secret the existence of which he now considered proved, Mr. Donnelly commenced a series of laborious experiments in order to satisfy himself as to whether or not, and if so in what manner, the curious features which the Folio presents were connected with the cipher which he believed the Plays to contain. He writes to a correspondent in England—

I counted up all these peculiarities and set myself to consider how they could be used as factors in the problem. After some experiments I obtained the following results: I found that in many cases where some remarkable word, such as 'St. Albans' or 'Bacon,' is in the text, that word is reached by multiplying the number of the page at which the scene begins by the number of italic words in the first column of that page.

For instance, on page 53 of the Histories (*I. Henry IV.*) there are seven italic words in the first column. $53 \times 7 = 371$. The 371st word is 'Bacon.' On page 67 (same play) the first column contains six words in italics. $67 \times 6 = 402$, and the 402nd word is 'St. Albans.'⁹ These are two significant instances out of many given by Mr. Donnelly.

He seems to have found further encouragement in the fact that there are several individual pages in the volume in which more than one peculiarity of strong suggestiveness occurs, as though to attract the attention of the reader. Thus the page 53 just referred to contains, to start with, the strange hyphenation in Gadshill's speech, the word 'Bacon' with a capital letter, and 'Nicholas' twice. On the next page are found 'Exchequer' twice, 'Bacon,' and 'Bacon-fed,' and on page 52, in that portion of the page which is exactly opposite to Gadshill's speech on page 53, the words—

And now I will unclasp a secret book,
And to your quick-conceiving discontents
I'll read you matter deep and dangerous,
As full of peril and adventurous spirit,
As to o'erwalk a current, roaring loud,
On the unsteadfast footing of a spear¹⁰

Mr. Donnelly considered this simile forced. It may appear so or not to others, but Mr. Donnelly states that subsequent researches have convinced him that it was only introduced to bring in the word 'Speare,' the latter half of 'Shakespeare.'

Again, on page 53 of the Comedies, already referred to as illustrative of the irregular use of brackets and italics, the word 'Bacon' is found in a most irrelevant scene in a most irrelevant pun, based on a story which is told, perhaps by Bacon himself, of his father, Sir

⁹ The accuracy of these statements, as well as that of the others made by Mr. Donnelly and quoted here, may be verified by anyone who can give an hour to the study of the Folio.

¹⁰ The spelling &c in this passage, being for this purpose unimportant, have been modernised. The last word appears as 'Speare'

Nicholas.¹¹ This scene does not occur in the Quarto of 1602. Nor does what Mr. Donnelly terms the 'very forced and unnatural construction' on page 54, where the jealous Ford is made to strike himself on the forehead and cry 'peere-out, peere-out;' nor, again, the description on page 56 of Herne the Hunter, who

shakes a chain
In a most hideous and dreadful manner.

The occurrence of these two words 'shakes' and 'peere' under these circumstances is also among the observations which in the mass have been so much encouragement to Mr. Donnelly.

It will now be seen that his researches proceeded upon a rule based on the mutual relations of the paging, the brackets, the italics, and the hyphens of the Folio text. This implies that these irregularities were inserted in manuscript for reproduction in the text, and that the proofs of the latter must have been submitted to their author for correction at the risk of rendering necessary a re-setting of a large portion of the type. This is a tremendous assumption indeed, but even for this there is something to be said. In the first place, the corrections would amount to nothing more than the addition or deletion of one or two hyphens or brackets, in case there was a word too few or too many in the page or the column; and in the second place Mr. Donnelly is content to wait until the publication of the Cipher with its workings and results will reduce this consideration from the rank of an objection to that of an eternal source of amazement. That this would be the case in the event of his establishing the genuine nature of his assertions seems clear, for that the Cipher should be true is not impossible, while that a continuous story should be mathematically worked out of the Plays by means of a consistent use of a non-existent Cipher is, by any known or conjectured law of chances, plainly out of the question.

With respect to this matter of the addition and deletion of hyphens &c. in the proof sheets, an examination of the text will show that these do not really present the difficulties that at first appear inevitable. Hyphens might have been inserted between words which have such an original connection that their typographical junction would not create suspicion to the ordinary reader; this is

¹¹ *Apophtegms*, S, E, & H, vol. vii p. 185:—'Sir Nicholas Bacon being appointed a judge for the northern circuit, and having brought his trials that came before him to such a pass as the passing of sentence on malefactors, he was by one of the malefactors mightily importuned for to save his life; which, when nothing that he had said did avail, he at length desired his mercy on account of kindred. "Prithce," said my lord judge, "how came that in?" "Why, if it please you, my lord, your name is Bacon, and mine is Hog, and in all ages Hog and Bacon have been near kindred that they are not to be separated." "Ay, but," replied Judge Bacon, "you and I cannot be kindred except you be hanged, for Hog is not Bacon until it be well hanged." It is of no importance whether or not the anecdote is given by Bacon himself.

rendered more likely by the fact that words in some cases appear so joined in one place while in another they stand separate, as 'fore-tells,' first-born,' 'death-bed.' It seldom happens that the necessities of the case produce such striking irregularities as that quoted above from the Induction to *II. Henry IV.*, where the words are the last of their page, as if the corrector had been on this occasion hard driven to make the numbers come right. An italic more or less can be secured by adding or omitting once the name of the interlocutor. Brackets are not so easily managed, and hence the more noticeable is their arbitrary use.

Mr. Donnelly reports other extraordinary discoveries. Agamemnon's speech containing the reference to the 'Masticke' jaws of Thersites (*Troilus and Cressida*, i. 3) does not appear in the Quarto, but is in the Folio inserted in the middle of the speech of Ulysses. This word commentators have generally altered into 'mastiff.' Mr. Donnelly assures us that it forms part of the word 'satire-o-masticke.' In the description of Falstaff's death in *Henry V.*, ii. 3, the Folio reading (p. 75 of the Histories) is 'for his Nose was as sharp as a Pen, and a Table of greene fields.' (This passage does not appear in the Quarto.) Theobald's emendation is now generally accepted—'and 'a babbled of green fields.' Mr. Donnelly declares, 'There was a necessity to speak in that sentence of the word "table," and it had to be dragged in whether it destroyed the sense or not.'¹² 'I have found,' he says, 'scores of other instances where the sense and the words were so twisted to bring in the Cipher story, and in many cases the necessities of the Cipher compelled Bacon to make his characters talk nonsense in passages that have puzzled commentators from that day to this.'

The above is an outline of what Mr. Donnelly has up to the present thought it safe to make known with reference to the origin and progress of the work of deciphering. It certainly is not much, but for reasons already given he declares that he cannot yet publish the whole rule. People must wait until he is out of danger of being forestalled, in the meantime taking what he says on trust.

The multiples are, he writes, not the most important part of the Cipher. They do not bring the words out in their order. The transposed words have to be rearranged in proper order according to another system, which it took him two more years to discover. When the rule is published, it will prove 'to be so simple and clear that any one with a reprint of the Folio can decipher the Plays for himself.'¹³ To his correspondent in England he writes enthusiastically—

¹² It is, however, considered not improbable that 'mastiff' and 'babbled,' or 'talked,' were the words originally written, and that Bacon foresaw that commentators would easily hit upon them.

¹³ Besides the large and expensive reproductions, there is one in reduced facsimile

It is a most marvellous piece of work. The ingenuity used in constructing it is as great a subject of wonder to me as the genius manifested in the Plays has been to the world. . . . He seems to have written it, as it were, reckless of the trouble it would give him to work the words into the Plays—that is, *the Plays were bent and twisted to conform to the Cipher, not the Cipher to the Plays.*

Later:—

I find it almost hopeless to attempt to give you a due impression of the marvellous nature of this Cipher. You, however, if any one can, will be able to conceive the marvellous ingenuity, versatility, wittiness, and patience which are here revealed to our contemplation. Bacon's ingenuity and nimbleness of mind were a thousand times greater than his genius, though that genius was the vastest and profoundest ever known in the world. . . . It was to these Plays that Bacon alluded when he spoke of the 'pinnacle of human industry.'

This is strong language with a vengeance, but it must be remembered under the influence of what circumstances Mr. Donnelly was writing.

Again:—

As I work the marvel grows upon me, how any human brain could have been ingenious enough to construct such a wonderful mosaic work. These Plays (I think I told you before) are that 'pinnacle of human industry' to which Bacon alludes, enigmatically, in his acknowledged writings, when he asks that the reader 'will not be appalled by them' (I quote from memory), 'considering the great experience that was had.' . . . The publication of the Cipher and my work will place Bacon upon an unapproachable height in human estimation, as not only the first of men, intellectually, but, as *you* know, with a vast gap between him and the second.

In another letter he refers to the slowness of the process:—

It cannot be hastily or perfunctorily performed: the miscounting of a word, the reckoning of a hyphen too little or of a letter too much will throw out the count for pages and break the thread of discovery.

In another he writes:—

I know that it is hard to believe that one set of writings could be made the vehicle of another set, but the character of the age must be remembered, an age of tyranny and suppression; and we must remember too the extraordinary character of the mind that wrote the Plays—a mind not to be measured by any ordinary standard of ability or industry.

A very interesting part of his correspondence is that in which he speaks of the results of the application of the Cipher rule to the text:—

At first, as you know, I expected no more than to find written into the Plays (perhaps a word on a page) a brief statement that Francis Bacon was their author. But as I went on the Cipher grew under my hands until I found it to be a complete and elaborate narrative, perfect in all its parts, minute in detail; containing not only a statement of facts, but a description of his own feelings in the midst of the

great troubles and dangers which surrounded him. . . . Beginning, as I chanced to do, upon the Plays of the first and second parts of *Henry IV.*, I found myself plunged into the middle of the Cipher story. You know how indignant Elizabeth was at the excitement and interest caused by the performance of the play of *Richard II.* . . .

Upon the subject of this play, the circumstances of the production of which are of such great importance to 'Baconians,' he has fortunately much to say; but this is concerned with such a wide subject that it cannot be entered upon here.

The Cipher story, he tells us, after treating of Essex's plots against the Cecils, proceeds to a minute and detailed account of Robert Cecil's jealousy of his cousin Francis Bacon and his detection of the drift and authorship of the Plays, of his confiding his suspicions to the Queen, and of the complications that ensued. On this point Mr. Donnelly has written at length to his friend in this country, quoting in full the graphic description in the Cipher of the exciting events that took place, in which Shakespeare, Burleigh, Bacon himself, and his faithful servant Harry Percy are the chief actors. This last-named person occupies a very prominent position throughout the Cipher story; he seems to have been admitted to the greatest intimacy with his master, and to have thoroughly deserved the confidence reposed in him. Shakespeare's character, antecedents, and career are dwelt upon at some length. With the utmost detail is recorded how the Queen ordered him to be arrested, and, if necessary, racked to divulge the name of the real author, and how Bacon managed to save the disclosure. It is, writes Mr. Donnelly, a wonderful story

how Bacon sent his faithful friend-servant to find Shakespeare and to get him to fly the country when the Queen gave orders for his arrest. Percy's disguise of himself; how he stooped down and embraced Bacon for the last time, as he was about to start on his mare (note the minute details) from the orchard at St. Albans; how he comforted him and told him that he would save him, Bacon meanwhile standing in the darkness and listening to the dull beats of the hoofs of his horse on the hard ground as he receded. His fondness for Percy's faithful and cheerful spirit, his feeling that only the errand of that one true man stood between him and the greatest disgrace and shame, &c. &c. The internal story will be found to be as thrilling and absorbing and as powerfully rendered as the Plays themselves. . . . The interview between Percy and Shakespeare takes place at Stratford in the presence of Shakespeare's wife and daughter. It is told with the utmost detail. The whole Shakespeare family is described, his young brother Edmund, his daughter Susanna, his wife, his sister. The very supper bill of fare is given, and a very mean one it was—'dried cakes, mouldie and ancient,' roast mutton far advanced in decomposition, the odour of which *perfumed* the room, bitter beer and worse Bordeaux stuff. The smell of the meal took away the dandy Percy's appetite. He told Shakespeare that the Queen's officers were after him, to arrest him as the nominal author of *Richard II.*, which represented the murder and deposition of the King, and which was held to be an incentive to treason. Shakespeare, Percy said, must fly to Holland or Scotland, and there abide until the storm blew over. Thereupon Shakespeare became violently abusive of Bacon—'Master Francis' he calls him—for getting him into such a scrape. 'He is,' says Percy, 'the foul-mouthedst rascal in England.' Shakespeare declares that he will confess

the truth and clear his own skirts. Thereupon came the first anti-Baconian argument. It is the parent of all later ones. Percy told Shakespeare (not, probably, as a fact, but as a threat, and to drive him from the country, so as to save Bacon's exposure) that 'Master Francis' would deny the authorship, and that the world would surely believe him and not Shakespeare. For who, says Percy, 'could conceive of one man putting the immortal glory of the Plays on the shoulders of another? Did not Shakespeare bear his blushing honours through all the disreputable houses of London? Did he not profit by the Plays? Was he not transformed in new silk and feathers, and looked upon in the low society in which he shone as the one who wrote the Plays? The Queen would ask, "Why kept'st thou silence so long?"' and much more to the same purpose. So you see there is nothing new under the sun. Harry Percy anticipated all the anti-Baconian arguments by nearly two hundred and ninety years.

After other passages of a kindred nature Mr. Donnelly sums up as follows:—

If the Cipher were nothing more than the internal history of the Plays and of Bacon's life it would be intensely interesting; but it is more than that: it is the history of the latter part of Elizabeth's reign, with all its plots and conspiracies and their effects on great historical events. As I take it, it is Bacon's appeal to posterity, and his impalement, for all the ages, of those who had so cruelly suppressed and persecuted and humiliated him. A terrible revenge! the gall and bitterness of a tortured life embalmed in poetry and the merriment of comedies. He was not only a Creator, like Providence, but, like Providence, he left his veins of secret meaning running hidden through the texture of his work. . . .

Mr. Donnelly is not unaware of the obvious objections to his demanding credence for a statement not supported by more evidence than is here produced. The reticence which in self-defence he is at present compelled to preserve will, he recognises, be held up as a proof that his assertions are one vast fraud. These suspicions he must for the present be content to undergo; but, though positive evidence must for a short time longer be withheld, he writes on this subject from another standpoint:—

Why should I assert that I have found such a Cipher—not a hop-skip-and-jump Cipher, but a mathematically accurate rule—if I have *not*? I ask no money from any one. If I published a book that was a fraud or a delusion, the few copies which might be sold before the truth was discovered would surely not compensate me for the everlasting shame and ridicule which would fall upon me. Can any one believe that I would concoct a deliberate lie, which only a few months would explode? And for what? Not for notoriety; I have enough of that already. Is it to be believed that I would imperil whatever little honour I may have gained by my exceptionally successful books *Atlantis* and *Ragnarok* by a pretended claim to a great discovery? ¹⁴

With this the public must for the present be contented—or discontented. They will probably not have to wait long for the full exposition which will ensue upon his arrival in England. He is expected here within a few weeks, but the exact time must depend upon the amount of progress he is able to make with his work.

¹⁴ These two most fascinating books are now in their twelfth and sixth editions respectively.

I hold no brief for the 'Baconians.' The above is not an enunciation of their position. As before stated, their belief is not grounded upon this discovery. Though it is perhaps hardly fair to Mr. Donnelly's contribution, which will to the general public appear of less force, standing as it does here by itself, I have been anxious not to introduce any of the evidence upon which the Society's conviction rests. Nor have any of the *à priori* objections to the theory been adduced, not from any want of recognition of their number and force, but because against them are arrayed the publications containing the rudiments of the movement, which are available in England.

To the Cipher alone the foregoing pages have been confined. Consequently it is due to the 'Baconians' to point out that those not conversant with the rest of their evidence will not only not have learnt from the above any fair notion of the nature of their belief, but also will hardly be able to approach this phase of the movement in the same spirit of preparedness as they would otherwise bring to its consideration.

PERCY M. WALLACE.

the truth and clear his own skirts. Thereupon came the first anti-Baconian argument. It is the parent of all later ones. Percy told Shakespeare (not, probably, as a fact, but as a threat, and to drive him from the country, so as to save Bacon's exposure) that 'Master Francis' would deny the authorship, and that the world would surely believe him and not Shakespeare. For who, says Percy, 'could conceive of one man putting the immortal glory of the Plays on the shoulders of another? Did not Shakespeare bear his blushing honours through all the disreputable houses of London? Did he not profit by the Plays? Was he not transformed in new silk and feathers, and looked upon in the low society in which he shone as the one who wrote the Plays? The Queen would ask, "*Why kept'st thou silence so long?*"' and much more to the same purpose. So you see there is nothing new under the sun. Harry Percy anticipated all the anti-Baconian arguments by nearly two hundred and ninety years.

After other passages of a kindred nature Mr. Donnelly sums up as follows:—

If the Cipher were nothing more than the internal history of the Plays and of Bacon's life it would be intensely interesting; but it is more than that: it is the history of the latter part of Elizabeth's reign, with all its plots and conspiracies and their effects on great historical events. As I take it, it is Bacon's appeal to posterity, and his impalement, for all the ages, of those who had so cruelly suppressed and persecuted and humiliated him. A terrible revenge! the gall and bitterness of a tortured life embalmed in poetry and the merriment of comedies. He was not only a Creator, like Providence, but, like Providence, he left his veins of secret meaning running hidden through the texture of his work. . . .

Mr. Donnelly is not unaware of the obvious objections to his demanding credence for a statement not supported by more evidence than is here produced. The reticence which in self-defence he is at present compelled to preserve will, he recognises, be held up as a proof that his assertions are one vast fraud. These suspicions he must for the present be content to undergo; but, though positive evidence must for a short time longer be withheld, he writes on this subject from another standpoint:—

Why should I assert that I have found such a Cipher—not a hop-skip-and-jump Cipher, but a mathematically accurate rule—if I have *not*? I ask no money from any one. If I published a book that was a fraud or a delusion, the few copies which might be sold before the truth was discovered would surely not compensate me for the everlasting shame and ridicule which would fall upon me. Can any one believe that I would concoct a deliberate lie, which only a few months would explode? And for what? Not for notoriety; I have enough of that already. Is it to be believed that I would imperil whatever little honour I may have gained by my exceptionally successful books *Atlantis* and *Ragnarok* by a pretended claim to a great discovery? ¹⁴

With this the public must for the present be contented—or discontented. They will probably not have to wait long for the full exposition which will ensue upon his arrival in England. He is expected here within a few weeks, but the exact time must depend upon the amount of progress he is able to make with his work.

¹⁴ These two most fascinating books are now in their twelfth and sixth editions respectively.

I hold no brief for the 'Baconians.' The above is not an enunciation of their position. As before stated, their belief is not grounded upon this discovery. Though it is perhaps hardly fair to Mr. Donnelly's contribution, which will to the general public appear of less force, standing as it does here by itself, I have been anxious not to introduce any of the evidence upon which the Society's conviction rests. Nor have any of the *à priori* objections to the theory been adduced, not from any want of recognition of their number and force, but because against them are arrayed the publications containing the rudiments of the movement, which are available in England.

To the Cipher alone the foregoing pages have been confined. Consequently it is due to the 'Baconians' to point out that those not conversant with the rest of their evidence will not only not have learnt from the above any fair notion of the nature of their belief, but also will hardly be able to approach this phase of the movement in the same spirit of preparedness as they would otherwise bring to its consideration.

PERCY M. WALLACE.

THE NATIONAL INDIAN CONGRESS.

THE city of Bombay was the scene of a remarkable gathering at the close of last year. On the last three days of November a National Indian Congress assembled to deliberate upon the state of India, and, after full discussion, to embody their wishes in a series of resolutions for the information of the people and Government of Great Britain. In taking to itself the designation of 'National' the Congress accurately described its character. Representatives were there assembled from Calcutta, Madras, Poona, Allahabad, Lahore—in a word, from every part of British India. The proceedings were conducted throughout in the English language. The speeches, while clear and explicit upon the urgent need of various reforms, were characterised by a spirit of genuine loyalty to the established order of things; and the resolutions, as I hope to show presently, were remarkable not less for their practical sagacity than for their moderation. The Congress broke up with the determination to re-assemble—but this time at Calcutta—on the 28th of December, 1886. Now, this Congress is, to my mind, one of the most extraordinary occurrences that are to be found during the period of British rule in India. Many may dislike it, but it would be the merest folly to under-rate its profound importance. It is like the handwriting on the wall of Belshazzar's palace. It shows that the time has passed when the paternal despotism we have hitherto maintained in India could satisfy the new life and the new desires which the English language and English literature have breathed into the population. The voices which tell us of this great fact are altogether friendly. The debt of gratitude is freely admitted, and they only call upon us to worthily complete the work which has been begun. It rests with the people and their leaders in this country to determine the character of the response that shall be given to the appeal thus made from India.

The first resolution 'earnestly recommends that the impending inquiry into the condition of India should be entrusted to a Royal Commission, the people of India being adequately represented thereon, and evidence taken both in India and in England.' So far as the nomination of a Royal Commission is concerned, this resolution

has been anticipated by a refusal. The Ministry has decided to be guided by former precedents, and to entrust the inquiry to a parliamentary committee. There can be no question that a Royal Commission would have been the better and more efficient machinery. At the same time it is essential to point out that if the inquiries of the committee are carried on according to the practice hitherto, they will be almost useless. The evidence taken before the parliamentary committees of 1853 is contained in about a dozen bulky volumes, and was obtained almost wholly from English officials employed either in India or at the India Office, then located in Leadenhall Street. A few missionaries were also examined; but of the people of the country there were no representatives beyond three or four Parsees from Bombay. And yet, even in those days, those who make it their business to go through this voluminous evidence will find that by far the most valuable portions of it are contained in the appendices, in the form of petitions drawn up by native associations at the chief presidency towns. I would draw the especial attention of the student to one from the inhabitants of the town of Madras, giving a truly doleful picture of the fortunes of that presidency since it was privileged to enjoy the 'inestimable blessings of British rule.' The neglect of native evidence in 1853 was a serious misfortune then; to ignore it now would be a political crime.

The Indian National Congress has also expressed its desire that evidence should be taken in India as well as England; and this is a matter of the greatest importance. The conveyance of native witnesses from India to this country will heavily increase the costs of the inquiry, and even if carried out on the most lavish scale will only inadequately achieve the object desired. There are, it is true, a great number of highly educated and representative men in India who will not be deterred by scruples of caste or other hindrances from coming to this country; but there are also many—and these witnesses of a perfectly indispensable kind—who will be so deterred. An inquiry into the condition of India will be a very imperfect and unsatisfactory affair which does not include within its scope the state of feeling in the independent native states, and their political relations with the supreme power. Those best fitted to furnish information upon these points are men like Sir Dinkur Rao, Sir Salar Jung, Sir Mahdava Rao, and others whose position and occupations render it impossible for them to come to England. In British India, also, there are scores of native gentlemen held in the highest esteem among their countrymen, distinguished for their ability, their knowledge, and their public spirit, but who, from one cause or another, could not leave India.

Resolution No. 2 records that, 'in the opinion of the Congress, the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, as at present constituted, is the necessary preliminary to all other reforms.'

Personally, I cannot but rejoice at this frank expression of opinion. I believe that I may claim to be first in the field in drawing attention to the anomalous and inconvenient character of this singular body, and in advocating its dissolution. Its extreme unpopularity in India with all classes—officials, unofficial Europeans, and the people—is notorious, and the reason of it easy to divine. Either the members of the Indian Council do, or do not, exercise a prevailing authority over the Secretary of State for India. If they do not—if, as some people allege who ought to know, they are little more than very highly paid clerks—then clearly the sooner that such a costly and superfluous body is dissolved the better. If, on the other hand, they *do* determine the policy of the Secretary of State, on what ground is the judgment of the India Council held to be of higher authority than the judgment of instructed official opinion upon the spot? The probability is that the former alternative is the more correct of the two. The members of the Indian Council—such of them at least as are retired Indian officials—are doubtless content, for the most part, at the close of a laborious life, to draw their twelve hundred a year, and live very much at their ease in Zion. But the world has no evidence of this.

And practically it comes to this, that the final appeal in all matters Indian is supposed by the people of Great Britain and India to rest with a secret and irresponsible conclave of fifteen retired Indian officials. No institution could be imagined more repugnant to the spirit of British politics than this, and the profound hostility with which the princes and people of India regard it is most natural and inevitable. The Parliament of Great Britain is the tribunal to which the people of India look in all cases of collision between them and the Indian bureaucracy; but by this singular device of an Indian Council we have contrived to build up a second dead wall of officialism, an inner line of defence so to speak, beyond which the petitioners for Parliamentary interposition feel that they are unable to force their way.

Resolution No. 3 states that in the opinion of the Congress it is 'essential that the Supreme and Provincial Councils should be rendered largely representative, that all budgets should be referred to these councils for consideration; their members being, however, empowered to interpellate the Executive in regard to all branches of the Administration.' This particular change I have already advocated in a pamphlet on *The Poverty in India, and its Remedies*. Its expediency can hardly be denied by any one outside the ~~unlimited~~ official circle. There are very few subjects connected with British rule in India on which we find two Indian officials in agreement; but there is one on which I believe that they are practically unanimous, and that is, that legislation in India is always legislation in the dark. It is impossible to ascertain beforehand with any degree of complete-

ness or certainty either the wishes of the people or the probable consequences of the proposed legislation. And why is this? Simply because we have not called in the advice and assistance of the leaders of the people. There is no question here of the comparative ability of Englishmen and Indians. The knowledge of the Indian is altogether indispensable to the good government of the country. It is not only unjust to the people, but it is in the highest degree prejudicial to ourselves, to go on educating Indians to a knowledge of their political disabilities, to inspire them with political ambition by making them aware of their own abilities, and yet to provide no field for the intellectual activities that we have roused from sleep. The educated Indians are fully aware of the great importance of introducing a representative element into the Supreme and Provincial Councils. At the Congress, as elsewhere, they laid greater stress upon this than admission to the Covenanted Civil Service, and in so doing they exhibit true political insight. Representative government is the parent of all political reform, and, as Mr. Banerjee pointed out in a speech upon this subject, the constituencies from which to obtain fitting representatives are ready to hand. They will, to quote his words,

consist of the local bodies which Lord Ripon's scheme of local self-government has called forth into existence. They will comprise the public bodies, such as the chambers of commerce, the trades associations, the British Indian Association, and other similar associations. Let these constituencies send their members to the Legislative Council. With reference to the local bodies, I would suggest that the municipalities of district towns should each send a member to the Legislative Council, or that all the municipalities of a district in conference assembled might select a member to represent them in Council. The whole country, with all its districts, would thus be represented. Local and national self-government would thus be interwoven together, and the independence of the local bodies would be secured. The office of municipal commissioner would thus be a passport to still higher distinctions. With regard to the powers and functions of the Council, I would say that they should have some control over finance, and should be invested with the right of interpellation. The right of interpellation is a valued privilege. It will be useful to the Government, it will be the safeguard of popular rights. If there are unfounded statements in the newspapers, the Government will have an opportunity of clearing them away. If there are erring magistrates, guilty of high-handedness, the right will soon enable the popular leaders in the Council to call them to account.

Resolution 4 demands that greater facilities should be granted the people of India for admission into the Covenanted Civil Service. I regret this resolution. The time seems to have arrived for the gradual extinction of this exclusive service and the breaking down of the walls of partition which divide what are called 'subordinate' services from the higher. The urgent need of economy, apart from all other considerations, imperatively demands that the Civil Service, as a separate body, should cease to exist, because not until this has been done will it be possible to proportion the salaries of public servants

to the resources of the country which they govern. And not only in the Covenanted Civil Service do sound policy and equity require a larger introduction of the native element: the need for it is much more urgent in the subordinate services, and what may be described as the 'non-political' branches of the Administration. In the 'protest' against the Income Tax Bill, drawn up by the Indian Association of Calcutta, I find the following remarkable statements:

Lord Ripon recorded a resolution which distinctly laid down that at least one-fourth of the appointments in the junior grades of the Survey Department should be held by natives of India. The Committee notice with regret that not a single appointment has yet been made in favour of a native of India under the terms of the resolution. In November 1879 Lord Lytton recorded a resolution in favour of the appointment of natives to the higher ranks of the Railway Traffic Department. 'It should be clearly understood (observed this resolution) that all posts in the revenue establishment of State railways are open to natives of India; and as men in every respect qualified for the superior grades are found, the Government of India will be glad to receive from local administrations recommendations for this employment in suitable positions;' yet to this time not a single native of India has been appointed to the office of traffic or of assistant traffic superintendent.

Attached to this 'protest' is a statement showing the proportion in which Indians and Europeans are to be found in various branches of the Administration, which is highly instructive as showing the manner in which State patronage is distributed in British India. I have not room to give the statement entire, but I select one or two typical examples. The Bengal Opium Department is one to which no political character belongs, and where Indians, one would think, could hardly fail to be more efficient than Englishmen, and yet in this department no native can be nominated to an office with a salary beyond 100 rupees a month; and as a matter of fact, no native is in it at all. In the Postal Department the highest salary attached to the service is 2,000 rupees a month: the highest which a native of India can get is 600 rupees. In the Preventive and Salt Department the highest salary attached to the service is 1,000 rupees a month: the highest which a native of India can get is less than 100 rupees. In the Jail Department the highest salary is 2,000 rupees a month: the highest which a native of India can get is less than 100 rupees. And so on through all the departments. It is manifestly absurd to pretend that this profoundly unjust allotment of State patronage is occasioned by the lack of fit men among the children of the soil. The Indian delegates who visited this country a few months ago were, I take it, average specimens of the class to which they belong—the class, I mean, which has addressed itself with a kind of passion to the acquisition of the English language; and who that saw these men can doubt that they were fitted, both by ability and natural integrity, for the discharge of responsible public duties?

The fifth resolution runs as follows: 'That in the opinion of this Congress the proposed increase in the military expenditure of the

Empire is unnecessary, and, regard being had to the revenues of the Empire and the existing circumstances of the country, excessive.' This resolution refers to the proposed increase of thirty thousand men to the Indian Army, and the construction of an entrenched camp in the Pisheen Valley, which, it is calculated, will raise the Indian military budget to nineteen millions a year. In 1856-57 the cost of the Indian Army was 12,781,916*l.* It is now 16,975,750*l.* exclusive of the cost of the proposed increase. In other words, the military expenditure has grown by about four millions and a quarter in the course of thirty years, and is still in a state of rapid expansion. The extra two millions are due exclusively to our Afghanistan policy; and no provision has yet been made for the defence of the frontier of Upper Burmah. As the Burmese will not submit to the exact discipline of our military service, the troops for the protection of the new province will have to be got by an increase of the Madras Army, and this, with the cost of erecting barracks, fortifications, and other military works in Upper Burmah, will in all probability increase the Indian military budget to the gigantic total of twenty millions.

The sixth resolution states :

That in the opinion of this Congress, if the increased demands for military expenditure are not to be, as they ought to be, met by retrenchment, they ought to be met firstly by the re-imposition of customs duties, and secondly by the extension of the license tax to those classes of the community, official and non-official, at present exempted from it, care being taken that in the case of all classes a sufficiently high taxable minimum be maintained.

The Government response to this resolution has been, not a retrenchment of expenditure, but the imposition of an income tax assessable upon incomes of 500 rupees a year derived from other than agricultural sources. Lord Dufferin's defence of his revived impost is, that it compels the English in India, official and non-official, and the wealthier classes among the natives to contribute to the expenses of the State; and had it been confined to these classes, I, for my part, should have been heartily glad to see it established as a permanent source of revenue. I am convinced that we should hear very little about a 'spirited foreign policy'—about the sacred duty of extending the blessings of British rule over new countries—about 'the keys of India'—about all those subjects, in fact, which provide honours and emoluments for military men and a pleasant excitement for readers of newspapers—if the adventurous spirits who counselled these undertakings were made to pay for them in the shape of a heavy income tax. With the English in India, a policy of aggression is a policy that is always applauded, because they reap all its advantages and bear none of its burdens, and the impregnable character of the Indus frontier would be revived as if by magic if our countrymen in India had to bear the cost of carrying it beyond that river. But the Government of India cannot adopt so audacious a financial

policy as this. In order to obtain the acquiescence of the English in a tax upon their incomes, they are obliged to extend a similar tax to the poorest among the people. They silence the clamour that would otherwise be raised, by pointing to the general incidence of the new impost. But any one who remembers the history of the income tax during the viceroyalty of Lord Mayo must feel tolerably confident that, after creating an immense amount of discontent, this tax, like the former one, will have to be repealed. In India an income tax can never be a productive tax, because about nineteen-twentieths of the population are not in the enjoyment of any incomes, great or small. But the amount of oppression practised by the income-tax assessors upon these poor and defenceless people is incalculable, and cannot be guarded against. This fact it was which induced Lord Northbrook, almost as the first act of his government, to abolish the income tax, which under his predecessor had formed a part of our Indian financial system. 'It may be true,' said the Honourable Mr. Inglis in 1871, in the course of a debate on this subject in the Governor-General's Council,

that only 1 in 300 of the people pay income tax to Government, but it is equally true that of the 299 remaining, at least one-half are subjected to the most vexatious oppression, inquisition, and extortion when the preliminary lists are being drawn up, and that a very large number of these men have to pay in order to keep their incomes out of the lists.

And again :

It is, I believe, no exaggeration to say that for every rupee that is paid into the Treasury, another is paid to the subordinate native officials; that is, that the natives of India paid last year upwards of two million pounds sterling as income tax to Government, and two millions more as bribes. Everywhere throughout the country the people are being demoralised by the tax; everywhere false returns are sent in; everywhere the trading classes are beginning to keep two sets of books—one set showing accurately the real transactions, the other containing a carefully prepared garbled account to be shown to the income-tax assessors.

The sum for which this oppressive and demoralising tax is to be reimposed upon the people of India is stated by Sir Auckland Colvin to be 700,000*l.*; and were it possible to accept this estimate as even approximately correct, the measure would be indefensible. But double that amount will not cover the impending liabilities of the Indian Government. Sir Auckland Colvin himself acknowledges that the costs of the Burmese war and the still heavier costs yet to be incurred in effecting the pacification of the province are not taken into account in the sum of 700,000*l.* And all estimates as to the cost of the railway and military works in the Pisheen Valley are certain to be far below the actual results. The income tax has been revived in order to provide the Government of India with a source of revenue which, the machinery of collection having been once prepared, may be expanded at will to meet new emergencies. But it will be in the attempt to increase the income tax, or to extend the area of

its incidence, that the Government will find itself baffled and defeated precisely as did Lord Mayo and his colleagues. The more money that the income-tax assessor is empowered to collect, the larger become the extortions which he practises for his own private advantage. In a short time there is a general murmur of complaint heard from all parts of the country; and for once, the English in India, officials not less than non-officials—a fellow-feeling making them wondrous kind—instead of attempting to ignore the outcry, use every exertion in their power to force it upon the attention of the Government. This active sympathy on the part of the ruling class naturally redoubles the vigour of the popular outcry; and the Government speedily discover that it is impossible to persevere in the collection of a tax repugnant to its own officials, and loudly denounced by both its English and its Indian subjects.

The seventh resolution, and the last on which it will be needful to make any comment, is to the following effect :

That this Congress deprecates the annexation of Upper Burmah, and considers that if the Government unfortunately decide on annexation, the entire country of Burmah should be separated from the Indian Viceroyalty and constituted as a Crown colony.

Since this resolution has been passed, Upper Burmah has not only been annexed, but incorporated with the Indian Empire, and it would be idle to expect any return upon this policy. But there is in this country so profound a misapprehension as to the effects wrought by past annexations, that it will not be without use to point out the probable consequences on the peace and solvency of our Indian Empire, of this, our latest acquisition.

When the cost of the Burmese war was under discussion in the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone cited Sind and the Punjab as instances of countries which had been annexed by the Indian Government with striking advantages to all concerned. This, I am aware, is the prevalent impression. The annexation of these two provinces has been invariably appealed to as a justification for every appropriation of our neighbours' possessions that we have made since, and yet it is easy to show that, from whatever point of view we regard these conquests, they have in their consequences been most disastrous to ourselves and the people of India. I will take the instance of the Punjab first. The one fact which, in popular opinion, justifies the annexation of the Punjab, is that when our old native army revolted, Sir John Lawrence created a new one from materials furnished by the Land of Five Rivers. But no one can suppose that the population of the Punjab entered our military service in 1857 out of pure gratitude because we had destroyed their independence. At any rate Sir John Lawrence was under no such hallucination. He acknowledges frankly enough, in more than one of his letters, that the Punjabees came forward at this crisis because they did not realise the formidable character of the

revolt. Had they done so, he said, instead of assisting in its suppression, they would have seized upon the opportunity for recovering, or at any rate attempting to recover, their lately forfeited freedom. On the other hand, there is little doubt that but for the annexation of the Punjab and Sind there would have been no revolt of the old native army. The conquest of these provinces affected for evil both the disposition of our native soldiers and the policy of Lord Dalhousie. Following as it did close upon our first mad and unfortunate invasion of Afghanistan, it sapped the fidelity of the Bengal sepoy. Until then, the Bengal sepoy had regarded the native army in which he served as a garrison for the defence of Hindostan, properly so called, and the popularity of the service was largely due to this conviction. But the policy pursued in Afghanistan, in Sind, and in the Punjab bred the suspicion in his mind that the British Government in its insatiable earth-hunger was about to use its native troops, not as a garrison of defence, but a machinery of conquest; in other words, that the sepoy would be liable at any moment to be ordered far away from his home, from a climate which suited him, to perish in wars amid a strange people, and for causes in which he had and could have no interest. On the other hand, the annexation of the Punjab, and the general acclaim with which the act was greeted in this country, enabled Lord Dalhousie to enter unchecked upon that policy of annexation which, by the alarm and indignation it created throughout India, was the direct cause of the great insurrection of 1857. The waning loyalty of the native army was still further diminished by the general discontent among the classes from which it was recruited. The annexation of Oude, in gross violation of treaties of old standing, together with the issue of the famous greased cartridges, brought matters to a crisis; and the horrors of the Well of Cawnpore, the siege of Delhi, and the defence of Lucknow, are linked in a direct sequence with the annexation of Sind and the Punjab. This is not all. The incorporation of these provinces with British India brought us into immediate propinquity with Khelat on the one side, and Afghanistan on the other, and thus led directly to Lord Lytton's invasion of Afghanistan, and to the incalculable dangers which still await us in these barren and inhospitable countries. Financially, the consequences of this extension of territory have been disastrous in the extreme. Apart from the costs of the original conquest, neither the Punjab nor Sind has ever paid its way, if we debit against the revenues derived from these provinces the cost of the twenty-four expeditions against the hill tribes on our north-west frontier, the military lines of railway that we have been obliged to construct, and the prodigious cost of holding the frontier station of Peshawur, where fever and cholera swept away our English soldiers literally by thousands.

Morally, the annexation of these countries gave a shock to the

popular belief in the good faith and rectitude of the British Government from which it has never recovered. The conquest of Sind was described by Sir Charles Napier—its instigator and executor—as an ‘act of *honest rascality*,’ and Mr. Gladstone does not attempt to defend it, but he seems to be under an impression that a sufficient ethical reason can be made out for that of the Punjab. In 1848, when the rebellion broke out in the Punjab, the British Government was the guardian of the infant Maharajah Dhuleep Singh. The native Government, as constituted by Lord Hardinge under the treaty of Lahore, co-operated with the British Government in the suppression of the revolt. It was not accused, nor, I believe, so much as suspected, of any disaffection, and from first to last all acts and operations were carried on in its name. Lord Dalhousie and the English in India were the allies of the Maharajah and his advisers; in no way their enemies. Nevertheless, at the termination of the war, Lord Dalhousie thought fit to treat the written engagements of his predecessor as so much waste paper, to depose the infant Maharajah from the throne on which Lord Hardinge had placed him, and to transform his territories into a British province.¹ A grosser abuse of power was never perpetrated. On the other hand, had we been content to leave Sind under the supervision of Sir James Outram, and the Punjab under that of Sir Henry Lawrence, not only would our moderation and rectitude have won the confidence of India (including the sepoys of our native army), but these countries would now be prosperous and friendly states—the bulwarks of our Empire, not, as they are, outlying provinces of it, which need ever new wars and new seizures of territory in order to provide for their defence.

There are, I am convinced, few of our Indian annexations which, if examined in the light of subsequent experience, would yield more favourable results than those of Sind and the Punjab. Upper Burmah assuredly will not prove an exception to this general rule. The ground has been already considerably cleared for a discussion of its probable consequences. Nobody will now pretend that we had any just cause of quarrel with Theebaw, or, in truth, any cause great or small. Nobody will now pretend that the acquisition of Upper Burmah is at all likely to be financially profitable. Nobody will assert that the inhabitants are at all desirous of being merged into the British Empire. And no one will now have the hardihood to assert that there is any chance for a great many years to come of opening up trade with the Chinese province of Yunnan. The first Burmese war cost the Indian exchequer fifteen millions of money; the second, between three and four; and this last one will not cost less

¹ Those who are desirous to get a clear understanding of the moral side of the annexation of the Punjab, and of Lord Dalhousie's policy generally, should study the writings of Major Evans Bell, more especially his *Retrospects and Prospects of Indian Policy*.

than a million sterling before the account is closed. Of these twenty millions of money, at least fifteen millions have become a permanent part of the Indian debt. For a few years, it is true, the surplus revenue of Lower Burmah has probably sufficed to pay off the interest on this debt, but that surplus will now be converted into a chronic deficit by the demands of our newly acquired territory. Accordingly, the first result of this war will be an addition of 700,000*l.* annually to the charges upon the Indian revenue. For the rest, all that we have obtained is the formidable danger of having China as our immediate neighbour. Lord Dalhousie was not a statesman remarkable for prudence or foresight, but even he, after the second Burmese war, shrank from a policy which would cause the British frontier to run for four hundred miles along with that of China. But the certainty, at no distant date, of a conflict with China is not the most serious evil likely to result from the conquest of Upper Burmah. Far more serious are the distrust and apprehension which this open violation of the policy solemnly proclaimed in the Royal Proclamation of 1858 must of necessity engender in the minds of the peoples and the feudatories of India. This distrust and apprehension will not fail to extend to our precious ally, the Ameer of Afghanistan, and the people whom he rules. In the doom of King Theebaw and his people they will read the fate that is destined for themselves.

Anticipations of this kind lead inevitably to their own fulfilment. The process is the same though now it may be exercised upon a Shere Ali, now upon a King Theebaw, and now upon an Abd-al-Rahman Khan. The independence of a people is menaced by us, or circumstances happen which create the belief that it is so menaced. Then, in order to escape this impending fate, the menaced people try to form covert alliances with some other European Power, and the presumption and treachery of such a procedure are instantly considered by us as a sufficient reason for sending an army among them, and destroying their independence. The absolute certainty that we shall act towards the Afghans as we have done to the people of Upper Burmah, is the reason why I regard with dismay the enormous expenditure upon military works in the Pisheen Valley. To the English public these works are represented as defensive in their character. They are nothing of the kind. As soon as the entrenched camp is completed and securely linked to India by the most costly railway in the world, upon one pretext or another a forward dash will be made upon Kandahar, and the millions expended in the construction of the entrenched camp might as well have been flung into the sea. It is the conquest and occupation of all Afghanistan for which our Indian officials are now engaged in making preparations, not, as they profess, for the defence of British India. And whether we in this country choose to believe this or not, we may rest assured that no other interpretation will be put upon our proceedings by the Ameer and his subjects. The annexation

of Upper Burmah will satisfy every Afghan that there is no dependence to be placed upon our professions of moderation—our bland protestations of respect for *his* independence. So long as Colonel Ridgway's Boundary Commission remains on the frontier, the Ameer will probably dissimulate his feelings, but their removal will too probably be the signal for resuming secret but cordial relations with his old friends and protectors, the Russians in Central Asia.

Therefore it is that, vast as is our present military expenditure in India, it is only the prelude of an expenditure a great deal heavier. We stand upon the brink of a financial catastrophe from which nothing can save us except a resolute reversal of the policy of annexation which has brought us into this perilous position. There is no more reason why the people of India should be burdened with the costs and responsibility of maintaining the province of Burmah than of Ceylon or the Cape of Good Hope. Burmah is not a part of India. Its people differ from the people of India in language, in religion, in appearance, in manners and habits. There is no similarity between the political and social institutions of the two countries; and the people of India, either now or at any future period, can be in no way advantaged by our occupation of Upper Burmah. Clearly, then, it seems to me that the demand that it should be detached from India and made into a Crown colony dependent upon its own resources, is an eminently just and prudent one, and would, among other good consequences, result in this, that our relations with China along the new frontier would be transferred from the fire-eaters of Calcutta to the wiser and more peaceable guardianship of a British Parliament.

JOHN SLAGG.

THE CASE OF GALILEO.

THE world has heard a great deal of Galileo. He has figured very conspicuously in controversial literature for more than two centuries. Critics unfriendly to the Catholic Church point to him as a martyr of science, a victim of spiritual tyranny; they quote his case as a specimen of the Church's hostility to science, and as proof conclusive of the fallibility both of Church and Pope. Catholics, on the other hand, say, and not without reason, that for his treatment, such as it was, Galileo had himself very largely to blame; they say that he was proud, arrogant, and overbearing, that not content with science which was his province, he was perpetually meddling in theology which was not, and that this meddling was the real cause why somewhat severe measures were taken against him—for which measures, however, neither the Pope in his official capacity, nor the Church in any sense, was responsible. But now for the first time the hero of this protracted controversy is introduced by Mr. Mivart in a capacity altogether new—that is, as affording an argument for the undoubted orthodoxy of evolution. How far this argument serves its purpose, how far it tends to confirm Mr. Mivart's position, it is my present purpose to consider.

In the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for December 1884 I wrote a criticism of Mr. Mivart's theory. I said very little of the general theory of evolution, my object being to consider the theological aspect of the theory as applied to man. To this special aspect of the question my attention was called by a controversy between Mr. Huxley and Mr. Mivart, originating with an article by the former gentleman in the *Contemporary Review* for November 1871. In that article Mr. Huxley raised somewhat serious difficulties, and suggested difficulties more serious still against the harmony said by Mr. Mivart to exist between evolution and theology. I read Mr. Mivart's reply in the concluding chapter of his *Lessons from Nature*, and though my sympathies were entirely with him, I was forced to admit that he did not remove the difficulties suggested by his opponent. From those distinguished scientists, whose theological knowledge did not impress me very favourably, I turned to the Catholic theologians themselves to find what they taught with reference to the question in dispute, and the conviction very soon forced itself upon me that, whatever may be said of evolution as applied to lower

organisms, the whole weight of Catholic theological teaching was opposed to the application of the evolution theory to man. To this conviction I gave expression in the *Ecclesiastical Record*, and I did so in language studiously mild and courteous, in a manner of which Mr. Mivart has nothing to complain except that I expressed very decidedly my dissent from his assertion of the complete orthodoxy of evolution as applied to man. Now surely a champion of 'intellectual freedom' ought not to deny to another the liberty which he claims for himself; he ought to regard it as a pardonable transgression on my part that I should form an opinion for myself, and express it calmly and temperately, even though that opinion happened not to harmonise with his own. But Mr. Mivart is not disposed to be thus tolerant. He is clearly impatient of contradiction, and this is not a philosophic state of mind. In his essay in this Review for July last, as well as in letters previously addressed to the *Tablet*, Mr. Mivart has written with considerable bitterness—indeed in a tone of lofty disdain—of me for venturing to question the correctness of his conclusions. I am, it appears, 'one of the ever-recurring band of obstructives who always turn out to have been in the wrong' (p. 35). I am the heir to everything that is dark and retrograde, opposed to everything that is liberal and enlightened in the ecclesiastical policy of the past; one of those 'narrow-minded and incompetent obstructives' whose opinions need be of no concern 'to those persons who, in addition to scientific knowledge, possess some acquaintance with the history of the seventeenth century' (p. 34). Now it is easy enough for a disputant who is so minded to charge his opponent with ignorance, but it is not always so easy to establish the charge. 'Incompetent obstructives' are no doubt very objectionable people, but they do less injury to any cause than is done by indiscreet advocates. Those opinions of mine which have so displeased Mr. Mivart were not, in reality, mine at all; I took them from the best known, the most trusted theologians of the Catholic Church. I gave the very words of my authorities, and all the necessary references to their works. Some of these made the evolution theory a special study, and are quite competent to pronounce an opinion on it; one of them at least, the Abbé Moigno, was a scientist far more widely known than even Mr. Mivart himself is. Now I submit that to class such men as 'incompetent obstructives,' though it may be a very heroic way, is certainly not a wise or an effectual way of disposing of them. Personalities serve no cause, and are sadly out of place in a discussion like this, and I therefore pass Mr. Mivart's by as if unsaid, merely observing that a few sentences of calm sound reasoning would do far more to advance his cause. Mr. Mivart has met two London priests, one 'the head of a college,' who are very useful for his purpose just now. They are anti-Copernicans, and they are so because they believe the Church is committed to that doctrine by the condemnation of

Galileo. Now I may be permitted to say that I know a great many more priests than Mr. Mivart does, and I have not met even one such fossil among them. I have found them feeling on such questions as I myself feel, and I am in no sense nervous as to any possible conclusion of genuine science. I have read nearly all that Mr. Mivart has written, some of it with pleasure and profit, some of it with regret and pain. I am quite prepared to accept thankfully from him or from any one else real genuine science—strictly logical deductions, or inferences from sound principles or from well-established facts. But I am not prepared to accept from any one a *fasciculus* of conditional propositions as a substitute for science. I cannot regard as scientific a process which amounts to saying that something *would be* if ten thousand other things *had been*.

Mr. Mivart is, he thinks, absolved from the necessity of noticing my authorities because of 'a certain previous question;' that they merit no consideration is, he thinks, abundantly clear 'to those persons who, in addition to scientific knowledge, possess some acquaintance with the history of the seventeenth century' (p. 34). 'For a most instructive parallelism exists between the opposition of our present ecclesiastical obstructives to evolution and that offered by their predecessors to Copernicanism' (p. 36). The memorable conflict between science and ecclesiastical authority in the seventeenth century, resulting in Galileo's condemnation, has, according to Mr. Mivart, so discredited ecclesiastical authority, has so completely put it out of court in scientific discussion, that he does not hesitate to say, 'It is the very distinctness and authority with which scientific truths have been condemned which make secure beyond all possibility of question the complete scientific freedom of sincere Catholics' (p. 35). 'Viewing these events, however, in the light of our present knowledge, Catholics may far more thankfully exclaim: "How providential was that Divine permission by which such ecclesiastical authorities were allowed to fall into such egregious errors!"' (p. 38). And all this is the deliberate verdict of 'a loyal son of the Catholic Church.' Now, as Mr. Mivart has set this verdict before the readers of this Review, who are largely non-Catholic, I have some claim to be heard on the other side. If his 'previous question' have any interest for them, it is a true, not a false and distorted, version of it that is worth their hearing. I may be presumed to know as well as Mr. Mivart does what is the teaching of the Catholic Church. If there be weak points in the Church's armour, or sore points in her history, I may be presumed to be as interested in the matter as he is. The case of Galileo is not buried so far back into the history of the past that I may not know something of it, and something of its bearing on other points of Catholic doctrine. Mr. Mivart takes a very limited view of his 'instructive parallel.' To establish it he must contrast not merely the fact of condemnation in both cases, but

also the value of the condemning authorities, and the nature of the doctrine in each case. Mr. Mivart will, I presume, admit that the solar system is not so important a fact for students of revelation as the creation of the first man, and that consequently the value of theological teaching on the one question is very different from its value on the other. The doctrine which I have set in opposition to Mr. Mivart's theory is an explanation of an article of faith founded on texts of Scripture, as clear apparently as any that exist—an explanation given by Fathers and theologians without break or interruption from the dawn of revelation down to the present time. In such teaching Catholics recognise the voice of the ordinary *magisterium* of the Church, and as such they accept it. As parallel to this, Mr. Mivart adduces a doctrine in no sense necessarily connected with any article of faith, and the Scriptural expressions which seem to favour it are indirect and incidental—expressions which we ourselves are every day using with the full knowledge of Copernicanism. Then there is no such consensus of teaching as I have cited on the other side. Bellarmine, I admit, seems to say that there is some such consensus. But if Mr. Mivart will examine the matter for himself he will find how very little the Fathers trouble themselves with the matter, and he will find that the very few commentators who refer to the Scripture texts merely explain them in accordance with the scientific ideas of their time without at all insinuating that any truth of faith was involved in the interpretation. And even Bellarmine does not by any means hold the consensus to be decisive against Copernicanism. For in his letter to F. Foscarini he says that though he does not believe that any proof of the earth's motion will be adduced, yet, should that occur, he is quite prepared to change his views as to the meaning of the Scripture texts. But surely if he regarded those texts as decisive against Copernicanism, on no possible supposition could he alter their meaning. He is not then a decisive witness against Copernicanism. And if there ever was anything like an ecclesiastical tradition against Copernicanism, it was broken long before Galileo's time. For a hundred years before that time churchmen of the highest character taught the doctrine for which Galileo is supposed to have been subsequently condemned. Nicholas de Cusa taught it, and was made a cardinal by Eugene IV. in 1431. Copernicus, himself a priest and a canon, did not suffer in the estimation of his superiors for having taught this doctrine. Widmanstadt, a disciple of Copernicus, taught the doctrine of his master in 1533 at Rome in presence of Clement the Seventh and the cardinals, and received the applause and the congratulations of them all. And Mr. Drinkwater, one of Mr. Mivart's own authorities, says: 'Copernicus had been allowed to dedicate his book to Paul the Third, and from the time of its first appearance under that sanction in 1543 until the year 1616 the theory was left in the hands of mathematicians and philosophers, who alternately attacked or

defended it without receiving either support or molestation from ecclesiastical decrees' (p. 48). As far, then, as the doctrines are concerned, there is no approach to a parallel. But it is on the condemnation of Galileo that Mr. Mivart stakes all. What, then, is the value of that condemnation? It is necessary first of all to see what precisely is the ecclesiastical authority from which the condemnation emanated according to Mr. Mivart. He evidently means something more than a mere congregation of cardinals; he means the supreme teaching authority of the Church, including of course the Pope. At page 38 he speaks of the 'supreme ecclesiastical authority,' to which infallibility has been given. He quotes Urban the Eighth and Alexander the Seventh as ordering, confirming, and approving the condemnation of Galileo's doctrine. It is clear, therefore, that Mr. Mivart seeks to hold the Pope responsible for Galileo's condemnation, and for the 'erroneous judgment about the meaning of Scripture'—the 'egregious errors' which were implied in that condemnation. And this responsibility he seeks to fix upon the Pope in his public official capacity as teacher of the Church; for if he had been referring to the Pope merely as a private doctor, his whole case would crumble to the ground. His argument, then, is this. The doctrine of Galileo was condemned as heretical by the supreme ecclesiastical authority, that is, by the Pope teaching in his official capacity, and yet that doctrine is true; and therefore evolutionists—in fact scientists in every department—need not trouble themselves about ecclesiastical strictures on their doctrines, no matter how exalted the source whence those strictures come. 'Catholic men of science of the present day . . . should in no wise allow their efforts after truth to be checked by the declarations of ecclesiastical authorities' (p. 43). The value of this argument depends of course on the official documents in Galileo's case. Mr. Mivart volunteers the admission that he is not competent to interpret correctly such documents. He says: 'I decline to attempt the task of furnishing an interpretation of legal ecclesiastical documents for which I have not the requisite technical knowledge' (p. 46). Now to decide dogmatically a case which depends on such documents without 'the requisite technical knowledge' is, I submit, to act the 'incompetent obstructive' all out. In the absence of that technical knowledge, the course open to Mr. Mivart was to consult some approved theologian, some expert, as to the meaning of such documents. The prudence of this course is unquestionable. The Lord Chancellor may be presumed to be a safer guide than Mr. Mivart in interpreting an Act of Parliament, and so too may a theologian be in interpreting a decree of the Index or Inquisition. But as Mr. Mivart did not adopt even this precaution, the very least that might be demanded from him is that he should give fully and fairly the text of the documents, or certainly as much of it as would put the reader in a position to judge calmly for himself what precisely is the

thing decreed. This Mr. Mivart has not done, and the result is that any one whose information on Galileo's case is taken solely from his essay must of necessity fall into 'egregious errors' with regard to that case. There are two, and only two, official documents bearing directly on the case—the decree of the Index, dated the 5th of March, 1616, and that of the Inquisition, dated the 22nd of June, 1633. Mr. Mivart says that, 'by order of Urban the Eighth, the Inquisition formally promulgated certain statements for the express purpose that Catholic men of science might be informed what they were to hold on this subject.' These statements are two propositions censured, long before Urban became Pope, by the qualifiers of the Inquisition, whose 'express purpose' was *not to decide* (for they had no authority to do so) 'what Catholic men of science were to hold,' but to arrange and systematise the matter on which the cardinals were to pass judgment. These propositions formed the basis of the decree of A.D. 1616, and are recited as part of the history of the case in the preamble of the decree of A.D. 1633, but they were not 'formally promulgated' for 'Catholic men of science' by Index, or Inquisition, or Pope. The decree of A.D. 1616, as far as it bears on Galileo's case, is as follows:—

Decree of the Holy Congregation of most illustrious Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church specially deputed by our Holy Father, Pope Paul the Fifth, and the Holy Apostolic See, for the Index of Prohibited Books, and for the permission, prohibition, expurgation, and printing of them in the whole Christian world, to be published everywhere.

After referring to, and condemning, certain books in no way connected with Galileo's case, the decree proceeds as follows:—

And whereas it has come to the knowledge of the aforesaid Holy Congregation that that false Pythagorean doctrine, altogether opposed to Holy Scripture, on the mobility of the earth and the immobility of the sun, taught by Nicholas Copernicus in his book on the *Revolutions of the Heavenly Bodies*, and by Didacus Astunica in his *Commentary on Job*, is being now promulgated and accepted by many, as may be seen from a printed letter of a certain Carmelite father, entitled 'Lettera del B. Padre Maestro Paolo Antonio Foscarini,' . . . wherein the aforesaid Father has endeavoured to show that the aforesaid doctrine of the immobility of the sun in the centre of the universe, and of the mobility of the earth, is consonant with truth, and is not opposed to Holy Scripture; therefore, lest such an opinion should grow on further to the destruction of Catholic truth (this Congregation) has decreed that the said (books) *Nicholas Copernicus de Revolutionibus* and *Didacus Astunica on Job* be suspended until they are corrected, and that the book of F. Paul Antony Foscarini should be altogether prohibited and condemned, and that all other books that teach the same thing should be prohibited, as by this present decree (the Congregation) prohibits, condemns, and suspends all respectively. In witness whereof this decree was signed and sealed with the hand and seal of the most illustrious and most reverend Lord Cardinal of Saint Cecilia, Bishop of Albano, on the 5th day of March, 1616.

Now on the face of this decree we read the character, the extent of the authority from which it emanated. It comes to us as the act of a number of cardinals, deputed by the Pope certainly, but deputed,

for a fixed and well-defined purpose, beyond which their authority did not extend. They are deputed for the 'permission, prohibition, expurgation, and printing of books,' and for the forming of an 'index of such books to be published everywhere.' They are not deputed, and they could not be, by the Pope, to make for us articles of faith, or to tell us with infallible certainty what is, or is not, heresy. Their prohibition of books, I admit, presupposes a judgment on the part of the cardinals that the books prohibited are unsound in doctrine or dangerous to morality. This judgment ought to be prudent, and generally is so, but no Catholic regards it as infallible. It is the judgment of a fallible tribunal. But the fallibility of that judgment is no reason for refusing obedience to the decree founded on it. Just as the judges in our law courts may be in error as to law in a given case and are not infallible expounders of law in any case, but no sane person would think of setting aside all their decisions on that account. And yet what no one would say of the judges is precisely what Mr. Mivart says of the theologians. A certain number of them happened to express an erroneous opinion on a subject on which they are confessedly fallible, and he says, never mind the ecclesiastical authorities—the theologians henceforward: 'Men of science should in no wise allow their efforts after truth to be checked by the declarations of ecclesiastical obstructives.' But it is said that this decree has been officially confirmed by the Pope, and that consequently the supreme teaching authority of the Catholic Church has declared Copernicanism to be heresy. Now is this so? Nothing need be clearer or more explicit than the language in which the Catholic doctrine on Papal infallibility is defined. The Vatican Council defined

that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when, in the discharge of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians, he, in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, defines a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the universal Church—is, by the divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, endowed with that infallibility wherewith our Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed in defining doctrines of faith or morals.

The Pope thus speaks *ex cathedra*, or infallibly, when (1) he speaks as universal teacher, (2) when in virtue of his apostolic authority he defines a doctrine of faith or morals, (3) when he intends his teaching for all the members of the Church and means it to be binding on them all. In these circumstances Catholics believe the Pope to be infallible, and they accept his teaching unhesitatingly with the assent of faith. What the Pope's opinions may be on matters not revealed or not connected in any way with revelation, what his *private* opinions may be even with reference to things that are revealed, need be of no concern to Catholics. It is his *ex-cathedra*, that is his public solemn and official teaching, that claims from them the assent of faith. Now, even though I were to admit (which I do not for a moment) that the decree of 1616 was officially confirmed by the

Pope, I ask, does that decree rank as *ex-cathedra* teaching in the sense defined by the Vatican Council—the only sense that is binding on Catholics? The Pope does not speak in it as universal doctor and teacher; *he does not speak in it at all*. There is no doctrine of faith or morals promulgated in it; the thing decreed in it is the prohibiting of certain books, and the suspension of certain others. That is, it is a purely disciplinary decree which may be altered according to circumstances, and such a decree is not rendered dogmatic by the approbation of the Pope. By such approbation the decree would acquire a more stringent binding force, but its nature is not changed. And it is the thing decreed, and not the preamble or the reasons for it, that is affected by the approbation. So true is this that even though there were question of a dogmatic definition issued by the Pope himself speaking *ex cathedra*, it is the definition itself, not the preamble to it or the arguments given in support of it, that is infallibly true. Bishop Fessler (*True and False Infallibility*) says: ‘Even in dogmatic decrees, bulls, &c., not all that therein occurs in any one place, not all which occurs or is mentioned incidentally, not a preface nor *what is laid down as the basis of the decree*, is to be looked upon as a dogmatic definition, and so as matter of infallibility’ (p. 46). And at page 65 he adds: ‘Moreover, if we have before us a real and true dogmatic definition of the Pope, still only that portion of it is to be looked upon and accepted as an *ex-cathedra* utterance which is expressly designated in the definition, and nothing whatever is to be so regarded which is only mentioned as accessory matter.’ I may remark that Dr. Fessler was the secretary of the Vatican Council, a sufficient guarantee for the complete orthodoxy of his theological views. Dr. Murray (*De Ecclesia*, Disp. XI. No. 25) says: ‘Infallibility does not extend to the motives of the definition, nor to the arguments in favour of that definition.’ Cardinal Hergenrother (*Church and State*) says: ‘And we must, in every doctrinal decision of Pope or General Council, distinguish between the definition itself and the grounds or reasons alleged for it. Only the definition itself is infallible. This is no new distinction, but one that has ever been well known to theologians and canonists, and also to the Roman Court’ (p. 31). And in favour of this view he quotes, *and quotes correctly*, Cano, Bellarmine, Suarez, and Veron. Father Knox (*Infallibility*) says: ‘In the case of an infallible decree, it is only the doctrine ruled, and not the grounds alleged in support of that ruling, that is exempt from the possibility of error’ (p. 92). Here, then, are Catholic theologians, ultramontanes of the most pronounced type, the very last men to minimise Papal prerogatives, and yet they so limit the doctrine of infallibility as completely to exclude such decrees as Galileo’s condemnation from the list of *ex-cathedra* pronouncements. Now, as we are to take the interpretation of legal documents from lawyers, so too must we take

the interpretation of the decrees against Galileo from theologians and canonists, experts in the interpretation of such documents. And they tell us that even the most solemn and authoritative approbation of such decrees is not an authoritative pronouncement on the motive of the decrees—that a Papal prohibition and condemnation of Copernican books is not an *ex-cathedra* judgment that the doctrine contained in these books is ‘false and contrary to Scripture.’ Therefore, were I to admit that the Pope solemnly approved and confirmed the decree of 1616, the assertion contained in the preamble of that decree, namely, that the doctrine was ‘false and contrary to Scripture,’ comes to us as the opinion of the cardinals and qualifiers, and as nothing more. And as such Mr. Mivart will not find it a very valuable prop for his *thesis*.

But the decree was not confirmed by the Pope or approved by him in any sense that could entitle it to be regarded as an *ex-cathedra* act. The decree itself bears no intrinsic evidence of such confirmation. It is published in the name *not of the Pope*, but of the Cardinal Bishop of Albano. The only extrinsic evidence of Papal confirmation is, first, the certificate given by Bellarmine to Galileo, in which the decree is spoken of as a ‘declaration made by the Holy Father, and published by the Congregation of the Index;’ and secondly, the alleged confirmation by the bull ‘*Speculatores*’ of Alexander the Seventh. Bellarmine’s certificate was given to Galileo to meet a calumny circulated by his enemies, to the effect that he was forced to recant and abjure his errors. The recantation was supposed to have been made at an interview between Galileo and Bellarmine on the 26th of February, 1616. At a meeting of the Holy Office on the 3rd of March, at which the Pope was present, Bellarmine gave an account of the above interview. A *minute* of that meeting has been published by Gherardi. It is as follows:—

March 3, 1616—The Lord Cardinal Bellarmine having reported that Galileo Galilei, mathematician, had in terms of the order of the Holy Congregation been admonished to abandon the opinions he has hitherto held that the sun is the centre of the spheres, and immovable, and that the earth moves, and had acquiesced therein; and the decree of the Congregation of the Index having been presented, prohibiting and suspending respectively the writings of Nicholas Copernicus (*De Rev.*), of Diego de Zuniga on Job, and of Paolo Antonio Foscarini, Carmelite friar; His Holiness ordered the edict of prohibition and suspension respectively to be published by the Master of the Sacred Palace.

Now, if the falsehood of the doctrine was one of the cardinal points discussed at this meeting, how strange that the minutes make no reference to it! They do not tell all that was said, but the decision that the doctrine was heretical was surely the most important part of the proceedings, and yet there is no reference to any such decision. And it is merely the *prohibition* and *suspension* of certain books that is sanctioned by the Pope; and this surely has none of the

conditions of an *ex-cathedra* act. There is no truth of faith announced as necessary to be believed by all the faithful, no principle of morality enjoined as obligatory on all. A mere disciplinary edict is issued by a Congregation with the sanction of the Pope. I admit freely that Paul the Fifth, and after him Urban the Eighth, and the cardinals believed Galileo's speculations to be opposed to Scripture, at least in its *prima facie* meaning, and that this belief probably inspired their treatment of Galileo; but this belief does not come to us with the official stamp of papal *ex-cathedra* teaching upon it. It comes to us as their private opinion, and as such is in no sense binding upon us. Then there was no retraction, as there certainly would have been if Galileo's doctrine had been condemned as heretical by an *ex-cathedra* decree. No one at the time regarded the decree of 1616 as defining that Galileo's doctrines were heretical. In a letter to Picchena on the 6th of March (the day after the issue of the decree), he writes with evident satisfaction of the disappointment of his enemies because his doctrines were not defined to be heretical. Five days later (11th of March), he had a most friendly interview (*benignissima udienza*, his own words) with the Pope, when Paul the Fifth assured him that he and the cardinals were well aware of the malice of Galileo's enemies, and assured him also that during his pontificate he (Galileo) would have nothing to fear from them. Here, then, we have a man whose doctrine is said to have been defined heretical on the 5th of March, having on the 11th a most friendly audience with the pontiff who condemned him, and receiving from that author of his troubles assurances of sympathy and protection—and all this without being asked to retract one iota of his heretical tenets. Just fancy some political offender of a very pronounced type having, on the sixth day after his condemnation for high treason, a most friendly audience with Queen Victoria, and receiving from her Majesty solemn assurances of esteem and protection—such, in fact, as would during her reign render him quite independent of the lynx-eyed gentlemen of Scotland Yard! This picture is just as real as that one which is presupposed by Mr. Mivart's version of Galileo's condemnation. No one at the time believed that his opinions were defined to be heretical. Many of the cardinals were his best friends; among them were Del Monte, Orsini, and Barberini, afterwards Urban the Eighth. And Cardinal del Monte wrote to the Grand Duke on Galileo's departure from Rome, stating that, with the full knowledge of all that had taken place, he 'could assure his Highness that there was not the least imputation attaching to the philosopher' (Von Gebler, p. 96). And in the interval between 1616 and 1633 many ecclesiastics of high character and position were known to have held Galileo's opinions. On the other hand, during that period he was attacked by many able and determined opponents, and not one of them quoted against him an *ex-cathedra* condemnation of his

doctrine—the best possible proof that the decree of 1616 was not regarded as a final decision emanating from ‘supreme ecclesiastical authority.’

I have no desire to gloss over the conduct of Galileo's enemies in the interval between the decree of the Index in 1616 and that of the Inquisition in 1633, but no unprejudiced reader of the history of the period can deny that his own conduct tended very largely to bring on the trial before the Inquisition. At all events the trial came, and resulted in a very long decree, part of which is given by Mr. Mivart. The decree is much too long for insertion here. It reviews in detail all that was done in the case. It refers to Galileo's various writings, to the two propositions censured by the qualifiers, to Bellarmine's admonition and the mandate alleged to have accompanied it, to the decree of 1616 which it tells us was issued by the Congregation of the Index, and also to Bellarmine's certificate. The doctrine of Copernicus is undoubtedly regarded as heretical, on the ground that it is contrary to Scripture; and for holding such doctrine Galileo is adjudged ‘suspected of heresy’ and sentenced to certain penalties in consequence. The abjuration followed, in which he says, ‘With a sincere heart and faith unfeigned, I curse, abjure, and abhor the above-named errors and heresies.’ Now what is the authority from which this severe sentence emanated? Who are the ‘we’ that ‘pronounce, decide, define, and declare’ in this case? Simply the cardinals. The decree begins ‘We, Cardinal Gasper of the title S. Croce in Jerusalem, Borgia,’ and nine other names follow. These, then, are the ‘we’ that speak throughout the decree, that ‘pronounce, define, and declare’ everything that is declared in it, that invoke the sacred name, that pronounce Galileo ‘suspected of heresy,’ and give their reasons for the suspicion. At the conclusion of the decree the number dwindles down to seven, who again ‘pronounce, sentence, declare, ordain, and condemn,’ &c. The document concludes thus, ‘So we the undersigned *cardinals* pronounce, F. Cardinal de Asculo,’ and six other names follow. From first to last, then, this decree is the work of the cardinals. It has no authority beyond what they could impart to it, and infallible authority they certainly could not impart. It received no authoritative papal confirmation or approbation, and consequently Catholics are in no sense bound by the doctrinal allegations contained in it. The cardinals who issued it were no doubt commissioned by the Pope to try the case. In all probability the Pope shared their views with regard to Galileo and his doctrine. But the decree is not a papal act, and could not become so unless it were specially (by special mandate) approved and promulgated. This is the teaching of Catholic theologians and canonists with reference to such decrees as those we are considering. I shall merely refer to a few of the many authorities on this point:—Lacroix, *Theol. Mor.*, De Cons. lib. i. 934; Lehmkuhl, vol. i. p. 132;

Schmalzgrueber, *Dis. Proem.* Nos. 384-385; Craisson, vol. i. No. 732; Grandclaude, vol. i. p. 53; Bouix, *De Curia*, p. 3, s. 3, &c. Without a special mandate of the Pope, then, approving of congregational decrees and authorising their promulgation, they are not regarded as *ex-cathedra* pontifical acts, and doctrinal statements embodied in them have no claim on the internal assent of the faithful.

But Mr. Mivart fancies that he finds this special mandate of approbation in the bull 'Speculatores' of Alexander the Seventh published on the 5th of March, 1664, with that Pontiff's issue of the Index. Mr. Mivart labours under more than one extraordinary hallucination with reference to this bull. In a note (p. 38) he says 'this fact has been discovered and published for the first time by the Rev. W. Roberts.' The very novelty of this discovery casts very serious doubt upon its value. Papal infallibility has had very many hostile critics who were not wanting in determination or in ability, and it is simply incredible that so powerful, so useful an argument would have escaped their notice. But the fact which Mr. Mivart regards as a discovery has been perfectly notorious for two hundred years. Benedict the Fourteenth referred to it in the bull prefixed to his own issue of the Index. St. Liguori referred to it in his *Dissertation on Prohibited Books*. Ferraris discusses it at considerable length. It is then no discovery, though the use now made of it is, I admit, new, and I attach no importance to the matter except as showing how conversant Mr. Mivart is with 'the history of the seventeenth century,' of which he supposes me to know so very little. Now the fact is that this bull, so far from being a special approbation of each decree contained in the Index to which it is prefixed, is not a special approbation of even one of them. It is merely a guarantee that we have an authentic copy of the Index, containing all the decrees published by the Congregation up to that time. It is a reissue by public authority of all these decrees, but it leaves each decree just as it was, and this Mr. Mivart would have seen had he read the bull for himself. The Pope begins by saying that the mission of the Church is mainly concerned with the faith and morals of her children, and that faith and morals are very intimately affected by the reading of good or bad books. He then refers to the origin of the Index, and he says that though 'many books were prohibited and condemned both by the Pope and by the cardinals of the Congregation' since Clement the Seventh issued his Index, yet 'there was no catalogue issued by public authority embracing systematically and clearly those prohibited books and condemned authors, on which account great confusion has arisen, and is every day likely to increase unless a remedy be provided. Accordingly, to meet the difficulty of finding out the truth in this matter,' the Pope says that with the advice of the Cardinals he 'has decreed to issue a new Index.' He then proceeds to state the plan on which the new Index was to be drawn up, and in this the aim was, first, 'that we may have a

clear knowledge of all that was done from the beginning in this matter ; secondly, to facilitate reference for 'readers,' and for booksellers especially, whose error in this matter would be a source of error to others.' And the Pope says: 'When all this was, according to our desire, carefully, diligently, and accurately put into execution, and the new Index formed . . . this same general Index as aforesaid composed and revised by our order, and printed at our apostolic press, we confirm and approve,' &c. ; and then follows all the usual technical phraseology of such documents. Here, then, is the object aimed at by Alexander the Seventh—to give an accurate authoritative copy of the decrees issued by the Index up to his time ; to do this, in order that all that was done in each case may be accurately known, and that readers and booksellers may be relieved from the annoyance and confusion inseparable from the old system of publishing the decrees. No new decree is issued, no new obligation imposed, no change in the character of any of the decrees is made by this bull. It is, then, an issue, by public authority, of an authentic copy of the Index of Prohibited Books, and no one capable of forming an opinion on such documents has ever regarded it as anything more. And no Catholic theologian would for a moment regard this bull as equivalent to an approbation by special mandate of any decree contained in the volume to which it is prefixed, and it is only such special approbation that would render the decrees pontifical acts. The bull is a purely disciplinary act, perfectly valid until it is cancelled by an authority equal to that which issued it, but it condemns no new error, and defines no new truth. If Mr. Mivart's version of Galileo's case were correct, then Copernicanism must at that time be regarded as heresy publicly and solemnly so defined. But at the time no one regarded it in this light, no one quoted against it a solemn *ex-cathedra* definition. Gassendi, Riccoli, and De Cartes deny that the doctrine is heretical after the condemnation. Caramuel says that 'it is improbable, not heretical.' Tiraboschi says that the condemnation came 'not from the Catholic Church, but from a secondary and fallible tribunal.' F. Fabri, S.J., in 1665, and Ricci, Consultor of the Holy Office, in 1666, speak to the same effect even after the issue of the bull of Alexander the Seventh. Now can we fancy men of high character and in responsible ecclesiastical positions speaking in such terms of a man whose doctrine was solemnly defined to be heretical, whose person was condemned by the Holy Office, and whose condemnation in both senses was solemnly and publicly endorsed by the Pope? There is but one reasonable answer. No one at that time, when men could form a reliable judgment on the matter, put upon the case of Galileo that construction which prejudice and passion have so often put upon it in recent times. The conclusion is then inevitable—that there was no *ex-cathedra* pronouncement on the truth or falsehood of Galileo's doctrine, and his condemnation, such as it was, comes to us as the act, the judgment of a number of fallible

men. And as such what is its value to Mr. Mivart as an argument? It proves, what requires no proof, that a number of theologians may err. Nothing more than this logically follows from it; and, granting all this, Mr. Mivart would have to show that the authorities quoted by me not only may err, but actually have erred. But he declines to consider them at all, and quietly takes it for granted, as the outcome of Galileo's case, that theologians in such circumstances 'always turn out to have been in the wrong'—a process of reasoning quite unworthy of one so saturated with science as Mr. Mivart professes to be. But it is not the opinions of a few isolated theologians that I have set in opposition to Mr. Mivart's theory. I have set against him 'a consensus of Catholic teaching founded on Scripture, and handed down to us by the principal Fathers and theologians in every age from the early dawn of Catholic tradition down to our own time. All along it is unbroken, consecutive, consistent, affirming a doctrine that is inconsistent with the application of Mr. Mivart's theory to man. This consensus is the voice of the ordinary *magisterium* of the Catholic Church, and to it all Catholics, no matter how profound their knowledge or how loud their boasting, are bound to bow. Mr. Mivart's parallel then breaks down on all points, and his headlong and unaccountable onslaught on 'supreme ecclesiastical authority' is a complete, a lamentable break-down. And if he desires to establish the complete orthodoxy of the evolution theory as applied to man, it must be by arguments taken from some source other than the condemnation of Galileo.

From his version of Galileo's case Mr. Mivart seeks to deduce another conclusion that is wider and more important by far than the theological character of evolution. He infers from it that scientists, in all their pursuits and speculations, are completely independent of 'supreme ecclesiastical authority,' and that therefore in every imaginary conflict (for real conflict there cannot be) between science and revelation, to reason and not to 'ecclesiastical authority' does the last appeal lie. He admits, it is true, that 'a loyal Catholic must of course say that when any matter is clearly of faith his conclusions must be wrong if they are opposed to it' (p. 45). But the value of this admission is completely neutralised by the statement that, whenever a conflict arises, the loyal Catholic 'has always the choice whether to distrust the fact of the decision or the fact of physical science.' In other words, loyal Catholics are free to believe just what they please. 'The perfect intellectual freedom of Catholics' is, he thinks, 'unanswerably demonstrated by Galileo's case' (p. 36). It proves 'not only our freedom with reference to such passages of Scripture, but also . . . our freedom, as good Catholics, with reference to ecclesiastical decrees also' (p. 39). 'Catholic men of science should in no wise allow their efforts after truth to be checked by the declarations of ecclesiastical authorities' (p. 43). Now it must be

borne in mind that, in Mr. Mivart's argument, the 'ecclesiastical congregations' and 'ecclesiastical authorities' include the Pope, and that, too, in his official capacity as teacher of the Universal Church. Just as the Pope is included in that ecclesiastical authority which condemned Galileo, so, too, is he included in that ecclesiastical authority which, according to Mr. Mivart, has no right to interfere with science or scientific men—that is, Catholic men of science are in their speculations completely independent of the supreme teaching authority of the Church—almost a literal translation of the 14th condemned proposition of the *syllabus*. And 'to certain good Catholics' Mr. Mivart offers these considerations, which he thinks 'will effectually dissipate their scruples,' and which I think would 'effectually dissipate' their faith also. For the 'intellectual freedom' which Mr. Mivart claims is not freedom but wanton license, the offspring of intellectual pride, a license which loyal Catholics have never claimed, and which the Catholic Church has never granted. Mr. Mivart knows well that the Catholic Church claims to be not only the divinely appointed teacher of all that is contained in the divine deposit of faith, but its divinely commissioned custodian as well. This claim Mr. Mivart, as a Catholic, of course admits. And admitting it, he cannot deny that it is part of the office of the Church to watch carefully all such theories and speculations as bode danger to the faith. Hence it is that her jurisdiction extends *indirectly* to many things that form no part of the divine deposit of faith at all. That there are many sciences and many scientific conclusions with which the Church is in no way concerned is abundantly clear. The natural sciences as such are outside her province. They are founded on natural truths out of which they are deduced by processes of reasoning with which the Church has nothing to do. Between reason and faith, between any truth clearly established by reason and any truth of faith, there can be no real contradiction. Reason is as much God's gift as faith is, and both therefore must be always in harmony. If, then, there be a real conflict between a revealed truth and an alleged conclusion of science, the fancied scientific conclusion must be at fault. It must have been deduced from false principles, or by reasoning that is unsound. Hence it is that the Church, while indifferent to the facts and arguments of the natural sciences, is always vigilant as to the conclusions at which scientists profess to have arrived. She measures these conclusions by the standard of revealed doctrine, and if they be found inconsistent with that standard, she has *indirect* jurisdiction over them, and in virtue of her office as infallible guardian of the faith, and to ward off danger from her children, she condemns them; and in her judgment loyal Catholics are bound submissively to acquiesce. Then there are mixed questions which, besides being conclusions of natural science, are also revealed either explicitly or implicitly; and over all such questions, inasmuch as they are revealed, the Church

has direct control, and of course there can be no questioning her judgment with reference to them. It follows, then, that the Church judges directly of many, and indirectly of very many more, of those questions which Mr. Mivart fancies are the exclusive province of the man of science; and her office as divinely commissioned guardian of the deposit of faith would be impossible if her authority did not extend to such questions. And hence it is that loyal Catholics have always bowed to that authority, and that Catholics who have read Mr. Mivart's article are pained and shocked by the extraordinary assertions it contains. He tells us that 'ecclesiastical authority did give a judgment which impeded the progress of science' (p. 39). This is all but a literal translation of the 12th proposition condemned in the *syllabus*. And history justifies the condemnation, for it teaches that as long as scientific men confined themselves to their own province they were encouraged by 'ecclesiastical authority,' and that they met with opposition from that authority only when they began to dogmatise in a province not their own. That license which Mr. Mivart claims for scientific men the Church will not grant them; her whole life is a protest against it, and it has been sternly reprobated by repeated solemn and authoritative declarations of the supreme head of the Church in our own times. The encyclical 'Quanta cura' is very explicit in its reprobation of that license. The brief 'Inter gravissimas' addressed to the Archbishop of Munich in 1862, when 'Old Catholicism' was in its embryo, lays down the following plain statement, which is very profitable matter for meditation for Catholic men of science:—

Wherefore the Church, in virtue of the power entrusted to her by her Divine Author, has the right and the duty not only of refusing to tolerate, but also of proscribing and condemning, all errors, if the integrity of the faith and the salvation of souls demand it; and all philosophers who wish to be sons of the Church, and philosophy itself likewise, are bound in duty never to say anything contrary to the Church's teaching, and to retract those things about which she may have admonished them. Moreover we decree and declare that the opinion which teaches the contrary to this is altogether erroneous, and in the highest degree insulting to the faith of the Church and her authority.

And in the brief 'Tuas libenter' addressed to the same Archbishop in 1863, Pius the Ninth says: 'For although the natural sciences depend on their own principles known from reason, yet Catholic students of these sciences must keep their eyes on revelation as a guiding star, that they may avoid the labyrinths of error.' And the Holy Father goes on to tell Catholic scientists that their obligation is not at all restricted to such things as are defined by the Apostolic See, but that they are also bound to accept as decisive the voice of the ordinary *magisterium* of the Church. Mr. Mivart gives his estimate of these 'utterances' with lamentable clearness. He disregards them, but they are none the less wise and true, obligatory on, and accepted by, all loyal children of the Catholic Church. Thus the Church has acted always,

and her action is proof conclusive of her right to act. Mr. Mivart admits this, for he says: 'An infallible authority must know the limits of its revealed message. If authority can make a mistake in determining its own limits, it may make a mistake in a matter of faith' (p. 38). And since authority cannot 'make a mistake in determining its own limits,' it remains for all loyal Catholics to keep within the limits so repeatedly and so clearly laid down. I am quite as anxious as Mr. Mivart can be to avoid anything that may be an unnecessary strain upon the belief of good Catholics, or that may be an unnecessary obstacle in the way of persons desirous of joining the Catholic Church, but it would be cowardly as well as unchristian to conceal from those who are within the Church the extent of their obligations, or to hold out delusive hopes of intellectual license to those who are without. If persons are to become Catholics or to continue such, it must be, not on their own terms, but on the terms of the Catholic Church. This is nothing more than saying that the Catholic Church has a fixed and definite creed. Mr. Mallock wrote recently that the clergymen of a certain school seemed to regard their Church as 'seized in a sort of intellectual custom house,' and considered it their duty 'to cast overboard as many articles of faith as science could object to.' Catholics and the Catholic Church would be in just this position if Mr. Mivart's ideas on ecclesiastical authority were correct.

The doctrine of the immediate formation—the independent creation—of our first parents, Mr. Mivart regards as 'inexpressibly shocking;' it 'could never have been the creation of a God of truth and goodness, but rather of a malignant father of lies' (p. 45). This is very strong language of a doctrine which, whether true or false, has been believed by the greatest, the holiest, the wisest men and women who have ever been. But why is this doctrine 'inexpressibly shocking'? Because Mr. Mivart sees in man certain things which he cannot explain to his own satisfaction unless this doctrine were what he describes it. Then, unless the plan of man's creation be such as to get Mr. Mivart's *nihil obstat*, 'it must be a process worthy only of a malignant father of lies!' Truly a modest man is this philosopher, and most fortunate is the Catholic Church in possessing a son who is sufficiently learned to enlighten her even 'on the meaning of Scripture which was universally supposed to be her province,' and sufficiently loyal to warn her against opening her lips 'on physical science which was not her province,' and who is good enough to expose and refute her 'egregious errors' whenever she may happen to disregard his warning. But then, by a strange perversity, the Church disregards such admonitions, and keeps on 'never minding' the philosophers—treats some of them as 'incompetent obstructives.' Worse still, she now and then puts one of them on the Index, as a spectacle—a warning to others of his kind—just as a farmer shoots a

crow and suspends it to a pole in his corn-field, to warn off other trespassers of the same class. Of course philosophers of a certain class think this very unreasonable conduct on the part of the Church, and naturally say that the Church is the enemy of science. But the common sense of sober-thinking people ultimately vindicates the Church, and the philosophers are quietly forgotten. Thus has arisen the false idea that the Catholic Church is hostile to science, and this idea is to some extent strengthened by the efforts of some well-meaning Catholics, who attempt seriously to refute so palpable, so notorious a calumny. We sometimes hear the question asked, 'May a Catholic study science?' As well might the question be, 'May a Catholic take his breakfast?' 'Ubinam gentium sumus?' said the indignant Roman long ago. Are we now living in the time when Tertullian hurled his indignant eloquence against the calumniators of the Christian name? Are we Catholics at this time to go about hat in hand apologising for our ignorance, when the intellectual triumphs of our co-religionists are the most notorious facts in history? Are we then, like cowards, to play the game of our calumniators by putting the silly question, 'May a Catholic study science?' Yes, Catholics may study, and have studied science, with zeal and with success, and in its study, as well as in everything else, they have all the intellectual freedom which reasonable men, believing in revelation, can demand. In every honourable enterprise, in every learned profession, in every department of knowledge, Catholics have distinguished themselves. And the Church rejoices in the triumphs of her children. She blesses them, encourages them, patronises them, but she does not like to see any of her 'loyal sons' proceeding on the supposition of his own personal infallibility. When loyal Catholics study science, as they are quite free to do, the Church insists that they should not lose sight of the advice wisely given them by her Supreme Head: 'Catholici earum scientiarum cultores divinam revelationem, veluti rectricem stellam, præ oculis habeant oportet, qua prælucente sibi a Syrtibus et erroribus caveant' (Munich Brief, Dec. 21, 1863).

J. MURPHY, C.C.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE: A REPLY.

As one who for some years has taken a great interest in the extension of the Parliamentary suffrage to women, perhaps I may be allowed to offer a few observations in reply to Mrs. Chapman's article on this subject.

There are fortunately only two matters of fact in regard to which Mrs. Chapman's paper calls for a reply: the first of these is the assertion that women do not wish for the suffrage; the second is that the advocates of 'women's rights' strongly insist on the absolute mental equality of the sexes as a main ground for the concession of the franchise to women. In both these statements Mrs. Chapman, in my opinion, has unintentionally fallen into error.

With regard to the first, Mrs. Chapman makes the assertion in the broadest possible terms that there is no genuine demand on the part of women for representation. 'One thing is clear,' she writes, 'that neither among educated nor uneducated women, among those who think most nor among those who work most, among rich women nor among poor, is there any great and pressing and genuine desire for the suffrage.' The facts surely point the other way: if the case of educated women, thinkers and workers, is considered first, there is a remarkable preponderance of opinion among them in favour of women's suffrage. There is hardly any distinguished English woman of the latter half of the nineteenth century who has made an honourable name through the work she has done in literature, science, education, or philanthropy who has not expressed her sympathy with the movement for the extension of the suffrage to women. We have had warm help and support from Miss Martineau, Mrs. Somerville, Miss Mary Carpenter, Mrs. Jameson, Mrs. Nassau Senior, Mrs. Grote, Miss Emily Davies, Miss Clough, Mrs. W. Grey, Miss Nightingale, Miss Anna Swanwick, Mrs. Garrett Anderson, Miss Edith Pechey, Miss Frances Power Cobbe, Mrs. Pfeiffer, Mrs. Butler, Miss Irby, Miss Clara Montalba, Mme. Bodichon, Mrs. Thackeray Ritchie, &c. A page could easily be filled with names, but I have merely taken a selection hastily and almost at random from among the great army of women who have done good work for the world in various ways, and who have joined their forces with those of the men and

women who are endeavouring to remove the electoral disabilities of women. Of course it is not contended that among the women whom we think of when we speak of thinkers and workers, there is absolute unanimity on this or any other subject ; but for every name among women thinkers and workers which can be quoted as opposed to women's suffrage, I should not mind undertaking to quote at least a dozen, and that without going very far afield, who support it.

With regard to the masses of women, it is difficult to get at precise facts. We have, however, some indications which encourage the belief that the mass of women do wish that those among them who possess the statutory qualifications, should be enfranchised. I never saw a paper specially intended for women, from *The Queen* downwards, which is not favourable to women's suffrage. Petitions have repeatedly been sent up to Parliament signed by a very large majority of the women householders in a particular place. The petition from Hyde, near Manchester, may be quoted as an example, where out of 700 women householders 608 petitioned Parliament to grant them the suffrage. Mrs. Chapman does not, however, think much of petitions, so she will not be influenced by the fact that year after year for eighteen years hundreds of thousands of women have petitioned Parliament to pass the Women's Suffrage Bill. She will perhaps find more significance in the annual attendance at the Trades' Union Congress of a deputation of working women, who of late years have always been able to carry the majority of the Congress with them in support of a resolution affirming the principle of women's suffrage. In 1885 this resolution was carried by 70 to 6. In schools and colleges for girls where there are debating societies it is possible to gather some indication of the tendency of public opinion among young women. A short time ago at Newnham College, Cambridge, a resolution condemning women's suffrage was lost by 56 to 13. At a working women's college in London in which there are several hundred women, some of the members of the college were lately talking over with the secretary desirable subjects for discussion at the debating society. The secretary suggested women's suffrage, but the women present objected on the ground that a debate was no good on a subject on which all were agreed ; there was, they urged, no possibility of getting anyone to oppose a proposition so obviously just as that women householders and ratepayers should be allowed to vote in Parliamentary elections.

The progress of events often opens women's eyes to their need of representation. The pit-brow women, whose work and wages will be taken from them if the bill relating to mines now before Parliament becomes law, are receiving this kind of enlightenment. Their numbers are estimated at about 5,000 ; there are 1,300 in West Lancashire alone. Several cases similar to this, where the claims of the unrepres-

sented are set aside and those of the represented only are attended to, have had a very convincing effect upon the minds of working women as to the practical hardships which follow from their exclusion from the suffrage.

As to the second of the assertions of which I venture to question the accuracy, I do not think it is true that the advocates of 'women's rights' strongly insist on the absolute mental equality of the sexes. Like Marco Polo, I wish to set down things seen as seen, things heard as heard only; therefore I confine my remarks to what has come under my own observation in the conduct of the women's suffrage movement in England during the last twenty years. The leaders of the movement, and its rank and file, have entertained some one and some another view as to the comparative natural capacity of the sexes. But whether they think men and women similar in this respect, or dissimilar but equal, or dissimilar and unequal, they have all, I believe, agreed that the matter was not of any real importance to the question in hand. It is certain that, whatever the inherent natural capacity of a woman's mind may be, its development largely depends on education, circumstances, and opportunity. All that the advocates of women's rights have wished or claimed on behalf of women is that, whatever their natural gifts may be, the opportunity of developing those gifts should not be denied to them. The physical strength of the average woman is inferior to that of the average man; but this does not afford any reason for subjecting women to lowering physical conditions: wholesome food, fresh air, daily exercise, and suitable clothing are as necessary for making the best of the physical powers of the weaker as of the stronger sex. Analogous reasoning can be applied to the educational, social, and political conditions of a woman's life. The question is not whether men and women are equal, but, whether the conditions by which men and women are surrounded are calculated to bring out and make the best of their natural powers, whatever these may be. Whether our cups hold a pint or a quart, we wish for the opportunity of filling them. With regard to the effect which a larger measure of freedom has had in developing the natural capacities of women's minds, I think we have every reason to be satisfied with the result of the experiment so far as it has gone. The respect for the individual rights of every human being, which was partly the cause and partly the outcome of the French Revolution, marks the beginning of the modern era so far as the position of women is concerned. The great discovery that women were human beings 'fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as a man is, is conveniently dated in England by the publication in 1792 of Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women*. Previous to that, hardly any woman, save here and there a saint, a queen, or a king's mistress, had done any work which

left its mark on the history of art, politics, literature, or science. Whatever the natural gifts of women may be, before that time they were undeveloped in comparison with a later period. Since that time we have had indeed among women no Shakespeare, no Dante, no Beethoven, no Newton, but in our scarcely completed century we have had, in literature alone, women whose works the world will not willingly let die. Jane Austen, the two Brontes, Mrs. Browning, and George Eliot are not a poor harvest for one nation to have reaped as a result of giving greater scope and greater opportunities of development to the natural powers, whatever they may be, of one half of its inhabitants. 'We live by admiration, hope, and love.' Our love and admiration for the great women given to us during the last half century, as a result of the comparative freedom accorded to Englishwomen by advancing civilisation, leads us to hope that yet greater women may be given to us in the time to come, when a larger measure of liberty and greater opportunities of development will have been won.

We are moving and growing slowly towards larger ideas as to the capacity of women and what it is fitting that they should or should not do. At one time it was thought impossible that a woman should ever acquire the difficult art of cutting hair; a male hairdresser remarked, 'It took *me* a fortnight to learn it,' and believed that this settled the question. A little later it was discovered that women could keep accounts, and keep them well. When I was being shown over the Savings Bank Department of the General Post Office, the excellence of the work of the women there was specially pointed out to me by the kindness of the gentleman who was then head of the branch. Taking down one of the heavy ledgers, and showing with official pride the beautifully neat columns of figures, he said, 'At one time I did not believe that females were capable of making figures like these.' I smiled, and hoped that further surprises were in store for him. Till Ellen Watson won the first prize for Mathematics at London University and Miss Scott was eighth wrangler at Cambridge, many people believed that—Mrs. Somerville notwithstanding—there was something in the female brain which rendered it incapable of apprehending the mysteries of mathematical science. It is evident, then, that there is more capacity on the part of women to undertake successfully various kinds of work than at one time was dreamed of. It will never be certainly known whether their mental powers are equal to those of men till their chances have been equal during a long period of time. It may be that physical laws have irrevocably ordained that their chances never can be equal; and that by the service they render to the world in another way women are eternally handicapped, if a comparison is made between their achievements and those of men. If this be so, we argue not against Heaven's hand or will; but we ask, all the same, on behalf of women, that they should

have the opportunity of developing whatever powers nature may have vouchsafed to them.

It should be remarked that, contemporaneously with the greater activity of women during the last half century in those spheres which were at one time held to be fit for men exclusively, the work that always has been and probably always will be specially women's work has not been neglected; on the contrary, in almost every department women have done their own special work, since a larger degree of liberty has been afforded them, with increased zeal and intelligence. I need only refer to the great improvement in the education of the young; to the careful training now sought by all women who wish to devote themselves to the nursing of the sick; to the revival of fine needlework, artistic and utilitarian; to the schools for teaching cookery; to the increase of skill and thought employed in beautifying the home; to the work of women as poor-law guardians; to the method of really helping the poor which is associated with the name of Miss Octavia Hill; and last, but not least, to that noble army of martyrs who, in ever-increasing numbers and with increasing wisdom and self-devotion, give their lives to rescuing from unspeakable misery the most wretched and unhappy of their sex.

Mrs. Chapman concedes everything that has been already won; it is only where the immediate issue of the battle is still doubtful that she joins the forces of reaction. She is convinced that it is right that women should vote in municipal and school-board elections and should serve the community as poor-law guardians; for school boards and boards of guardians deal, she urges, with local not national interests, and for these the distinguishing feminine characteristics are strong qualifications; and she further hints in another passage that wise women will recognise that great questions of national interest are the subjects appropriate for the consideration of masculine minds, while feminine minds should occupy themselves with such questions as are connected with household management and the care of the sick. Is there not a fallacy here? Is it not right that all human beings should like the best things best, and be most interested in the things that are most interesting? It often helps one to test the value of an argument to translate it from the abstract to the concrete. Will wise women recognise during the next few months that it is scarcely fitting that they should occupy themselves with an attempt to understand Mr. Gladstone's proposals for the future government of Ireland, and that they will find a subject in every way worthy of the contemplation of the female mind in the 'Substitutes for Butter' Bill? When the question arises whether the Church of England shall be disestablished, are women to leave its fate to be decided by others, while they occupy themselves exclusively, so far as public affairs are concerned, with those matters which Mrs. Chapman accurately describes as a sort of housekeeping on a large

scale? It is impossible in practice to separate the daily interests of men and women in this way. They live together as husbands and wives, fathers and daughters, brothers and sisters, mothers and sons. Those great questions of national interest which deeply stir the heart and mind of the country excite the most intense interest on the part of both men and women. It is true that from the natural difference of sex, and from the different conditions of their lives, women may look upon these and other questions from a point of view somewhat different from that of men. It is this very difference, from whatever cause it may arise, that, in my view, gives to women their strongest possible claim to representation. If women and men were just alike in everything but clothes and outward form, the representation of men would virtually represent women also; but, being different, the true representation of the country demands that this difference should be able to make itself felt constitutionally through representation. The main work of most women's lives is domestic, and is likely to remain so; this gives in their eyes a special value to the domestic virtues of truthfulness, morality, sobriety, economy, and order. Would not the course of legislation be favourably influenced if, through the constitutional channels of representation, more weight were given in public affairs to what promotes these virtues?

It appears to be thought that, if women vote for members of Parliament, they must bid a final adieu to all personal influence over their fellow-creatures. The *non sequitur* is obvious. Almost everyone exercises influence in a greater or less degree over those with whom he is brought into contact. Sometimes the influence is good and sometimes it is bad. An unselfish, noble character, one that cherishes high ideals, makes all great and brave and beautiful things easier in the entire circle where his influence radiates. That is one of the most blessed things in the world. It will not be stopped by women voting for members of Parliament. There have been men and women in all times and in all countries who have exercised this beneficent personal influence over both men and women. But personal influence is not necessarily good: sometimes it is akin to flattery and cajolery, or may be prompted by a desire for selfish ascendancy. I am not so Utopian as to imagine that this bad kind of personal influence will be extirpated by allowing women to vote for members of Parliament. I am afraid that the bad sort of personal influence, as well as the good, belongs to that class of 'great, unalterable facts underlying all our arrangements,' which Mrs. Chapman speaks of. But there is room to hope that to extend the blessings of liberty and self-government to women may help them to a more generous patriotism, to higher ideals and a keener appreciation of public duty; and in this case their influence for good would be strengthened, and such influence as is not good would be correspondingly diminished. Mr. Gladstone once said, in the pages, I believe, of this Review: 'All who live in a

country should take an interest in that country, love that country; and the vote gives that sense of interest, fosters that love.' It is impossible to doubt, unless it is contended that circumstances have no modifying effect on character, that the entire exclusion of women from direct political power and responsibility has weakened their sense of patriotism and public duty. How many men since Adam have been hindered in making the right choice between duty and temptation by 'the woman whom Thou gavest to be with me!' Browning makes Andrea del Sarto say to his wife:—

Had I been two, another and myself,
Our head would have o'erlooked the world!

Had you enjoined them on me, given me soul,
We might have risen to Rafael, I and you.

. . . . Had the mouth there urged
'God and the glory! never care for gain!'

I might have done it for you.

The thought may arise that it is easy to blame another for one's own shortcomings, and it is not uncommon to hear Adam's excuse sharply animadverted upon. If not manly, it is said to have been very like a man; but I am afraid that Eve's share in the transaction, if not womanly, was very like a woman.

It is a truism to say women have not always thrown their weight on the side of duty, irrespective of gain, reputation, and everything else. The question as to the suffrage is really this: Will the extension of political privileges to some women tend in any degree to awaken in all women a higher sense of civic duty, a juster power of comparison between the value of personal aims and national wellbeing? The tragedy of Lydgate and Rosamund Vincy in *Middlemarch* should ever be before the eyes of women. The life of the young husband, full of promise, of fine ideals, of generous enthusiasm, is marred and turned to dust and ashes by the entire incomprehension of the beautiful girl whom he married that life could have any higher aims than to get into good society and lead the van of provincial gentility. I am afraid we shall have Rosamunds always with us; but everything which lifts up women's lives, whether it be education or political responsibility or industrial independence, ought to be thankfully grasped at, in the faith that they will all help to weaken the Rosamund who is the Edward Hyde to the Dr. Jekyll of so many of us.

There is one circumstance in particular which tells us to be of good cheer in this matter of the extension of the suffrage to women. Women's suffrage will not come, when it does come, as an isolated phenomenon; it will come as a necessary corollary of other changes which have been gradually and steadily modifying during this century the social history of our country. It will be a political change, not

of a very great or extensive character in itself, based upon social, educational and economic changes which have already taken place. It will have the effect of adjusting the political machinery of the country to the altered social conditions of its inhabitants. The revolution has been quietly taking place for at least two generations; the political change will not be a revolution, but a public recognition by the State that the lot of women in England is no longer what it was at the beginning of the century.

Mrs. Chapman is rather scornful when she speaks of the comparatively mean and humble character of the Women's Suffrage Bill which was read a second time by the House of Commons in February. It is, as everyone knows, a bill to enfranchise exactly the same women who in boroughs have already been entrusted with the school board and municipal franchises; that is, it will, if it passes, give the right of voting to unmarried women and widows who are householders, and will not enfranchise wives as well. The limitation is no doubt open to attack; probably all limitations of the suffrage are so; but I think it can be defended on the same ground as that on which the principle of the Reform Bill of 1832 was defended. A 10*l.* rental suffrage was illogical; there was no reason to believe that all the virtues of citizenship immediately disappeared from a man's character if his rent were lowered from 10*l.* to 9*l.* 10*s.* But the limitation was defended, and successfully defended, on the ground that this was as far as the general public opinion of the country justified Lord Grey's Government in going in the direction of reform. Most of those who have had an opportunity of judging believe that the general public opinion of the country is now fully prepared to support the enfranchisement of single women and widows who are householders, but is not prepared to go further and enfranchise wives as well. In regard to this question, I think wives would gain immediately and immensely through the representation of single women. It is not as if they were really two different classes, and that some women were born married and others were born widows or old maids. Unmarried women are every day becoming wives, and wives, alas! are every day becoming widows. There must always be the closest identity in feeling and in interests between married and unmarried women. A Guardianship of Infants' Bill would probably pass in a single session if every member of Parliament had the twelve per cent. of unmarried women and widows among his constituents which he will have if the Women's Suffrage Bill passes in its present form. And the bill thus passed would bear only a remote resemblance to the homœopathic dose of justice wrapped up in the bill now before Parliament, but would be based on the law of nature, which gives every child, under normal conditions, to the joint guardianship of both its parents, and not to the uncontrolled power of one of them.

There is little danger that unmarried women and widows will be

neglectful of the interests of their married sisters. There may be, perhaps, some little danger the other way. Married women sometimes give themselves rather laughable airs of superiority over unmarried women. Even Mrs. Chapman is not exempt from this failing. She is quite sure of the answer to the question, 'Where shall wisdom be found?' if the choice lies between women who are married and those who are not; she has her little thrust at the unmarried women 'with hardly any experience of life beyond managing each her own maidservant and her own cat, if, indeed, the cat and the maidservant do not manage her.' This, to use a colloquial expression, will not hold water. It is not possible, except by way of a jest, for one section of women, of all ranks, creeds, and positions, to affect contempt for another equally heterogeneous section of women. The 800,000 single women and widows in England who are householders and ratepayers are fair samples of the female population of the country, and one with another are as likely to be self-reliant, thoughtful, and conscientious as married women are. I always recommend those who affect contempt for old maids and bachelors to read Charles Lamb's *Essay on The Behaviour of Married Persons*. If they are robust enough to endure being laughed at, it does them good.

Only one word more. Mrs. Chapman speaks of the way in which the second reading of the bill was carried in the House of Commons as if it had been the result of something underhand. She has been misled no doubt by an article in the *Times* which gave this impression. The facts are these. The second reading of the Women's Suffrage Bill was down as the third order of the day for Thursday, the 18th of February. This was the day the House reassembled after the adjournment necessary for the formation of the present Government. Two days before this it was noticed by the friends of women's suffrage that there would be a chance of the bill being reached, and they accordingly spared no pains to make this generally known. The position of the bill, supposing it could be reached, was a very strong one; for there are 348 members of the present House who are its supporters. A paragraph was sent, in the interests of the bill, to every London morning paper, announcing the possibility of the motion for the second reading being reached, and the probability of a majority in its favour in case it was reached. The *Times* omitted to insert this paragraph, and then accused the supporters of women's suffrage of carrying the second reading of the bill by means of secrecy and questionable tactics. Secrecy, or at least a suppression of the facts relating to the prospects of the bill, was manifested on the occasion, but not on the part of the friends of women's suffrage.

MILLICENT GARRETT FAWCETT.

THE FACTORS OF ORGANIC EVOLUTION.

CONCLUDED.

THE growth of a thing is effected by the joint operation of certain forces on certain materials; and when it dwindles, there is either a lack of some materials, or the forces co-operate in a way different from that which produces growth. If a structure has varied, the implication is that the processes which built it up were made unlike the parallel processes in other cases, by the greater or less amount of some one or more of the matters or actions concerned. Where there is unusual fertility, the play of vital activities is thereby shown to have deviated from the ordinary play of vital activities; and conversely, if there is infertility. If the germs, or ova, or seed, or offspring partially developed, survive more or survive less, it is either because their molar or molecular structures are unlike the average ones, or because they are affected in unlike ways by surrounding agencies. When life is prolonged, the fact implies that the combination of actions, visible and invisible, constituting life, retains its equilibrium longer than usual in presence of environing forces which tend to destroy its equilibrium. That is to say, growth, variation, survival, death, if they are to be reduced to the forms in which physical science can recognise them, must be expressed as effects of agencies definitely conceived—mechanical forces, light, heat, chemical affinity, &c.

This general conclusion brings with it the thought that the phrases employed in discussing organic evolution, though convenient and indeed needful, are liable to mislead us by veiling the actual agencies. That which really goes on in every organism is the working together of component parts in ways conducing to the continuance of their combined actions, in presence of things and actions outside; some of which tend to subserve, and others to destroy, the combination. The matters and forces in these two groups, are the sole causes properly so called. The words 'natural selection,' do not express a cause in the physical sense. They express a mode of co-operation among causes—or rather, to speak strictly, they express an effect of this mode of co-operation. The idea they convey seems perfectly intelligible. Natural selection having been compared with

artificial selection, and the analogy pointed out, there apparently remains no indefiniteness: the inconvenience being, however, that the definiteness is of a wrong kind. The tacitly implied Nature which selects, is not an embodied agency analogous to the man who selects artificially; and the selection is not the picking out of an individual fixed on, but the overthrowing of many individuals by agencies which one successfully resists, and hence continues to live and multiply. Mr. Darwin was conscious of these misleading implications. In the introduction to his *Animals and Plants under Domestication* (p. 6) he says:—

'For brevity sake I sometimes speak of natural selection as an intelligent power; . . . I have, also, often personified the word Nature; for I have found it difficult to avoid this ambiguity; but I mean by nature only the aggregate action and product of many natural laws,—and by laws only the ascertained sequence of events.'

But while he thus clearly saw, and distinctly asserted, that the factors of organic evolution are the concrete actions, inner and outer, to which every organism is subject, Mr. Darwin, by habitually using the convenient figure of speech, was, I think, prevented from recognising so fully as he would otherwise have done, certain fundamental consequences of these actions.

Though it does not personalise the cause, and does not assimilate its mode of working to a human mode of working, kindred objections may be urged against the expression to which I was led when seeking to present the phenomena in literal terms rather than metaphorical terms—the survival of the fittest¹; for in a vague way the first word, and in a clear way the second word, calls up an anthropocentric idea. The thought of survival inevitably suggests the human view of certain sets of phenomena, rather than that character which they have simply as groups of changes. If, asking what we really know of a plant, we exclude all the ideas associated with the words life and death, we find that the sole facts known to us are that there go on in the plant certain inter-dependent processes, in presence of certain aiding and hindering influences outside of it; and that in some cases a difference of structure or a favourable set of circumstances, allows these inter-dependent processes to go on for longer periods than in other cases. Again, in the working together of those many actions, internal and external, which determine the lives or deaths of organisms, we see nothing to which the words fitness and unfitness are applicable in the physical sense. If a key fits a lock, or a glove a hand, the relation of the things to one another is presentable to the perceptions. No

¹ Though Mr. Darwin approved of this expression and occasionally employed it, he did not adopt it for general use; contending, very truly, that the expression Natural Selection is in some cases more convenient. See *Animals and Plants under Domestication* (first edition) Vol. I, p. 6; and *Origin of Species* (sixth edition), p. 49.

approach to fitness of this kind is made by an organism which continues to live under certain conditions. Neither the organic structures themselves, nor their individual movements, nor those combined movements of certain among them which constitute conduct, are related in any analogous way to the things and actions in the environment. Evidently the word *fittest*, as thus used, is a figure of speech; suggesting the fact that amid surrounding actions, an organism characterised by the word has either a greater ability than others of its kind to maintain the equilibrium of its vital activities, or else has so much greater a power of multiplication that though not longer lived than they, it continues to live in posterity more persistently. And indeed, as we here see, the word *fittest* has to cover cases in which there may be less ability than usual to survive individually, but in which the defect is more than made good by higher degrees of fertility.

I have elaborated this criticism with the intention of emphasising the need for studying the changes which have gone on, and are ever going on, in organic bodies, from an exclusively physical point of view. On contemplating the facts from this point of view, we become aware that, besides those special effects of the co-operating forces which eventuate in the longer survival of one individual than of others, and in the consequent increase through generations, of some trait which furthered its survival, many other effects are being wrought on each and all of the individuals. Bodies of every class and quality, inorganic as well as organic, are from instant to instant subject to the influences in their environments; are from instant to instant being changed by these in ways that are mostly inconspicuous; and are in course of time changed by them in conspicuous ways. Living things in common with dead things, are, I say, being thus perpetually acted upon and modified; and the changes hence resulting, constitute an all-important part of those undergone in the course of organic evolution. I do not mean to imply that changes of this class pass entirely unrecognised; for, as we shall see, Mr. Darwin takes cognisance of certain secondary and special ones. But the effects which are not taken into account, are those primary and universal effects which give certain fundamental characters to all organisms. Contemplation of an analogy will best prepare the way for appreciation of them, and of the relation they bear to those which at present monopolise attention.

An observant Rambler along shores, will, here and there, note places where the sea has deposited things more or less similar, and separated them from dissimilar things—will see shingle parted from sand; larger stones sorted from smaller stones; and will occasionally discover deposits of shells more or less worn by being rolled about. Sometimes the pebbles or boulders composing the shingle at one end of a bay, he will find much larger than those at the other:

intermediate sizes, having small average differences, occupying the space between the extremes. An example occurs, if I remember rightly, some mile or two to the west of Tenby; but the most remarkable and well-known example is that afforded by the Chesil bank. Here, along a shore some sixteen miles long, there is a gradual increase in the sizes of the stones; which, being at one end but mere pebbles, are at the other end immense boulders. In this case, then, the breakers and the undertow have effected a selection—have at each place left behind those stones which were too large to be readily moved, while taking away others small enough to be moved easily. But now, if we contemplate exclusively this selective action of the sea, we overlook certain important effects which the sea simultaneously works. While the stones have been differently acted upon in so far that some have been left here and some carried there; they have been similarly acted upon in two allied, but distinguishable, ways. By perpetually rolling them about and knocking them one against another, the waves have so broken off their most prominent parts as to produce in all of them more or less rounded forms; and then, further, the mutual friction of the stones simultaneously caused, has smoothed their surfaces. That is to say in general terms, the actions of environing agencies, so far as they have operated indiscriminately, have produced in the stones a certain unity of character; at the same time that they have, by their differential effects, separated them: the larger ones having withstood certain violent actions which the smaller ones could not withstand.

Similarly with other assemblages of objects which are alike in their primary traits but unlike in their secondary traits. When simultaneously exposed to the same set of actions, some of these actions, rising to a certain intensity, may be expected to work on particular members of the assemblage changes which they cannot work in those which are markedly unlike; while others of the actions will work in all of them similar changes, because of the uniform relations between these actions and certain attributes common to all members of the assemblage. Hence it is inferable that on living organisms, which form an assemblage of this kind, and are unceasingly exposed in common to the agencies composing their inorganic environments, there must be wrought two such sets of effects. There will result a universal likeness among them consequent on the likeness of their respective relations to the matters and forces around; and there will result, in some cases, the differences due to the differential effects of these matters and forces, and in other cases, the changes which, being life-sustaining or life-destroying, eventuate in certain natural selections.

I have, above, made a passing reference to the fact that Mr. Darwin did not fail to take account of some among these effects directly produced on organisms by surrounding inorganic agencies.

Here are extracts from the sixth edition of the *Origin of Species* showing this.

'It is very difficult to decide how far changed conditions, such as of climate, food, &c., have acted in a definite manner. There is reason to believe that in the course of time the effects have been greater than can be proved by clear evidence. . . . Mr Gould believes that birds of the same species are more brightly coloured under a clear atmosphere, than when living near the coast or on islands; and Wollaston is convinced that residence near the sea affects the colours of insects. Moquin-Tandon gives a list of plants which, when growing near the sea-shore, have their leaves in some degree fleshy, though not elsewhere fleshy' (pp. 106-7). 'Some observers are convinced that a damp climate affects the growth of the hair, and that with the hair the horns are correlated' (p. 159).

In his subsequent work, *Animals and Plants under Domestication*, Mr. Darwin still more clearly recognises these causes of change in organisation. A chapter is devoted to the subject. After premising that 'the direct action of the conditions of life, whether leading to definite or indefinite results, is a totally distinct consideration from the effects of natural selection;' he goes on to say that changed conditions of life 'have acted so definitely and powerfully on the organisation of our domesticated productions, that they have sufficed to form new sub-varieties or races, without the aid of selection by man or of natural selection.' Of his examples here are two.

'I have given in detail in the ninth chapter the most remarkable case known to me, namely, that in Germany several varieties of maize brought from the hotter parts of America were transformed in the course of only two or three generations' (Vol. ii, p. 277.) [And in this ninth chapter concerning these and other such instances he says 'some of the foregoing differences would certainly be considered of specific value with plants in a state of nature' (Vol. i, p. 321.)] 'Mr Meehan, in a remarkable paper, compares twenty-nine kinds of American trees, belonging to various orders, with their nearest European allies, all grown in close proximity in the same garden and under as nearly as possible the same conditions.' And then enumerating six traits in which the American forms all of them differ in like ways from their allied European forms, Mr. Darwin thinks there is no choice but to conclude that these 'have been definitely caused by the long-continued action of the different climate of the two continents on the trees.' (Vol. ii, pp. 281-2.)

But the fact we have to note is that while Mr. Darwin thus took account of special effects due to special amounts and combinations of agencies in the environment, he did not take account of the far more important effects due to the general and constant operation of these agencies.² If a difference between the quantities of a force

² It is true that while not deliberately admitted by Mr Darwin, these effects are not denied by him. In his *Animals and Plants under Domestication* (vol. ii, 281), he refers to certain chapters in the *Principles of Biology*, in which I have discussed this general inter-action of the medium and the organism, and ascribed certain most general traits to it. But though, by his expressions, he implies a sympathetic attention to the argument, he does not in such way adopt the conclusion as to assign to this factor any share in the genesis of organic structures—much less that large share which I believe it has had. I did not myself at that time, nor indeed until quite recently, see how extensive and profound have been the influences on organization

which acts on two organisms, otherwise alike and otherwise similarly conditioned, produces some difference between them; then, by implication, this force produces in both of them effects which they show in common. The inequality between two things cannot have a value unless the things themselves have values. Similarly if, in two cases, some unlikeness of proportion among the surrounding inorganic agencies to which two plants or two animals are exposed, is followed by some unlikeness in the changes wrought on them; then it follows that these several agencies taken separately, work changes in both of them. Hence we must infer that organisms have certain structural characters in common, which are consequent on the action of the medium in which they exist: using the word medium in a comprehensive sense, as including all physical forces falling upon them as well as matters bathing them. And we may conclude that from the primary characters thus produced there must result secondary characters.

Before going on to observe those general traits of organisms due to the general action of the inorganic environment upon them, I feel tempted to enlarge on the effects produced by each of the several matters and forces constituting the environment. I should like to do this not only to give a clear preliminary conception of the ways in which all organisms are affected by these universally-present agents, but also to show that, in the first place, these agents modify inorganic bodies as well as organic bodies, and that, in the second place, the organic are far more modifiable by them than the inorganic. But to avoid undue suspension of the argument, I content myself with saying that when the respective effects of gravitation, heat, light, &c., are studied, as well as the respective effects, physical and chemical, of the matters forming the media, water and air, it will be found that while more or less operative on all bodies, each modifies organic bodies to an extent immensely greater than the extent to which it modifies inorganic bodies.

Here, not discriminating among the special effects which these various forces and matters in the environment produce on both classes of bodies, let us consider their combined effects, and ask—What is the most general trait of such effects?

Obviously the most general trait is the greater amount of change wrought on the outer surface than on the inner mass. In so far as the matters of which the medium is composed come into play, the unavoidable implication is that they act more on the parts directly exposed to them than on the parts sheltered from them. And in so

which, as we shall presently see, are traceable to the early results of this fundamental relation between organism and medium. I may add that it is in an essay on 'Transcendental Physiology,' first published in 1857, that the line of thought here followed out in its wider bearings, was first entered upon

far as the forces pervading the medium come into play, it is manifest that, excluding gravity, which affects outer and inner parts indiscriminately, the outer parts have to bear larger shares of their actions. If it is a question of heat, then the exterior must lose it or gain it faster than the interior; and in a medium which is now warmer and now colder, the two must habitually differ in temperature to some extent—at least where the size is considerable. If it is a question of light, then in all but absolutely transparent masses, the outer parts must undergo more of any change producible by it than the inner parts—supposing other things equal; by which I mean, supposing the case is not complicated by any such convexities of the outer surface as produce internal concentrations of rays. Hence then, speaking generally, the necessity is that the primary and almost universal effect of the converse between the body and its medium, is to differentiate its outside from its inside. I say almost universal, because where the body is both mechanically and chemically stable, like, for instance, a quartz crystal, the medium may fail to work either inner or outer change.

Of illustrations among inorganic bodies, a convenient one is supplied by an old cannon-ball that has been long lying exposed. A coating of rust, formed of flakes within flakes, incloses it; and this thickens year by year, until, perhaps, it reaches a stage at which its exterior loses as much by rain and wind as its interior gains by further oxidation of the iron. Most mineral masses—pebbles, boulders, rocks—if they show any effect of the environment at all, show it only by that disintegration of surface which follows the freezing of absorbed water: an effect which, though mechanical rather than chemical, equally illustrates the general truth. Occasionally a 'rocking-stone' is thus produced. There are formed successive layers relatively friable in texture, each of which, thickest at the most exposed parts, and being presently lost by weathering, leave the contained mass in a shape more rounded than before; until, resting on its convex under-surface, it is easily moved. But of all instances perhaps the most remarkable is one to be seen on the west bank of the Nile at Philæ, where a ridge of granite 100 feet high, has had its outer parts reduced in course of time to a collection of boulder-shaped masses, varying from say a yard in diameter to six or eight feet, each one of which shows in progress an exfoliation of successively-formed shells of decomposed granite: most of the masses having portions of such shells partially detached.

If, now, inorganic masses, relatively so stable in composition, thus have their outer parts differentiated from their inner parts, what must we say of organic masses, characterised by such extreme chemical instability?—instability so great that their essential material is named protein, to indicate the readiness with which it passes from one isomeric form to another. Clearly the necessary inference is that

this effect of the medium must be wrought inevitably and promptly, wherever the relation of outer and inner has become settled : a qualification for which the need will be seen hereafter.

Beginning with the earliest and most minute kinds of living things, we necessarily encounter difficulties in getting direct evidence ; since, of the countless species now existing, all have been subject during millions upon millions of years to the evolutionary process, and have had their primary traits complicated and obscured by those endless secondary traits which the natural selection of favourable variations has produced. Among protophytes it needs but to think of the multitudinous varieties of diatoms and desmids, with their elaborately-constructed coverings ; or of the definite methods of growth and multiplication among such simple *Algæ* as the *Conjugatæ* ; to see that most of their distinctive characters are due to inherited constitutions, which have been slowly moulded by survival of the fittest to this or that mode of life. To disentangle such parts of their developmental changes as are due to the action of the medium, is therefore hardly possible. We can hope only to get a general conception of it by contemplating the totality of the facts.

The first cardinal fact is that all protophytes are cellular—all show us this contrast between outside and inside. Supposing the multitudinous specialties of the envelope in different orders and genera of protophytes to be set against one another, and mutually cancelled, there remains as a trait common to them—an envelope unlike that which it envelopes. The second cardinal fact is that this simple trait is the earliest trait displayed in germs, or spores, or other parts from which new individuals are to arise ; and that, consequently, this trait must be regarded as having been primordial. For it is an established truth of organic evolution that embryos show us, in general ways, the forms of remote ancestors ; and that the first changes undergone, indicate, more or less clearly, the first changes which took place in the series of forms through which the existing form has been reached. Describing, in successive groups of plants, the early transformations of these primitive units, Sachs³ says of the lowest *Algæ* that ‘the conjugated protoplasmic body clothes itself with a cell-wall’ (p. 10) ; that in ‘the spores of Mosses and Vascular Cryptogams’ and in ‘the pollen of Phanerogams’ . . . ‘the protoplasmic body of the mother-cell breaks up into four lumps, which quickly round themselves off and contract, and become enveloped by a cell-membrane only after complete separation’ (p. 13) ; that in the *Equisetaceæ* ‘the young spores, when first separated, are still naked, but they soon become surrounded by a cell-membrane’ (p. 14) ; and that in higher plants, as in the pollen of many Dicotyledons, ‘the contracting daughter-cells secrete cellulose

³ *Text-Book of Botany, &c.*, by Julius Sachs. Translated by A. W. Bennett and W. T. T. Dyer

even during their separation' (p. 14). Here, then, in whatever way we interpret it, the fact is that there quickly arises an outer layer different from the contained matter. But the most significant evidence is furnished by 'the masses of protoplasm that escape into water from the injured sacs of *Vaucheria*, which often instantly become rounded into globular bodies,' and of which the 'hyaline protoplasm envelopes the whole as a skin' (p. 41) which 'is denser than the inner and more watery substance' (p. 42). As in this case the protoplasm is but a fragment, and as it is removed from the influence of the parent-cell, this differentiating process can scarcely be regarded as anything more than the effect of physico-chemical actions: a conclusion which is supported by the statement of Sachs that 'not only every vacuole in a solid protoplasmic body, but also every thread of protoplasm which penetrates the sap-cavity, and finally the inner side of the protoplasm-sac which encloses the sap-cavity, is also bounded by a skin' (p. 42). If, then, 'every portion of a protoplasmic body immediately surrounds itself, when it becomes isolated, with such a skin,' which is shown in all cases to arise at the surface of contact with sap or water, this primary differentiation of outer from inner must be ascribed to the direct action of the medium. Whether the coating thus initiated is secreted by the protoplasm, or whether, as seems more likely, it results from transformation of it, matters not to the argument. Either way the action of the medium causes its formation; and either way the many varied and complex differentiations which developed cell-walls display, must be considered as originating from those variations of this physically-generated covering which natural selection has taken advantage of.

The contained protoplasm of a vegetal cell, which has self-mobility, and when liberated sometimes performs amœba-like motions for a time, may be regarded as an imprisoned amœba; and when we pass from it to a free amœba, which is one of the simplest types of first animals, or *Protozoa*, we naturally meet with kindred phenomena. The general trait which here concerns us, is that while its plastic or semi-fluid sarcode goes on protruding, in irregular ways, now this and now that part of its periphery, and again withdrawing into its interior first one and then another of these temporary processes, perhaps with some small portion of food attached, there is but an indistinct differentiation of outer from inner (a fact shown by the frequent coalescence of the pseudopodia in Rhizopods); but that when it eventually becomes quiescent, the surface becomes differentiated from the contents: the passing into an encysted state, doubtless in large measure due to inherited proclivity, being furthered, and having probably been once initiated, by the action of the medium. The connexion between constancy of relative position among the parts of the sarcode, and the rise of a contrast between superficial and central parts, is perhaps best shown in the minutest and simplest *Infusoria*, the *Monadina*.

The genus *Monas* is described by Kent as 'plastic and unstable in form, possessing no distinct cuticular investment; . . . the food-substances incepted at all parts of the periphery;'⁴ and the genus *Scytomonas* he says 'differs from *Monas* only in its persistent shape and accompanying greater rigidity of the peripheral or ectoplasmic layer.'⁵ Describing generally such low forms, some of which are said to have neither nucleus nor vacuole, he remarks that in types somewhat higher 'the outer or peripheral border of the protoplasmic mass, while not assuming the character of a distinct cell-wall or so-called cuticle, presents, as compared with the inner substance of that mass, a slightly more solid type of composition.'⁶ And it is added that these forms having so slightly differentiated an exterior, 'while usually exhibiting a more or less characteristic normal outline, can revert at will to a pseud-amœboid and repent state.'⁷ Here, then, we have several indications of the truth that the permanent externality of a certain part of the substance, is followed by transformation of it into a coating unlike the substance it contains. Indefinite and structureless in the simplest of these forms, as instance again the *Gregarina*,⁸ the limiting membrane becomes, in higher *Infusoria*, definite and often complex: showing that the selection of favourable variations has had largely to do with its formation. In such types as the *Foraminifera*, which, almost structureless internally though they are, secrete calcareous shells, it is clear that the nature of this outer layer is determined by inherited constitution. But recognition of this consists with the belief that the action of the medium initiated the outer layer, specialized though it now is; and that even still, contact with the medium excites secretion of it.

Limited, as thus far drawn, to a certain common trait of those minute organisms which are mostly below the reach of unaided vision, the foregoing conclusion appears trivial enough. But it ceases to appear trivial on passing into a wider field, and observing the implications, direct and indirect, as they concern plants and animals of sensible sizes.

Popular expositions of science have so far familiarized many readers with a certain fundamental trait of living things around, that they have ceased to perceive how marvellous a trait it is, and, until interpreted by the Theory of Evolution, how utterly mysterious. In past times, the conception of an ordinary plant or animal which prevailed, not throughout the world at large only but among the most instructed, was that it is a single continuous entity. One of these living things was unhesitatingly regarded as being in all respects

⁴ *A Manual of the Infusoria*, by W. Saville Kent. Vol. i, p. 232.

⁵ *Ib.* Vol. i, p. 241.

⁶ *Ib.* Vol. i, p. 56.

⁷ *Ib.* Vol. i, p. 57.

⁸ *The Elements of Comparative Anatomy*, by T. H. Huxley, pp. 7-9.

a unit. Parts it might have, various in their sizes, forms, and compositions; but these were components of a whole which had been from the beginning in its original nature a whole. Even to naturalists fifty years ago, the assertion that a cabbage or a cow, though in one sense a whole, is in another sense a vast society of minute individuals, severally living in greater or less degrees, and some of them maintaining their independent lives unrestrained, would have seemed an absurdity. But this truth which, like so many of the truths established by science, is contrary to that common sense in which most people have so much confidence, has been gradually growing clear since the days when Leeuwenhoeck and his contemporaries began to examine through lenses the minute structures of common plants and animals. Each improvement in the microscope, while it has widened our knowledge of those minute forms of life described above, has revealed further evidence of the fact that all the larger forms of life consist of units severally allied in their fundamental traits to these minute forms of life. Though, as formulated by Schwann and Schleiden, the cell-doctrine has undergone qualifications of statement; yet the qualifications have not been such as to militate against the general proposition that organisms visible to the naked eye, are severally compounded of invisible organisms—using that word in its most comprehensive sense. And then, when the development of any animal is traced, it is found that having been primarily a nucleated cell, and having afterwards become by spontaneous fission a cluster of nucleated cells, it goes on through successive stages to form out of such cells, ever multiplying and modifying in various ways, the several tissues and organs composing the adult.

On the hypothesis of evolution this universal trait has to be accepted not as a fact that is strange but unmeaning. It has to be accepted as evidence that all the visible forms of life have arisen by union of the invisible forms; which, instead of flying apart when they divided, remained together. Various intermediate stages are known. Among plants, those of the *Volvox* type show us the component protophytes so feebly combined that they severally carry on their lives with no appreciable subordination to the life of the group. And among animals, a parallel relation between the lives of the units and the life of the group is shown us in *Uroglena* and *Synerypta*. From these first stages upwards, may be traced through successively higher types, an increasing subordination of the units to the aggregate; though still a subordination leaving to them conspicuous amounts of individual activity. Joining which facts with the phenomena presented by the cell-multiplication and aggregation of every unfolding germ, naturalists are now accepting the conclusion that by this process of composition from *Protozoa*, were formed all classes of the *Metazoa* *—(as animals formed by this compounding are now called); and that

* *A Treatise on Comparative Embryology*, by F. M. Balfour, Vol. II, chap. xiii.

in a similar way from *Protophyta*, were formed all classes of what I suppose will be called *Metaphyta*, though the word does not yet seem to have become current.

And now what is the general meaning of these truths, taken in connexion with the conclusion reached in the last section? It is that this universal trait of the *Metazoa* and *Metaphyta*, must be ascribed to the primitive action and re-action between the organism and its medium. The operation of those forces which produced the primary differentiation of outer from inner in early minute masses of protoplasm, pre-determined this universal cell-structure of all embryos, plant and animal, and the consequent cell-composition of adult forms arising from them. How unavoidable is this implication, will be seen on carrying further an illustration already used—that of the shingle-covered shore, the pebbles on which, while being in some cases selected, have been in all cases rounded and smoothed. Suppose a bed of such shingle to be, as we often see it, solidified along with interfused material, into a conglomerate. What in such case must be considered as the chief trait of such conglomerate; or rather—what must we regard as the chief cause of its distinctive characters? Evidently the action of the sea. Without the breakers, no pebbles; without the pebbles, no conglomerate. Similarly then, in the absence of that action of the medium by which was effected the differentiation of outer from inner in those microscopic portions of protoplasm constituting the earliest and simplest animals and plants, there could not have existed this cardinal trait of composition which all the higher animals and plants show us.

So that, active as has been the part played by natural selection, alike in modifying and moulding the original units—largely as survival of the fittest has been instrumental in furthering and controlling the combination of these units into visible organisms, and eventually into large ones; yet we must ascribe to the direct effect of the medium on the first forms of life, that character of which this everywhere-operative factor has taken advantage.

Let us turn now to another and more obvious attribute of higher organisms, for which also there is this same general cause. Let us observe how, on a higher platform, there recurs this differentiation of outer from inner—how this primary trait in the living units with which life commences, re-appears as a primary trait in those aggregates of such units which constitute visible organisms.

In its simplest and most unmistakable form, we see this in the early changes of an unfolding ovum of primitive type. The original fertilized single cell, having by spontaneous fission multiplied into a cluster of such cells, there begins to show itself a contrast between periphery and centre; and presently there is formed a sphere consisting of a superficial layer unlike its contents. The first change,

then, is the rise of a difference between that outer part which holds direct converse with the surrounding medium, and that inclosed part which does not. This primary differentiation in these compound embryos of higher animals, parallels the primary differentiation undergone by the simplest living things.

Leaving, for the present, succeeding changes of the compound embryo, the significance of which we shall have to consider by-and-by, let us pass now to the adult forms of visible plants and animals. In them we find cardinal traits which, after what we have seen above, will further impress us with the importance of the effects wrought on the organism by its medium.

From the thallus of a sea-weed up to the leaf of a highly developed phænogam, we find, at all stages, a contrast between the inner and outer parts of these flattened masses of tissue. In the higher *Algae* 'the outermost layers consist of smaller and firmer cells, while the inner cells are often very large, and sometimes extremely long;' ¹⁰ and in the leaves of trees the epidermal layer, besides differing in the sizes and shapes of its component cells from the parenchyma forming the inner substance of the leaf, is itself differentiated by having a continuous cuticle, and by having the outer walls of its cells unlike the inner walls.¹¹ Especially significant is the structure of such intermediate types as the Liverworts. Beyond the differentiation of the covering cells from the contained cells, and the contrast between upper surface and under surface, the frond of *Marchantia polymorpha* clearly shows us the direct effect of incident forces; and shows us, too, how it is involved with the effect of inherited proclivities. The frond grows from a flat disc-shaped gemma, the two sides of which are alike. Either side may fall uppermost; and then of the developing shoot, the side exposed to the light 'is under all circumstances the upper side which forms stomata, the dark side becomes the under side which produces root-hairs and leafy processes.'¹² So that while we have undeniable proof that the contrasted influences of the medium on the two sides, initiate the differentiation, we have also proof that the completion of it is determined by the transmitted structure of the type; since it is impossible to ascribe the development of stomata to the direct action of air and light. On turning from foliar expansions, to stems and roots, facts of like meaning meet us. Speaking generally of epidermal tissue and inner tissue, Sachs remarks that 'the contrast of the two is the plainer the more the part of the plant concerned is exposed to air and light.'¹³ Elsewhere, in correspondence with this, it is said that in roots the cells of the epidermis, though distinguished by bearing hairs, 'are otherwise similar to those of the fundamental tissue' which they clothe,¹⁴ while the cuticular covering is relatively thin; whereas in stems the

¹⁰ Sachs, p 210¹¹ *Ibid.* p 80.¹² *Ibid.* pp 83-4.¹³ *Ibid.* p 185.¹⁴ *Ibid.* p 83.

epidermis (often further differentiated) is composed of layers of cells which are smaller and thicker-walled : a stronger contrast of structure corresponding to a stronger contrast of conditions. By way of meeting the suggestion that these respective differences are wholly due to the natural selection of favourable variations, it will suffice if I draw attention to the unlikeness between imbedded roots and exposed roots. While in darkness, and surrounded by moist earth, the outermost protective coats, even of large roots, are comparatively thin ; but when the accidents of growth entail permanent exposure to light and air, roots acquire coverings allied in character to the coverings of branches. That the action of the medium causes these and converse changes, cannot be doubted when we find, on the one hand, that 'roots can become directly transformed into leaf-bearing shoots,' and, on the other hand, that in some plants certain 'apparent roots are only underground shoots,' and that nevertheless 'they are similar to true roots in function and in the formation of tissue, but have no root-cap, and, when they come to the light above ground, continue to grow in the manner of ordinary leaf-shoots.'¹⁶ If, then, in highly developed plants inheriting pronounced structures, this differentiating influence of the medium is so marked, it must have been all-important at the outset while types were undetermined.

As with plants, so with animals, we find good reason for inferring that while the specialities of the tegumentary parts must be ascribed to the natural selection of favourable variations, their most general traits are due to the direct action of surrounding agencies. Here we come upon the border of those changes which are ascribable to use and disuse. But from this class of changes we may fitly exclude those in which the parts concerned are wholly or mainly passive. A corn and a blister will conveniently serve to illustrate the way in which certain outer actions initiate in the superficial tissues, effects of very marked kinds, which are related neither to the needs of the organism nor to its normal structure. They are neither adaptive changes nor changes towards completion of the type. After noting them we may pass to allied, but still more instructive changes. Continuous pressure on any portion of the surface causes absorption, while intermittent pressure causes growth : the one impeding circulation and the passage of plasma from the capillaries into the tissues, and the other aiding both. There are yet further mechanically produced effects. That the general character of the ribbed skin on the under surfaces of the feet and insides of the hands, is directly due to friction and intermittent pressure, we have the proofs ; first, that the tracts most exposed to rough usage are the most ribbed ; second, that the insides of hands subject to unusual amounts of rough usage, as those of sailors, are strongly ribbed all over ; and third, that in hands which are very little used, the parts commonly ribbed become quite smooth.

¹⁶ Sachs, p. 147.

These several kinds of evidence, however, full of meaning as they are, I give simply to prepare the way for evidence of a much more conclusive kind.

Where a wide ulcer has eaten away the deep-seated layer out of which the epidermis grows, or where this layer has been destroyed by an extensive burn, the process of healing is very significant. From the subjacent tissues, which in the normal order have no concern with outward growth, there is produced a new skin, or rather a pro-skin; for this substituted outward-growing layer contains no hair-follicles or other specialities of the original one. Nevertheless, it is like the original one in so far that it is a continually renewed protective covering. Doubtless it may be contended that this makeshift skin results from the inherited proclivity of the type—the tendency to complete afresh the structure of the species when injured. We cannot, however, ignore the immediate influence of the medium, on recalling the facts above named, or on remembering the further fact that an inflamed surface of skin, when not sheltered from the air, will throw out a film of coagulable lymph. But that the direct action of the medium is a chief factor we are clearly shown by another case. Accident or disease occasionally causes permanent eversion, or protrusion, of mucous membrane. After a period of irritability, great at first, but decreasing as the change advances, this membrane assumes the general character of ordinary skin. Nor is this all: its microscopic structure changes. Where it is a mucous membrane of the kind covered by cylinder-epithelium, the cylinders gradually shorten, becoming finally flat, and there results a squamous epithelium: there is a near approach in minute composition to epidermis. Here a tendency towards completion of the type cannot be alleged; for there is, contrariwise, divergence from the type. The effect of the medium is so great, that, in a short time, it overcomes the inherited proclivity and produces a structure of opposite kind to the normal one.

Fully to perceive the way in which these evidences compel us to recognise the influence of the medium as a primordial factor, we need but conceive them as interpreted without it. Suppose, for instance, we say that the structure of the epidermis is wholly determined by the natural selection of favourable variations; what must be the position taken in presence of the fact above named, that when mucous membrane is exposed to the air its cell-structure changes into the cell-structure of skin? The position taken must be this:—Though mucous membrane in a highly evolved individual organism, thus show the powerful effect of the medium on its surface; yet we must not suppose that the medium had the effect of producing such a cell-structure on the surfaces of primitive forms, undifferentiated though they were; or, if we suppose that such an effect was produced on them, we must not suppose that it was inheritable. Contrariwise we must suppose that such effect of the medium either was not wrought

at all, or that it was evanescent: though repeated through millions upon millions of generations it left no traces. And we must conclude that this skin-structure arose only in consequence of spontaneous variations not physically initiated (though like those physically initiated) which natural selection laid hold of and increased. Does any one think this a tenable position?

And now we approach the last and chief series of morphological phenomena which must be ascribed to the direct action of environing matters and forces. These are presented to us when we study the early stages in the development of the embryos of the *Metazoa* in general.

We will set out with the fact already noted in passing, that after repeated spontaneous fissions have changed the original fertilised germ-cell into that cluster of cells which forms a gemmule or a primitive ovum, the first contrast which arises is between the peripheral parts and the central parts. Where, as with lower creatures which do not lay up large stores of nutriment with the germs of their offspring, the inner mass is inconsiderable, the outer layer of cells, which are presently made quite small by repeated subdivisions, forms a membrane extending over the whole surface—the blastoderm. The next stage of development, which ends in this covering layer becoming double, is reached in two ways—by invagination and by delamination; but which is the original way and which the abridged way, is not quite certain. Of invagination, multitudinously exemplified in the lowest types, Mr. Balfour says:—‘On purely *à priori* grounds there is in my opinion more to be said for invagination than for any other view;’¹⁶ and, for present purposes, it will suffice if we limit ourselves to this: making its nature clear to the general reader by a simple illustration.

Take a small india-rubber ball, not of the inflated kind, nor of the solid kind, but of the kind about an inch or so in diameter with a small hole through which, under pressure, the air escapes. Suppose that instead of consisting of india-rubber its wall consists of small cells made polyhedral in form by mutual pressure, and united together. This will represent the blastoderm. Now with the finger, thrust in one side of the ball until it touches the other: so making a cup. This action will stand for the process of invagination. Imagine that by continuance of it, the hemispherical cup becomes very much deepened and the opening narrowed, until the cup becomes a sac, of which the introverted wall is everywhere in contact with the outer wall. This will represent the two-layered ‘gastrula’—the simplest ancestral form of the *Metazoa*: a form which is permanently represented in some of the lowest types; for it needs but tentacles round

¹⁶ *A Treatise on Comparative Embryology*. By Francis M. Balfour, LL.D., F.R.S. vol. ii. p. 343 (second edition).

the mouth of the sac, to produce a common hydra. Here the fact which it chiefly concerns us to remark, is that of these two layers the outer, called in embryological language the epiblast, continues to carry on direct converse with the forces and matters in the environment; while the inner, called the hypoblast, comes in contact with such only of these matters as are put into the food-cavity which it lines. We have further to note that in the embryos of *Metazoa* at all advanced in organisation, there arises between these two layers a third—the mesoblast. The origin of this is seen in types where the developmental process is not obscured by the presence of a large food-yolk. While the above-described introversion is taking place, and before the inner surfaces of the resulting epiblast and hypoblast have come into contact, cells, or amœboid units equivalent to them, are budded off from one or both of these inner surfaces, or some part of one or other; and these form a layer which eventually lies between the other two—a layer which, as this mode of formation implies, never has any converse with the surrounding medium and its contents or with the nutritive bodies taken in from it. The striking facts to which this description is a necessary introduction, may now be stated. From the outer layer, or epiblast, are developed the permanent epidermis and its outgrowths, the nervous system, and the organs of sense; from the introverted layer, or hypoblast, are developed the alimentary canal and those parts of its appended organs, liver, pancreas, &c., which are concerned in delivering their secretions into the alimentary canal, as well as the linings of those ramifying tubes in the lungs which convey air to the places where gaseous exchange is effected; and from the mesoblast originate the bones, the muscles, the heart and blood-vessels, and the lymphatics, together with such parts of various internal organs as are most remotely concerned with the outer world. Minor qualifications being admitted, there remain the broad general facts, that out of that part of the external layer which remains permanently external, are developed all the structures which carry on intercourse with the medium and its contents, active and passive; out of the introverted part of this external layer, are developed the structures which carry on intercourse with the quasi-external substances that are taken into the interior—solid food, water, and air; while out of the mesoblast are developed structures which have never had, from first to last, any intercourse with the environment. Let us contemplate these general facts.

Who would have imagined that the nervous system is a modified portion of the primitive epidermis? In the absence of proofs furnished by the concurrent testimony of embryologists during the last thirty or forty years, who would have believed that the brain arises from an infolded tract of the outer skin, which, sinking down beneath the surface, becomes embedded in other tissues and eventually surrounded by a bony case? Yet the human nervous system in common

with the nervous systems of lower animals is thus originated. In the words of Mr. Balfour, early embryological changes imply that—

‘the functions of the central nervous system, which were originally taken by the whole skin, became gradually concentrated in a special part of the skin which was step by step removed from the surface, and has finally become in the higher types a well-defined organ embedded in the subdermal tissues. . . . The embryological evidence shows that the ganglion-cells of the central part of the nervous system are originally derived from the simple undifferentiated epithelial cells of the surface of the body.’¹⁷

Less startling perhaps, though still startling enough, is the fact that the eye is evolved out of a portion of the skin; and that while the crystalline lens and its surroundings thus originate, the ‘percipient portions of the organs of special sense, especially of optic organs, are often formed from the same part of the primitive epidermis’ which forms the central nervous system.¹⁸ Similarly is it with the organs for smelling and hearing. These, too, begin as sacs formed by infoldings of the epidermis; and while their parts are developing they are joined from within by nervous structures which were themselves epidermic in origin. How are we to interpret these strange transformations? Observing, as we pass, how absurd from the point of view of the special-creationist, would appear such a filiation of structures and such a round-about mode of embryonic development, we have here to remark that the process is not one to have been anticipated as a result of natural selection. After numbers of spontaneous variations had occurred, as the hypothesis implies, in useless ways, the variation which primarily initiated a nervous centre might reasonably have been expected to occur in some internal part where it would be fitly located. Its initiation in a dangerous place and subsequent migration to a safe place, would be incomprehensible. Not so if we bear in mind the cardinal truth above set forth, that the structures for holding converse with the medium and its contents, arise in that completely superficial part which is directly affected by the medium and its contents; and if we draw the inference that the external actions themselves initiate the structures. These once commenced, and furthered by natural selection where favourable to life, would form the first term of a series ending in developed sense-organs and a developed nervous system.¹⁹

Though it would enforce the argument, I must, for brevity’s sake, pass over the analogous evolution of that introverted layer, or hypoblast, out of which the alimentary canal and attached organs arise. It will suffice to emphasise the fact that having been originally external, this layer continues in its developed form to have a quasi-externality, alike in its digesting part and in its respiratory part; since it

¹⁷ Balfour, *loc. cit.* vol. ii pp. 400, 401.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 401.

¹⁹ For a general delineation of the changes by which the development is effected, see Balfour, *loc. cit.* vol. ii. pp. 401-4.

continues to deal with matters alien to the organism. I must also refrain from dwelling at length on the fact already adverted to, that the intermediate derived layer, or mesoblast, which was at the outset completely internal, originates those structures which ever remain completely internal, and have no communication with the environment save through the structures developed from the other two: an antithesis which has great significance.

Here, instead of dwelling on these details, it will be better to draw attention to the most general aspect of the facts. Whatever may be the course of subsequent changes, the first change is the formation of a superficial layer or blastoderm; and by whatever series of transformations the adult structure is reached, it is from the blastoderm that all the organs forming the adult originate. Why this marvellous fact?

Meaning is given to it if we go back to the first stage in which *Protozoa*, having by repeated fissions formed a cluster, then arranged themselves into a hollow sphere, as do the protophytes forming a *Volvox*. Originally alike all over its surface, the hollow sphere of ciliated units thus formed, would, if not quite spherical, assume a constant attitude when moving through the water; and hence one part of the spheroid would more frequently than the rest come in contact with nutritive matters to be taken in. A division of labour resulting from such a variation being advantageous, and tending therefore to increase in descendants, would end in a differentiation like that shown in the gemmules of various low types of *Metazoa*, which, ovate in shape, are ciliated over one part of the surface only. There would arise a form in which the cilium-bearing units effected locomotion and aeration; while on the others, assuming an amœba-like character, devolved the function of absorbing food: a primordial specialisation variously indicated by evidence.²⁰ Just noting that an ancestral origin of this kind is implied by the fact that in low types of *Metazoa* a hollow sphere of cells is the form first assumed by the unfolding embryo, I draw attention to the point here of chief interest, namely, that the primary differentiation of this hollow sphere is in such case determined by a difference in the converse of its parts with the medium and its contents; and that the subsequent invagination arises by a continuance of this differential converse.

Even neglecting this first stage and commencing with the next, in which a 'gastrula' has been produced by the permanent introversion of one portion of the surface of the hollow sphere, it will suffice if we consider what must thereafter have happened. That which continued to be the outer surface was the part which from time to time touched quiescent masses and occasionally received the collisions consequent on its own motions or the motions of other things. It was the part to receive the sound-vibrations occasionally propagated

²⁰ See Balfour, vol. i. p. 149, and vol. ii. pp. 343-4.

through the water; the part to be affected more strongly than any other by those variations in the amounts of light caused by the passing of small bodies close to it; and the part which met those diffused molecules constituting odours. That is to say, from the beginning the surface was the part on which there fell the various influences pervading the environment, the part by which there was received those impressions from the environment serving for the guidance of actions, and the part which had to bear the mechanical re-actions consequent upon such actions. Necessarily, therefore, the surface was the part in which were initiated the various instrumentalities for carrying on intercourse with the environment. To suppose otherwise is to suppose that such instrumentalities arose internally where they could neither be operated on by surrounding agencies nor operate on them,—where the differentiating forces did not come into play, and the differentiated structures had nothing to do; and it is to suppose that meanwhile the parts directly exposed to the differentiating forces remained unchanged. Clearly, then, organisation could not but begin on the surface; and having thus begun, its subsequent course could not but be determined by its superficial origin. And hence these remarkable facts showing us that individual evolution is accomplished by successive in-foldings and in-growings. Doubtless natural selection soon came into action, as, for example, in the removal of the rudimentary nervous centres from the surface; since an individual in which they were a little more deeply seated would be less likely to be incapacitated by injury of them. And so in multitudinous other ways. But nevertheless, as we here see, natural selection could operate only under subjection. It could do no more than take advantage of those structural changes which the medium and its contents initiated.

See, then, how large has been the part played by this primordial factor. Had it done no more than give to *Protozoa* and *Protophyta* that cell-form which characterises them—had it done no more than entail the cellular composition which is so remarkable a trait of *Metazoa* and *Metaphyta*—had it done no more than cause the repetition in all visible animals and plants of that primary differentiation of outer from inner which it first wrought in animals and plants invisible to the naked eye; it would have done much towards giving to organisms of all kinds certain leading traits. But it has done more than this. By causing the first differentiations of those clusters of units out of which visible animals in general arose, it fixed the starting place for organisation, and therefore determined the course of organisation; and doing this, gave indelible traits to embryonic transformations and to adult structures.

Though mainly carried on after the inductive method, the argument at the close of the foregoing section has passed into the

deductive. Here let us follow for a space the deductive method pure and simple. Doubtless, in biology *à priori* reasoning is dangerous; but there can be no danger in considering whether its results coincide with those reached by reasoning *à posteriori*.

Biologists in general agree that in the present state of the world, no such thing happens as the rise of a living creature out of non-living matter. They do not deny, however, that at a remote period in the past, when the temperature of the Earth's surface was much higher than at present, and other physical conditions were unlike those we know, inorganic matter, through successive complications, gave origin to organic matter. So many substances once supposed to belong exclusively to living bodies, have now been formed artificially, that men of science scarcely question the conclusion that there are conditions under which, by yet another step of composition, quaternary compounds of lower types pass into those of highest types. That there once took place a gradual divergence of the organic from the inorganic, is, indeed, a necessary implication of the hypothesis of Evolution, taken as a whole; and if we accept it as a whole, we must put to ourselves the question—What were the early stages of progress which followed, after the most complex form of matter had arisen out of forms of matter a degree less complex?

At first, protoplasm could have had no proclivities to one or other arrangement of parts; unless, indeed, a purely mechanical proclivity towards a spherical form when suspended in a liquid. At the outset it must have been passive. In respect of its passivity, primitive organic matter must have been like inorganic matter. No such thing as spontaneous variation could have occurred in it; for variation implies some habitual course of change from which it is a divergence, and is therefore excluded where there is no habitual course of change. In the absence of that cyclical series of metamorphoses which even the simplest living thing now shows us, as a result of its inherited constitution, there could be no *point d'appui* for natural selection. How, then, did organic evolution begin?

If a primitive mass of organic matter was like a mass of inorganic matter in respect of its passivity, and differed only in respect of its greater changeableness; then we must infer that its first changes conformed to the same general law as do the changes of an inorganic mass. The instability of the homogeneous is a universal principle. In all cases the homogeneous tends to pass into the heterogeneous, and the less heterogeneous into the more heterogeneous. In the primordial units of protoplasm, then, the step with which evolution commenced must have been the passage from a state of complete likeness throughout the mass to a state in which there existed some unlikeness. Further, the cause of this step in one of these portions of organic matter, as in any portion of inorganic matter, must have been the different exposure of its parts to incident forces. What

accident forces? Those of its medium or environment. Which were the parts thus differently exposed? Necessarily the outside and the inside. Inevitably, then, alike in the organic aggregate and the inorganic aggregate (supposing it to have coherence enough to maintain constant relative positions among its parts), the first fall from homogeneity to heterogeneity must always have been the differentiation of the external surface from the internal contents. No matter whether the modification was physical or chemical, one of composition or of decomposition, it comes within the same generalisation. The direct action of the medium was the primordial factor of organic evolution.

In his article on Evolution in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Professor Huxley writes as follows :

‘How far “natural selection” suffices for the production of species remains to be seen. Few can doubt that, if not the whole cause, it is a very important factor in that operation. . . .

‘On the evidence of palæontology, the evolution of many existing forms of animal life from their predecessors is no longer an hypothesis, but an historical fact; it is only the nature of the physiological factors to which that evolution is due which is still open to discussion.’

With these passages I may fitly join a remark made in the admirable address Prof. Huxley delivered before unveiling the statue of Mr. Darwin in the Museum at South Kensington. Deprecating the supposition that an authoritative sanction was given by the ceremony to the current ideas concerning organic evolution, he said that ‘science commits suicide when it adopts a creed.’

Along with larger motives, one motive which has joined in prompting the foregoing articles, has been the desire to point out that already among biologists, the beliefs concerning the origin of species have assumed too much the character of a creed; and that while becoming settled they have been narrowed. So far from further broadening that broader view which Mr. Darwin reached as he grew older, his followers appear to have retrograded towards a more restricted view than he ever expressed. Thus there seems occasion for recognising the warning uttered by Prof. Huxley, as not uncalled for.

Whatever may be thought of the arguments and conclusions set forth in this article and the preceding one, they will perhaps serve to show that it is as yet far too soon to close the inquiry concerning the causes of organic evolution.

HERBERT SPENCER.

RAILWAY TRAFFIC AND CHARGES.

OF the provisions which this Bill contains, those which have caused most apprehension to the Railway interest, and which will encounter most opposition, are undoubtedly the provisions by which power is given to the Board of Trade, subject to the control of Parliament, to revise rates. It is in respect of these provisions that such 'exciting terms' as 'confiscation' and 'breach of faith' have been used: expressions which are apparently not due to hallucinations which exist only in the minds of those who lead the railway world, for the Joint Committee on Railway Amalgamation in 1872 shared by anticipation their apprehensions. Discussing the question of immediate or periodical revision of rates, their report says (p. xxxv), 'On what principles is it to be performed, and by whom? If no rule is laid down to guide the revisers, the power of revision will amount to a power to confiscate the property of the companies. It is not likely that Parliament would attempt to exercise any such power itself, still less that it would confer such a power on any subordinate authority.'

The report goes on to discuss the rules which, it was suggested, might be laid down to guide the revisers, and shows that they are impracticable; but as no rule is laid down in Mr. Mundella's Bill, it is unnecessary to discuss them, and the fact remains that, in the opinion of that committee, this Bill provides a power to confiscate shareholders' property. The thought naturally occurs, what a valuable instrument would be ready to hand in this power if ever the State thought fit to purchase the railways. It would be so easy to depreciate the property which had to be purchased. Would the temptation to make some use of this power be resisted in such a case, and for how long?

Let us, however, examine the case for the Bill. Nobody, as yet, has had the courage to say that Parliament would be justified in interfering with powers of charge, which were granted to the railway companies, in return for solid national advantages, as part of their charter, unless the power to interfere had been accepted by them as part of the bargain. Accordingly, the contemplated interference is excused upon the ground that the shareholders have accepted their powers subject to a saving clause which justifies the proposed revision

of rates. Now, as a matter of legislative morality, such a saving clause would only justify the proposed revision, if it was intended to provide for that revision, and accepted as providing for it, and not for some other revision to take effect under different circumstances, and on different terms, from those which Mr. Mundella's Bill contemplates. Parliament, therefore, has to consider any evidence there may be, which tends to show what the real signification and intent of the clause is. It is not enough to interpret the words of the clause, as a court of law would do, 'on the view.' For it must be remembered that Parliament is interpreting the terms of its own bargain; and surely a party to a contract, who meant to be just and honest, would do to his friend—or even his enemy—what he intended to do when the contract was made, whether the legal construction of the words which were used would be more favourable to himself or not. Thus the circumstances under which the clause came into existence, and its history, become of great importance for the purpose of arriving at its true interpretation.

The clause, the latter part of which is relied on as justifying the present Bill, is as follows:—

Nothing herein contained shall be deemed or construed to exempt the railway by this Act authorised to be made from the provisions of any general Acts relating to railways which may hereafter pass, or during the present session of Parliament, or from any future revision or alteration under the authority of Parliament of the maximum rates of fare and charges authorised by this Act.

This clause first appears in its present form in 1845. It was ordered to be introduced into all railway Acts of that session. It afterwards became a standing order clause applicable to all railway Bills. As no different meaning has ever been assigned to it, nor special attention called to it, it may be safely assumed that the clause was intended to bear the same meaning in the Acts of 1885 as in those of 1845; but the earlier date is the more important one, because most of the Acts of the great railway companies date back to about that period.

It is my first object to show, by reference to what took place in Parliament in 1844 and 1845, that the clause does not justify a revision of rates at all (unless a notice, that Parliament might one day consider whether a revision of rates was justifiable, can be said to justify a revision without any such consideration taking place); and that the revision of rates which was contemplated by the clause was a revision, the policy of which was to be considered under circumstances which have never arisen and were totally different from those which are now said to make revision necessary. Secondly, I shall endeavour to show that, whatever the effect of the clause may be, Parliament is not justified in exercising such a power now, or upon the terms which the Bill proposes.

In 1844 the policy which ought to be adopted when powers were

granted to make railways was much discussed. A committee, of which Mr. Gladstone, then President of the Board of Trade, was chairman, sat to consider the subject, and an Act, commonly called Mr. Gladstone's Act (7 & 8 Vict. cap. 85) was passed, based upon its recommendations. Revision of rates was one of the subjects which that Act dealt with, and the terms upon which such a revision might be put in force in the case of future railways were stated. But the principle that it was justifiable to exercise such a power was not accepted by Parliament. On the contrary, in deference to a strong feeling which was manifested in the House against the exercise of such a power upon any terms (75 Hansard, 1189), Mr. Gladstone undertook to insert the following preamble in the Act:—

Whereas it is expedient that the policy of revision or purchase should in no manner be prejudged by the provisions of this Act, but should remain for the future consideration of the legislature upon grounds of general and national policy.

At the same time, so necessary was it thought to treat railway enterprise *uberrimâ fide*, and to avoid doing anything which would prospectively discourage the disposition, then so actively in operation, to extend the railway system by the formation of new lines (Rep. Com. Rys. 1844), that, as Mr. Gladstone expressed it in introducing his Bill,

the Government thought they were bound, in reserving this power, to tell those parties who were now going to invest large sums in national improvement, what were the terms, and the limits, within which, if Parliament thought fit to purchase or revise, it should so purchase or revise. (75 Hansard, 492.)

These terms were, that no revision should take place until twenty-one years after the powers to make the railway had been obtained, nor unless 10 per cent. had been paid for three years in succession; above all, the dividends of the companies whose rates were revised were to be guaranteed at 10 per cent. during the time the revised scale of rates was in operation. In 1844 therefore Parliament took the policy of revision of rates into consideration, but deliberately abstained from deciding it, leaving it for future discussion upon grounds of general and national policy; but the terms upon which, and the circumstances under which, revision might be permissible were carefully elaborated, for the express purpose of informing intending investors what they had to expect if Parliament should afterwards determine that it was justifiable to interfere with their profits.

It was at the very commencement of the following session that the present clause came into existence, and whatever else the reservation at the end of it may express, it certainly did not commit Parliament to the principle that revision was justifiable. As Lord Salisbury said in 1872, 'It contains no decision as to what moral right Parliament has to interfere with the receipts of shareholders' (Royal Com. Evid.

q. 1486). The clause leaves the question of revision in identically the same position as it was in 1844: a question to be decided upon grounds of general and national policy. Indeed such a question could not have been even debated upon a resolution the avowed object of which was, as I shall show, to leave things as they were. All it pretended to say was that nothing in the special Act should deprive Parliament of the right to revise rates, if it had any. If anybody had thought that it would have been construed as justifying the revision of rates, it would no doubt have met with the same opposition as the similar proposal in Mr. Gladstone's Bill of the previous session of the same Parliament, and with a similar result. If, however, any doubt remained whether the clause justifies revision, what took place in 1847 leaves no room for the existence of such a doubt. In that year an attempt was made to put the very same construction upon the clause which is now suggested, and a Bill was introduced by which railway companies whose Acts contained the clause were to have their rates made subject to revision every ten years. The Bill caused great apprehension in the country, and such an outcry was raised against it on the ground that it was a breach of faith on the part of Parliament, and an attempt to evade the conditions on which Mr. Gladstone's Act had been allowed to pass, that it had to be withdrawn on the second reading without debate. In passing it is interesting to notice that the plea on which the power to revise was sought for was that 'of affording to the public the advantages derivable from an altered state of circumstances' (80 Hansard, 854). As rates have been reduced since then, much more than working expenses, that principle would certainly not justify the revision now sought for. No attempt has since been made to obtain the sanction of Parliament to the policy of revision.

Conclusion 1. Parliament has never accepted the principle that it is justified in revising rates. It has in 1844 and 1847 declined to accept that principle.

If, then, the clause does not justify revision, but only amounts to a notice that Parliament may consider the policy of revision at some future period, let us see what were the contingencies which, if they happened, Parliament thought might possibly make revision justifiable, and in reference to which the notice was given.

The first part of the clause, which relates to general legislation, had been inserted in the railway Acts in 1844 in accordance with a recommendation of Mr. Gladstone's committee. It was again moved as a resolution of the House in 1845, and the words relating to revision of rates were added to it by amendment. The amendment was based upon, and had reference to, a new procedure which had been adopted by a resolution of the House in that session. It had been determined that committees on railway Bills should fix the maximum charges for the carriage of goods as well as for tolls, to which there had always

been a limit (79 Hansard, 1241). The mover of the amendment, who assumed that the maximum rates would be the rates which would be actually charged for all distances, stated that committees had much difficulty in carrying out their duty in this respect, and that the result of the adoption of the new procedure was quite uncertain. It was in view of the novelty of the procedure, and as a temporary measure, until the result should be ascertained and legislation proposed, that the amendment was accepted by the House. The mover of the resolution stated 'that he was not presuming to legislate for railways;' 'all that he asked was that the clause should be applied to every future railway Bill until the subject should be taken up by Government with a view of devising some general measure respecting them' (80 Hansard, 854). And it was unquestionably because it was deemed uncertain what the effect of the new system of fixing maximum rates would be, that the latter part of the clause was introduced. It was thought that the rates might be fixed so high as to enable the companies to make huge profits. Under the circumstances it was natural enough that Parliament should say, 'We give you, the companies, notice that, if the bargain turns out more favourable to you than you say it will, we will, if necessary, discuss the policy of revising rates before the period which the Act of 1844 fixes.'

These rates have, however, now been in force for forty years. Time has shown that the profits which railway companies can make under them are very modest. The contingencies contemplated by the clause have in fact never happened, and it has remained a dead letter up to the present time, when it is proposed to apply it for a purpose differing *toto calo* from that for which it was introduced. It is now intended to revise rates, not because the profits of the railway companies are too large, but because the traders say that their profits are too small, and that railway rates ought to be reduced. If anybody had thought in 1846 that Parliament reserved to itself a right of reducing rates if trade required the reduction, independently of what profit the railway companies were making, I wonder how much of the 124,000,000*l.* would have been forthcoming which was authorised to be raised to make railways with in that year, and how much of it would have gone to make railways in France, which it was then thought a great object to prevent.

Conclusion 2. The revision contemplated by the saving clause was a revision the policy of which was to be considered, if contingencies happened which have not happened, and under conditions wholly different from those which are now alleged to make revision necessary.

The terms upon which the revision contemplated by the clause was to take place have next to be considered. The Act of 1844, as we have seen, declared what the terms were upon which Parliament thought that persons who had put their money into works of national

improvement ought to be treated, if rates were revised. They were avowedly published for the information of intending investors. The Act which contains them is still in force. It applies to every railway Act that has ever been passed since 1844, and was incorporated in express terms in each Act up to 1854. The clause and the Act must inevitably therefore be read together, as part of the special Act in which they are both included; and Parliament, which is bound, both on the grounds of morality and expediency, to satisfy the reasonable expectations that it has created, cannot be justified in revising rates except upon the terms which it has thus held out year by year as applicable to revision, if revision should take place. There seems to be no escape from this position. Parliament in 1844 said, 'The terms upon which any future revision of rates shall be made are that there shall be a 10 per cent. guarantee while the revised rates are in operation.' These terms were made applicable to all future Acts. How can it be reasonably argued that, because a proviso has also been inserted in those Acts that nothing in *them* shall prevent Parliament from revising rates, it would be justified in throwing over those terms altogether and revising without reference to them? Is that fulfilling a just expectation on the part of investors, whom Parliament was sorely afraid of frightening *before* their money had been spent in works of national improvement. The Royal Commission of 1865 recognised that the terms of the Act of 1844 were still applicable in the event of the purchase of railways by the State (Rep. p. 75); why are they not to be applied if rates are to be revised?

Conclusion 3. If Parliament is justified in revising rates under the saving clause, the revision must be upon the terms prescribed by the Act of 1844, which applies to all the special Acts in which the saving clause is contained.

Let us, however, now assume that the clause in itself would justify Parliament in revising rates without any restrictions as to terms. Even in that case, if Parliament, by the course of action it has adopted, has led shareholders reasonably to believe that the clause was a tradition which could not or would not be acted upon, where can any justification be found for refusing to fulfil expectations founded on such a course of conduct? There can be no doubt that such a belief exists, and the reasonableness of it is not difficult to demonstrate. The fate of the Bill of 1847, coupled with the fact that no attempt has ever been made since to reopen the question, is strong evidence that Parliament had relinquished all intention of acting upon the clause. The fact that a large part of the railway system, certainly the most important part of it, has been exercising these powers for forty years is of itself sufficient to raise such a presumption. But when it is remembered that these powers have been complained of before numerous select committees and a royal

commission (who reported that the complaint of high rates was general) by traders who, to the end of the chapter, will think themselves ill-used; that the clause which was so strongly relied upon was pointed out at these inquiries, and the same argument founded upon them then as now, but that each report has refused to accept any such argument, or to recognise any such right in Parliament; what has before been a presumption becomes an almost irresistible conclusion.

Conclusion 4. If Parliament ever would have been justified in exercising the power of revision which is now claimed, it is not justified in doing so now, because it has so acted as to lead reasonable people to believe that such a power would not be exercised, who, in that belief, have invested money in railways.

Lastly, let us consider whether, even if the clause justifies a present revision of rates unfettered by any prearranged terms, the justification extends to the revision which the Bill proposes.

Now I suppose that no one would openly contend that Parliament would be justified in revising rates except upon the terms of enabling a fair interest to be obtained upon capital invested in railways. Does the proposed revision conform to this limitation? It will probably be said that Parliament, to whose control the proposed revision is to be committed, may be safely trusted to see that rates are not so reduced as to prevent a fair return upon capital being obtained. But even Parliament cannot compel the clouds to fall; and how, with the best intentions, is this to be done? In the first place it is to be observed that the power is to be exercised in 1887, and that, consequently, the capital upon which the fair interest has to be paid is not represented by the nominal capital of the companies, upon which the rate of dividend calculated by Mr. Mundella at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was based. It must be a much lower rate than that, depending upon how much stock is held by original subscribers, and how much has been purchased at a premium. Calculated in this way, the average rate of interest which shareholders receive must be a very moderate one, and one which would not leave any margin for reduction of rates. But there is also an insurmountable practical difficulty in the way of effecting the intentions of Parliament in this matter, even if they are assumed to be all-beneficent. It is well put by the committee of 1872, in discussing the question of a revision of rates with reference to an absolute limitation of dividend. The report says (p. xxxv) that proposal

implies that the authority to which the revision is committed can judge what rates will enable the company to make the given dividend upon a given capital. This is a function which a government department ought not to undertake. It involves the necessity of determining what are the proper expenses of the company and what economies they can practise. These are matters which require the skill and experience of the managers themselves, and any attempt on the part of a government department to do it for them is impossible, unless the agents of the govern-

ment were to undertake an amount of interference with the internal concerns of the companies which is neither desirable nor practicable.

It is so. Neither the best intentioned joint committee of Parliament, nor the Board of Trade, nor even the officials of the companies themselves, could tell on *a priori* considerations what effect a reduction of rates would have upon dividends. But, if that is so, to trust in the beneficent intentions of Parliament would be misplaced confidence, because Parliament would be unable, however willing it might be, to see that shareholders' proper interests are protected if revision takes place. The only way in which this could be done would be by guaranteeing a minimum dividend, which is not proposed.

Conclusion 5. Parliament, therefore, is not in any case justified in revising rates in the manner proposed by the Bill, because the only terms upon which revision would be justifiable would be such as would secure to shareholders a fair interest upon the money invested by them; whereas, the effect of revision of rates upon their profits cannot be predicted, and no guarantee of dividends is proposed by the Bill.

I wish to make some observations upon two matters in conclusion. It is said on behalf of the Bill that it is not intended to reduce rates, but to revise maximum rates. That is an utter fallacy. What would be the use of passing an Act to revise rates which nobody is paying? Besides, maximum rates are in very many cases charged for short distance traffic, which in some districts forms the bulk of the traffic, and therefore revision of maximum rates means, *pro tanto*, reduction of rates. And why, I would ask, is power given to traders' associations to set the Board of Trade in motion from time to time to obtain a revision of maximum rates, unless the result of that revision, which would entail upon them the expense of promoting the provisional order, would be to enable them to obtain a reduction of rates which they were actually paying?

It is also said by many people, who are inclined to think the Bill does an injustice to the railway companies, that they have brought it upon themselves, and deserve to be badly treated, because they have carried the foreigners' stuff at cheaper rates than home produce. That is a question upon which the railway companies have a great deal to say, only they have, as I think very injudiciously, never said it. But suppose that their action in that respect is all that it has been said it is. I want to point out, as emphatically as I can, that it has no more to do with the revision of rates proposal than Mr. Gladstone's Irish Bill has to do with the battle of Hastings. No revision of rates can possibly prevent railway companies carrying home and foreign produce at differential rates. That is a question wholly and entirely of undue preference, and it is absolutely untouched by the revision of rates clauses in the Bill.

ERNEST MOON.

THE GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND BILL.

WHETHER the Government of Ireland Bill be or be not a triumph of statesmanship, the statement in which it was introduced was perhaps Mr. Gladstone's masterpiece of persuasive and impressive oratory. The prosperity of a speech, even more than of a jest, lies in the ear of him that hears it rather than in the tongue of him that makes it; and the unexampled audience which listened to Mr. Gladstone on Thursday, the 9th of April, removes his speech beyond the range of comparative criticism even with his own previous efforts. The scene which then presented itself was unique in the Parliamentary history of England, and was without precedent or parallel in that of any other country. Such an audience was never gathered together in the House of Commons, filling up every inch of standing room, crowding the galleries with all that is most distinguished in the public life of the nation, disturbing the old Conservative furniture by the introduction of revolutionary chairs, blocking up the passages by a new method of Parliamentary obstruction. If the audience was unique, so were the actor, the theme, and the occasion. The foremost man of England stood forth to propose legislation which affronted the prepossessions of generations, almost of a century; which both the great parties in the State had up to that moment almost unanimously scouted; and which, in their view, threatened the disruption of the Empire, and undermined the greatness of England. The alarm and distrust of five-sixths of the audience were qualified only by the eager hopes of the representatives of Ireland, who saw in Mr. Gladstone the English Grattan of the closing years of the nineteenth century, prepared to rebuild the edifice of Irish Parliamentary independence which his predecessor erected more than a century ago, and of which he had seen, too, the demolition. The scene was dramatic in its true sense, but it was not theatrical. The elements of which it consisted were simple, consisting only of those which were essential to the action which was going on, and had nothing in them introduced for the sake of effect and display. Chatham's crutch and flannels and Burke's dagger were claptrap artifices to which there was nothing corresponding at this great historic moment. The fact that Mr. Gladstone could

during several hours half convince an audience of hostile disposition was his greatest oratoric triumph. The lucid exposition, in which the copious throng of words is marshalled in perfect order, and the moral elevation, which are the inspiring genius of his eloquence, were never more remarkably displayed. The age and unexampled services of the orator, the courage of conviction with which at a critical moment he was ready, in the interests of the public welfare, to break with his own past and with that of the nation, and to embark on an adventure strange and new, to try unknown seas instead of timidly hugging the shore, had the highest political heroism in it, though to some it might have seemed a heroism which only thin partitions divided from madness. The House was, however, under the wand of the enchanter, and an interval was necessary in order that judgment might resume its interrupted sway. Mr. Trevelyan described the Prime Minister's speech as for the moment benumbing the faculties of those who heard it. The corrective of the enchanter's wand is, however, in close attendance upon it, and consists in that humble instrument, the reporter's pencil. That is the great disenchanter and leveller. It equalises the tones and gestures of Mr. Gladstone and of Mr. Goschen, the articulation of Lord Hartington and of Mr. Chamberlain.

Look at that paper, if you print the speeches,
Pitt seems George Rose, and like Sir Richard preaches—
Nor tune, nor majesty, nor patriot fires:
Methinks the wit of Sheridan expires.
Lost in Dundas the Caledonian twang.

The appeal is from the debate as heard to the debate as printed and read, from the measure as expounded to the measure as printed, from the commentary and gloss to the text. This appeal has probably brought home to the mind of Mr. Gladstone himself and of his colleagues that without great modifications his Bill cannot be passed. His speech, in winding up the debate, was almost as much a reply to the speech with which he opened it as to the criticisms of Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Hartington, and Lord Randolph Churchill. In the interval between the introduction of the Home Rule Bill and that of the Land Purchase Bill, which are parts of one organic legislative whole, vital and essential provisions lost their vital and essential character, and arrangements denounced on Thursday as impossible were brought, after the interval of a week, within the range of practicability.

To Mr. Gladstone Mr. Pitt has apparently become the evil genius of Ireland, and it is only by undoing the spells which he has thrown over her that she can be liberated.

Without his rod reversed,
And backward mutterings of dis severing power,
We cannot free the lady that sits here,
In stony fetters, fixed and motionless.

It is not a rhetorical exaggeration to say that the Government of Ireland Bill repeals the Act of Union. It does so, not indeed in terms, but directly and by more than remote and possible consequence. The union with Ireland was essentially a legislative union. That was the one change which it brought about. All the other provisions of the Act of 1800 were subsidiary and instrumental to this purpose. The essence of the Bill, the vital clause, if phrases may be used which Mr. Gladstone has found dangerous, and has now taken the pledge against, runs as follows: 'That it be the third Article of the Union that the said United Kingdom be represented in one and the same Parliament, to be styled the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.' If Mr. Gladstone's Bill becomes law as it stands, the United Kingdom will cease to be represented in one and the same Parliament, and that Parliament will no longer be entitled to call itself the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. It will become what it was from 1707 to 1800, simply the Parliament of Great Britain, exercising functions of Imperial legislation and control, it is true, but not the Parliament of the United Kingdom any more than it is the Parliament of the British Empire, not the Parliament of Ireland any more than of Canada.

Nor is this the only provision of the Act of Union which the Government of Ireland Bill repeals. The Articles of the Union are eight in number. The first two deal with the Crown and with the succession to it in both countries, and these, of course, are not interfered with. The third, which has been quoted, establishes the legislative union, and it is set aside. The fourth regulates the numbers of the lords spiritual and temporal and of the commoners who shall sit and vote on the part of Ireland in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and of course it falls through with the third. The fifth constitutes the two Churches of England and Ireland a united Church, and declares that 'the continuance and preservation of the said United Church as the Established Church of England and Ireland shall be taken and deemed to be an essential and fundamental part of the Union.' That article has, of course, been done away with. The sixth puts British and Irish subjects on the same footing as regards trade, navigation, and treaties with foreign powers. This article is not affected by the Bill as it stands. On second thoughts Mr. Gladstone has allowed it to remain, having abandoned, in deference to the objections of Mr. Chamberlain and others, his original intention of placing customs' duties within the province of the Irish Legislative Body; though, of course, in withdrawing from the representatives of Ireland that control of trade, navigation, and treaties, which they possessed as members of the United Parliament, the conditions of the Union are modified in this particular too. The seventh article regulates the debt of the two countries,

and their respective contributions to the expenditure of the United Kingdom. The financial clauses of the Government of Ireland Bill (12-20) modify the arrangements adopted under the seventh article of the Union. The eighth article places the judicial system of Ireland under the control and protection of this United Parliament. Mr. Gladstone's Bill substitutes for it the control of the Irish Legislative Body. The only other provisions of the Act of Union are the adoption into it of an Act of the Irish Parliament regulating the mode of summoning and returning Irish peers and commoners to the United Parliament, which becomes obsolete by their exclusion from that Parliament, and the permission to use the great seal of Ireland within Ireland, and to continue the Privy Council of Ireland. All that Mr. Gladstone leaves of the Act of Union are the provisions relating to the settlement of the Crown, which are independent of the Act, the use of the great seal, and the retention of the Privy Council.

It is a misemployment of words to speak of provisions such as these as involving only a modification and revision of the Act of Union. They abrogate it. The ascertainment of the fact does not of course necessarily carry with it any judgment, adverse or favourable, as to its justice and expediency. The legislative union may merit no better fate than the ecclesiastical union, which, in spite of its essential and fundamental character, Mr. Gladstone righteously and courageously abolished in 1869. The lords temporal and the commoners of Ireland may deserve to be cleared out of St. Stephen's as the lords spiritual have been. But there is no use in disguising the fact that the United Parliament is threatened with the same fate, or promised the same good fortune—to employ a neutral alternative—as that which befell the United Church seventeen years ago.

The judgment which will be formed of Mr. Gladstone's measure of Home Rule will, of course, depend upon the view which is taken of the ends at which such a measure ought to aim: Is the efficiency of the Union to be impaired in order to establish Home Rule in Ireland, or is Home Rule to be established in Ireland with a view to maintaining a more perfect and cordial and on all essential points more complete union? Are you a Unionist in the first place, and a Home Ruler in the second? or are you a Home Ruler in the first place, and a Unionist in the second, or in no place at all? Is as much Home Rule to be granted as is compatible with and, I will add, contributory to the Union? or is as much and no more of the Union to be maintained as is compatible with the principle of Home Rule in Ireland? The answer which each man gives in his own mind to these questions will determine the judgment which he will form of Mr. Gladstone's Bill.

The preamble of the Act of Union describes the spirit and purpose

which should still animate statesmen. The object of legislation should be, in the words of the King's message there recited to the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland, 'to strengthen and consolidate the connection between the two kingdoms.' The 'essential interests of Great Britain and Ireland' will be best secured, as Mr. Pitt and the Parliament of his day thought, in promoting 'the strength, power, and resources of the British Empire.' Mr. Pitt's aim was precisely what it should be, and it ought to be the aim of all his successors. But his method has been proved by the experience of eighty-five years to be at fault. The road he took has carried him and those who have followed in his footsteps away from the goal which he endeavoured to reach. The union between England and Ireland has been that not of free converse and movement within defined limits, but of close smothering contact, not the union of friendship and affection, but the union of the policeman with the prisoner whom he has handcuffed. It has not been a union for the common purposes and interests of the two kingdoms, but a union which has allowed each to interfere in a meddling and vexatious manner with the special concerns of the other. Great Britain has passed bad laws, or good laws badly devised or otherwise unacceptable for the internal regulation of Ireland. Ireland has through several Parliaments prevented Great Britain from regulating its own affairs. It is time that this deadlock and antagonism came to an end, and an end can be brought to it in one way only—by allowing each of the two kingdoms, Great Britain and Ireland, or, if it should be desired, each of the three kingdoms, England, Scotland, and Ireland, to be master within its own house, and in its own insular or peninsular business, and bringing them together, without the elements of irritation and alienation arising from mutual interference in the affairs of each other.

Mr. Gladstone looks at the problem almost exclusively from an Irish point of view. It is to him a question of social order in Ireland, and the two subjects of Irish government and of the land are simply the two channels through which he endeavours to find access to that most vital point of all. To others it is, rightly as I think, primarily a question of the strength and well-being of the entire United Kingdom, including Ireland. If any sacrifice has to be made, it must be of the part to the whole, and not of the whole to the part. The strength flows indeed from the parts to the whole, but it is sent with redoubled force and efficacy from the whole back again to the parts. A weak or ailing member of the political as of the natural body is compatible with general strength of the entire system, and that general strength will contribute to restore the infirm limb. But a general malady of the system will soon affect each limb. The medicine which tries to nurse into health at the expense of the whole body the offending eye or the offending hand, will probably weaken the whole body without

strengthening the peccant member. Local applications, unaccompanied by general treatment, are as little likely to be effective in political therapeutics as in any other branch of the healing art. In any conflict of claims between Ireland and the United Kingdom as a whole, the Ministers and Parliament of the United Kingdom are bound not only by the obligations of the trust they have undertaken, but also by regard for the real interests of Ireland, to consider the general welfare of the United Kingdom first, and the special indulgences required by Ireland second.

One principal object of removing the purely internal affairs of Ireland from the cognisance of the Imperial Parliament ought to be to enable the representatives of Ireland to take part in legislation for the United Kingdom, the control of its Government, and the direction of its external policy unembittered by its meddling with their own insular concerns. The Irish patriotism of Irish members and of the Irish people is strong, and it is proper that a field for its exercise and display should be found for them in Ireland. It is inconvenient sometimes in Westminster. What is weak in them is imperial patriotism, to use a bad adjective—British patriotism, or, as I should like to call it (in the relation which the word has to the common language, the literature, the traditions, and the dominant race in the three islands, ignoring its narrower application to 'South Britain') English patriotism. This result cannot be brought about by turning Irish peers and Irish commoners out of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and by debarring them from participation in Imperial legislation and policy. Mr. Gladstone has more than once referred to the completeness and directness of political representation in the United States, the wide basis of the suffrage, the intimate relation in which each individual citizen stands to the Government, as constituting the strength of the Union, and as having brought the Republic safely through the war. Unless Irish human nature differs from human nature in the United States, unless it has been qualified, not by a double, but only by a half or quarter dose of original sin, exclusion from the common affairs of the Empire will produce indifference or even disloyalty to the Empire. The separation of taxation from representation, to say nothing of the constitutional monstrosity of such a practice at this time, though it might be acquiesced in by Irishmen for the moment and for a purpose, would probably lead before long to such a controversy as a century ago arose between England and her American colonies, and place before us the alternative of separation or conquest. Ireland, as a tributary state, would be a vassal state, and, in spite of reserves and forms and constitutional technicalities, the Queen would be converted from the Sovereign to the Suzerain of Ireland. We should have to return to the usage which prevailed until the time of Henry the Eighth, and to speak not of the kingdom but of the lordship of Ireland.

If Home Rule is incompatible with the fair and equal representation of Ireland in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, the idea of Home Rule must, in the interest alike of Ireland and the United Kingdom, be abandoned. If it is incompatible with any particular scheme of Home Rule, that particular scheme stands condemned. It must be either transformable or abandoned. In his speech on the 9th of April, Mr. Gladstone advanced by logical steps to a fatal conclusion. If, he said, Ireland has a domestic Parliament of her own, she cannot come to Westminster to control English and Scotch affairs. Can she come hither for the settlement not of English and Scotch but of Imperial affairs? Can a line of separation be drawn? Mr. Gladstone announced his reluctant but very positive conviction that the thing was impossible. 'I believe,' he said, 'it passes the wit of man; at any rate it passes not my wit alone, but the wit of many with whom I have communicated.' The House of Commons, he said truly, was not merely a legislative House; it was a House controlling the Executive. Irish members would be within their right, Mr. Gladstone argued, in supporting a vote of censure against the Foreign Minister. The vote, if carried, would involve not merely his resignation, but, on the principle of collective ministerial responsibility, would dislodge a government charged with the interests of England and Scotland. The distinction between Imperial affairs could not therefore be carried out in practice; and for this reason 'Irish members and Irish peers cannot, if a domestic legislature be given to Ireland, justly retain a seat in the Parliament at Westminster.' On reconsideration, however, Mr. Gladstone seemed inclined to view the problem more hopefully; and if the wit of man can solve it, he can solve it. But it is not easy to see how. Mr. Gladstone's exposition of the difficulty is forcible, but it tells not against the continued representation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament, not against the principle of Home Rule in general, but against this part of the scheme of Home Rule which Mr. Gladstone has devised. The Irish members, if they are introduced into a Parliament which is at once the Imperial Parliament and the Parliament of Great Britain, would easily find the means of voting indirectly, but really and with decisive effect, upon the domestic affairs of England and Scotland. Let us suppose, what is by no means outside the range of possibility, that Ministers, having a Liberal majority over English and Scotch Conservatives, introduce a measure for the establishment of secular education. Such a scheme would be bitterly though, if they depended on their own strength, fruitlessly opposed by the Roman Catholics, English and Irish, resident in Great Britain, and by the majority of the Conservatives. What would be the tactics which it would be natural and, according to the usages of party warfare, justifiable for them to adopt? A Conservative member would give notice of a motion of censure on the Government on some matter of foreign

policy, let us say, on which Irish members would be indisputably qualified to vote. A time would be chosen which would compel a decision to be taken before some stage of the English Secular Education Bill. The Government, in the case supposed, would be defeated by the combined Conservative and Irish forces, and the Secular Education Bill would be lost with them. The elder Pitt vowed that he would conquer America in Germany. English unsectarian education might be defeated by the allied Conservative and Irish forces in Egypt or Central Asia. The retention of the Irish peers and commoners in the Imperial Parliament is incompatible with Mr. Gladstone's scheme of Home Rule. This is a conclusive objection to that scheme in its present shape.

The solution must be looked for, and when looked for will be found, not in the banishment of Ireland from the Imperial Parliament, but in the banishment of the purely domestic business of England and Scotland from the Imperial Parliament. In other words, the principle of Home Rule must be extended to Great Britain. A Parliament for this island as a whole, or separate Parliaments meeting for purely English and Scotch business in Westminster and Edinburgh, would solve the difficulty as to the discrimination of Imperial from purely English and Scotch business. It is said that England and Scotland do not desire the change. But it does not follow that they would not be ready, on sufficient grounds of reason and the general advantage, to accept the change which they have not been the first to demand. They have not felt the inconvenience of the present system so seriously, though its inconvenience is often embarrassing. Lord Hartington has urged that we are ready to give to Ireland, on terms of perfect equality, all that we give to England and Scotland. Perhaps this doctrine might sometimes be equitably converted, and we might consent to give to England and Scotland what it is urgent to give to Ireland. I may be allowed in this connection to quote the conclusion with which Mr. Goldwin Smith a quarter of a century ago closed his survey of *Irish History and Irish Character* :—

In virtue of her [Ireland's] long unsettlement and special claims to consideration, she is affording a fair field for the discussion of political, ecclesiastical, and social questions, which the English nation, satisfied with an early and limited progress, will not suffer to be mooted directly in respect to herself. An Irish famine repealed the Corn Laws. Irish outrage gave to the Empire the benefit of a regularly organised police. The desperate state of Irish property led to the passing of an Encumbered Estates Act. Ireland has introduced the system of mixed education. In Ireland the relations between landlord and tenant have been first made the subject of discussion, with some prospect of an equitable solution. In Ireland was promulgated the potent aphorism, 'Property has its duties as well as its rights.' In Ireland, where the members of the dominant Church are in a small and hopeless minority, and the Establishment is clearly a political evil, the great question of Church and State will probably be first raised with effect and receive its most rational solution.

Seven years after these words were written, Mr. Gladstone, owing to the unexpected development of public opinion which brought the matter within the sphere of practical politics, carried the disestablishment of the Irish Church. Mr. Goldwin Smith would not admit the application I am about to make of his principle. But it may be given to Ireland to lead the way in introducing throughout the United Kingdom a rational distribution of legislative and administrative functions between local Parliaments for the two islands, or the three kingdoms, and an imperial Parliament dealing with the common interests of the United Kingdom.

Of one thing it is, I think, reasonable to feel assured. England and Scotland will not be parties to any system which places Ireland in a position inferior to themselves, nor would Ireland, though she might accept it for a moment, with a view not to completer or closer union, but to total separation, permanently acquiesce in it. The government of Ireland, in important relations, by a Parliament in which she was not represented would be an exercise of authority more dangerous to the ruling power than to the ruled. It would accustom men's minds in England and Scotland to ways of thinking and acting which might prove perilous to sound principles of government. The tyranny of the Athenian democracy over its subject islands undermined the democracy at home. Slaveholding is at least as dangerous to the slaveholder as to the slave. If equality between England, Scotland, and Ireland is to be maintained, it must be in one or other of three ways. There is the system established by the Act of Union, which gives England, Scotland, and Ireland each its fair share of representation in one Parliament, dealing alike with imperial and local concerns. This system has broken down. Parliament has proved unequal to the task of necessary legislation; the executive is overweighted; Ireland has been for eighty-five years in a state of open or secret rebellion. There is the federal system which prevails in every great Parliamentary nation, except Italy and France, and in those countries the centralised methods of government are constant sources of difficulty and danger. This probably will be the final solution. I do not say that the German Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Sweden and Norway, Switzerland, and the United States furnish precedents which we can closely follow, or analogies which are strictly to the point. But singly and collectively they indicate a general scheme and method which capable statesmanship and popular goodwill such as Mr. Gladstone can call to his aid would be able to apply to the case of the United Kingdom.

The third method of securing equality between England and Ireland is by their complete separation for all legislative and administrative purposes—a separation which would probably carry with it not only the Parliamentary independence of Ireland, but ultimately severance from the Crown of England too.

In its present shape, Mr. Gladstone's Bill tends to this result. No country worthy of self-government would permanently or long consent to be debarred from dealing by its representatives with the momentous topics not merely of external and Imperial policy, but even of domestic legislation, which the Legislative Body of Ireland is formally prohibited from touching or even approaching. The list is divided into two classes, the first of which is described in the marginal summary as 'Exceptions from Powers of Irish Legislature;' the second as 'Restrictions on Powers of Irish Legislature.'

The exceptions from the powers of the Irish Legislature, as to which it is declared that 'any law made in contravention of this section shall be void,' are thirteen in number. They consist of subjects which would properly fall within the province of a Federal Parliament; and, if Ireland were a member of such a federation, and were fairly represented in its Parliament, there would be no objection to their being withheld from the competence of the Irish Legislature. But in Mr. Gladstone's Bill, as it at present stands, though in this respect he will, it may be hoped, find it practicable to modify it in the sense I have indicated, England and Scotland are to legislate for Ireland on these paramount questions:—The status and succession of the Crown; peace and war; the national defences; treaties with foreign powers; offences against the law of nations; treason, alienage, naturalisation; trade, navigation, and quarantine; external postal and telegraph services; beacons, lighthouses, and sea-marks; money, weights and measures, copyright and patents—any law passed by the Irish Legislative Body on any of these subjects is declared to be null and void. The representatives of Great Britain are to legislate for Ireland on these things, and the representatives of Ireland cannot, as Mr. Gladstone's Bill now stands, touch them with a finger.

The subjects on which the powers of the Legislative Body are restricted—that is to say, on which it 'shall not make any law,' are the establishment or endowment of any form of religion, or the prohibition of its free exercise; the imposition of disabilities or privileges on account of religious belief; interference with denominational education or charities; the refusal of a conscience clause in schools; the rights and property of corporations (without the leave of her Majesty in Council); duties of customs and duties of excise; and the Government of Ireland Act itself. Irish members have declared that they will be content with a position similar to that of Canada. But the present Bill does not give them any such position. Most of the matters with which the Irish governing body is prohibited from dealing are expressly reserved in the British North America Act of 1867 to the Parliament of the Dominion. Ireland is put in a position corresponding not with that of Canada, but with that of Ontario. One of the viceroys of Ireland, who held office towards the close of the eighteenth century, expressed his view

of his official authority by a caricature which he drew of himself with his hands tied behind his back and his mouth open. The exceptions from, and the restrictions on, the powers of the Legislative Body of Ireland leave it in the position in which Lord Townshend depicted himself, its hands tied behind its back, and its mouth open. It may, perhaps, talk, but it cannot act.

These restrictions are certainly proposed, and they may possibly be accepted, in good faith. But though in Ireland an agitator, Mr. Parnell in Westminster is a tactician. Mr. Parnell has habitually said, when the settlement of Ireland has been in question, that he cannot guarantee permanent acquiescence in it. No man can guarantee circumstances, or the movement of public opinion and feeling. No honest man will even guarantee the future state of his own mind, or restrain his freedom of speech and action. It is as certain as anything future can be that, if Mr. Gladstone's Government of Ireland Bill becomes law in its present form, very few years will elapse before attempts are made to remove 'the exceptions from' and 'the restrictions on' the powers of the Irish Legislature. These efforts in the circumstances will be laudable and righteous. With the present development of Parliamentary government and the ideas which prevail as to the representative system, no nation worthy of itself will consent to be excluded from dealing with the topics which the Irish Legislative Body is allowed to approach only with its hands tied behind its back and its mouth open. Her representatives must have their equal share of authority in regard to them, if not in Westminster, then in Dublin. Irish Parliamentary life will be worth nothing, Ireland will be a parish and not a nation, if she is debarred from dealing with the matters which give their chief dignity to politics. If she is to handle them at Westminster, we must either maintain the Union as it is—which is now scarcely possible, and is not desirable—or adopt the federal system, in which probably the true solution lies. If Ireland is to deal with these high matters in Dublin, she becomes independent of the Imperial Parliament. Irish Parliamentary independence, if it is real, will carry with it the dependence of the executive power on Parliament, that is to say, independent of the Crown, as advised by ministers dependent on the British Parliament and subject to British influences.

This part of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, not in the intention of its author, but in its logical consequences, the working out of which would no doubt be variously hindered, delayed, and concealed, favours complete separation. In 1887 we should begin again the struggle with the Irish Parliament which marks the history of our relations with that country, but which assumes new vigour, in 1753. In less than thirty years from that time Ireland had gained her point. It probably would not take her longer now. The struggle now would

be against the statutory limitation of the powers of the Irish Legislative Body.

Sometimes in good faith, as often probably by way of experiment, laws trespassing on the subjects excluded from the powers of the Legislative Body would be passed, and the constitutional questions involved would be referred, under the twenty-fifth clause of the Government of Ireland Bill, to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, which is erected into a kind of Supreme Court as between Ireland and England, in analogy with its functions as regards our colonies and India. On other occasions the instrumentalities provided for the amendment of the organic statute would be put into force. By these means a constant agitation, involving frequent conflict between the Irish Government and the Imperial Power, would go on. By subtle and gradual usurpations involving at last a practice, by explanatory and enlarging laws, by amendments of the organic statute, it is likely that the Legislative Body of Ireland would gradually acquire the powers now withheld from it.

An analogous, though, owing to the difference of circumstances, a not precisely similar course, marked the history of the Irish Parliament. It always maintained in theory, and often attempted to vindicate, the independence of which Grattan at length obtained the recognition from the British Parliament. An English statute of Richard the Third's reign asserts in bad Latin a principle constitutionally sounder than that on which Mr. Gladstone's Bill is based: 'Hibernia habet Parliamenta, et faciunt leges, et nostra statuta non ligant eos, quia non mittunt milites ad Parliamentum.' Poynings's Act, which, as Mr. Gladstone stated in the House, was passed by the Irish Parliament, and was therefore a self-surrender of powers, is only ten years later in date than the statute of Richard the Third just quoted. Its provision that the statutes lately made in England be deemed good and effective in Ireland, was simply an adoption of previous legislation. It did not therefore apply, according to the Irish contention, to English Acts subsequent to it.

The celebrated work of Molyneux, published in 1697, *The Case of Ireland being bound by Acts of Parliament in England stated*, is the classic vindication of the principle which Grattan triumphantly asserted a century later. The English Parliament replied by censuring the book and having it burned. The right of the Irish Parliament to originate money bills and to maintain them in their original form in spite of amendments by the English Privy Council was asserted and denied, and compromised, in the true constitutional fashion, by expedients which did not involve concession of the point in dispute on either side. The right of the British House of Lords to decide Irish cases, which forms a part of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, was contested in Ireland.

In 1753 the renewed struggle of the Irish Parliament against its

control by England was begun by the claim of the Irish House of Commons to dispose, of its own authority and without the consent of the King, of certain surplus revenues. The pretension was not of course admitted in England, and the Irish Parliament provided against the dispute arising in future by appropriations calculated to leave no bone of contention in any subsequent surplus. These are a few illustrations of incessant and ultimately successful struggles against limitations such as Mr. Gladstone's Bill imposes, and which are likely, in a short time, to lead to corresponding conflicts with an identical result.

The best way out of these difficulties lies not in the removal of the restrictions upon the Irish Legislative Body, which would be complete separation, but in the admission of Irish peers and commoners to the Imperial Parliament to which these matters properly belong. This cannot be done, as I have endeavoured to show, by leaving it the Parliament of England and Scotland, as well as of the United Kingdom. In such a Parliament the line cannot be drawn so as to prevent Irish measures from interfering, indirectly perhaps but effectively, with English and Scotch business.

Separate Parliaments for Great Britain and Ireland, or for England, Scotland, and Ireland, subordinate to an Imperial Parliament, representing fairly the two or the three countries, is the only logical and practical solution of the difficulty. A step must be taken in this direction, or things must remain as they are. But to leave things as they are is to fall back upon a system of coercion which is likely to issue in civil war and the suppression of all constitutional liberties in Ireland.

Nor would our difficulty be in Ireland alone. The Irish, like the Jews and the Greeks, are now a dispersed race, and carry their sense of nationality and their hatred to England into every country in which they dwell, and they will find points and instruments of attack wherever they may be. To say this, to point to the danger of outrage and violence on a scale greater than any we have known, is not to address an argument to cowardice. It is simply to appeal to prudence and common sense. The cowardice lies in shutting the eyes to dangerous probabilities, so probable as to be practically certainties. While the passing of Mr. Gladstone's Bill in its present shape is inexpedient and indeed impossible, the delay of legislation would be full of peril. The transformation of the measure in the main after the manner which I have ventured to suggest, and its speedy enactment thus modified, is the course which a prudent statesmanship will follow.

I have not thought it desirable to speak of the details of the Bill. They exhibit Mr. Gladstone's unique power of political contrivance and construction. The constitution of the Irish Legislative Body, its division into two orders, the veto by the first order, the

financial arrangements of the bill, the functions assigned to the Lord Lieutenant, the relation of the judges to the new Irish Government, the associated scheme of land purchase—these and other things are matters for subsequent adjustment. The essence of the measure, its vital principle—its second-reading principle, so to speak—lies in the relations which it is proposed to establish between the Irish Legislative Body and the Parliament of the United Kingdom. If this can be satisfactorily arranged, the rest will be of comparatively easy arrangement in Committee. It is strongly to be desired that the reconsideration of the question of Irish representation in the Imperial Parliament, which Mr. Gladstone has half promised, will lead to the renewal of the one vital objection to a scheme inspired by the most generous purpose, and capable of forming a precedent for the further extension of the system of Home Rule within the United Kingdom.

FRANK H. HILL.

*The Editor of THE NINETEENTH CENTURY cannot undertake
to return unaccepted MSS.*

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY.

No. CXIII.—JULY 1886.

THE UNIONIST VOTE.

BUT a few months have come and gone since I, writing in these pages on the eve of the last election, advised the moderate Liberals to vote for the Conservatives, so as to prevent the return of Mr. Gladstone to power. The plea I urged in defence of my advice amounted chiefly to this. The Liberal party under Mr. Gladstone's leadership had, as I held, deserted the true traditions of Liberalism, and had embarked on a line of policy inconsistent with the principles on which the Liberal cause could alone be upheld. In fact, though not in name, these traditions and these principles were, as I opined, far safer in the hands of Lord Salisbury's Government than in those of any Government which Mr. Gladstone could form. I therefore appealed to those who shared my views to do what in them lay to retain Lord Salisbury in office and to keep Mr. Gladstone out of office.

My advice, I admit frankly, was not adopted. Party bonds proved too strong to be cast off on the grounds that were then before the public. With few exceptions the moderate Liberals threw in their lot with Mr. Gladstone and voted the Liberal ticket. They may have wavered in their allegiance, they may have been lukewarm in their advocacy. But yet they could not make up their minds to part company with Mr. Gladstone, and in consequence they allowed their names, their authority, and their influence to be used in order to secure the return of a Liberal majority. It is in the agricultural counties that the moderate Liberals are most powerful, and it is in the counties that the Liberals gained their most numerous and most decisive successes. The result was that office was

once more brought within measurable distance of Mr. Gladstone's attainment.

Had other—and as I deem wiser—counsels prevailed, the country might have been spared the danger of dismemberment. But it was not to be. Lord Hartington, and the great mass of moderate Liberals of whom he is the representative, agreed to accept the Hawarden programme, and to follow Mr. Gladstone's leadership. The member for Midlothian had, as they imagined, learnt wisdom by his late defeat, and might be trusted not to repeat the errors which had upset his last administration. They disliked the idea of a coalition with the Conservatives, they distrusted the possibility of a fusion, they flattered themselves that if they stuck by their party their influence would prove strong enough to keep the Liberals from any extreme measures. Party ties, personal likes and dislikes, political prepossessions had undoubtedly much to do with the decision of the moderate Liberals to support Mr. Gladstone at the last election. But the dominant cause of their so deciding lay in the fact that their confidence in Mr. Gladstone, though shaken, had not then been destroyed.

Their confidence proved misplaced. The general election had left the Parnellites in a position to decide whether the Liberals should or should not return to office. Without their aid, the accession of a Liberal Government was an impossibility; with their aid it was a certainty. The price of their aid was the concession of Home Rule. That price Mr. Gladstone suddenly awoke to the necessity of paying. I am not concerned with the question of Mr. Gladstone's motives, Psychological problems have no great interest for me, and the extent to which a man may deceive himself while deceiving others is a consideration into which I have neither the wish nor the power to enter. All I—or the world at large for that matter—have to deal with are Mr. Gladstone's acts, not his motives. In the annals of American politics it is recorded that, on a change of administration at Washington, a Western editor who had supported the defeated party was informed that the Government advertisements would be withdrawn unless he defended the policy of the party in power. The editor in question forthwith wired back, 'It is a sharp curve and an ugly curve, but I'll take it.' If Mr. Gladstone was not constitutionally incapable of ever using plain language to express plain ideas, it is in such terms as this he might have given in his adhesion to Home Rule. It was a very sharp curve, a very ugly curve indeed! Not only had Mr. Gladstone throughout his long career set his face against Home Rule, not only had he time after time declined to consider it as coming within the domain of practical politics, but he had distinguished himself above other English statesmen by the vehemence with which he had denounced its champions and advocates. If, as he now wishes us to believe, he had all along cherished a secret regard for Home Rule, he had succeeded most admirably in conceal-

ing his affection. Throughout his five years' tenure of office Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues had contrived to make themselves so exceptionally disliked and distrusted by the Irish Nationalists, that the Irish vote had been given to the Conservatives, not because much was expected from them, but because they were opposed to Mr. Gladstone. The fact that this support had been so given had been seized upon as an electioneering weapon by Mr. Gladstone, and had been used unscrupulously by his followers. The mere suspicion that some of the Conservative Ministers might be disposed to make concessions to the Home Rule agitators in return for the Irish vote had been urged as a grave offence against them upon every Liberal platform. Mr. Gladstone himself had made a solemn appeal to the constituencies imploring them to return a strong Liberal majority in order to deprive the Home Rule vote of its importance. In fact, if there was one point to which Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal party stood committed by the course they adopted at the last election, it was resistance to Home Rule.

Yet, as soon as it became clear that the Liberal party could not return to office unless they could deprive the Conservatives of the support they had hitherto received from the Parnellites, Mr. Gladstone went over bag and baggage to the Home Rule camp. Negotiations were opened between Mr. Parnell and Mr. Gladstone, and a compact was entered into in virtue of which the Conservative Ministry were thrown out on the first pretext that presented itself, and Mr. Gladstone was placed in a position to resume office.

I am quite ready to believe that by this time Mr. Gladstone had worked himself up into a genuine belief in the excellence of Home Rule, just as on all previous occasions in his career he has always held the most fervent conviction of the innate truth of any cause which it has served his purpose to espouse. But the fact remains the same that Mr. Gladstone, having defeated the Conservatives by accusing them of parleying with Home Rule, became a convert to Home Rule the moment that his conversion was shown to be the condition of his return to office. Having obtained his majority, his next step was to form his ministry. For this purpose it was essential to keep back the full extent of his conversion. It is obvious, from what we know already, that the colleagues whose aid Mr. Gladstone solicited towards the formation of his ministry were kept utterly in the dark as to the policy on which he had determined, and were only given to understand that in view of the recent manifestation of popular sentiment in Ireland something must be done to satisfy the Irish demand for local self-government. It does credit to the sagacity as well as to the public spirit of Lord Hartington and his personal followers that, in spite of the assurances that were tendered them, they declined to accept office in an administration which was to be constructed on the basis of a coalition with the Parnellites.

The Ministry was formed; and then, without consulting with his colleagues, Mr. Gladstone availed himself of Mr. Parnell's assistance to concoct a scheme repealing the Act of Union and providing Ireland with an independent parliament and a separate executive.

It is needless for my present purpose to repeat how the disclosure of this scheme broke up the Ministry. Nor am I concerned to defend the absolute logical consistency of Mr. Chamberlain and the Radicals who were willing to go a certain length in conceding the principle of Home Rule, but who stopped short at the point to which Mr. Gladstone proposed to lead them. Their most valid defence against the charge of inconsistency must be found in the reply of an eminent American politician in the days of the secession war, who was taunted at a public meeting because, having been a Democrat all his life, he had joined the Republicans when the Southern States seceded. His answer was this: 'Gentlemen,—I followed my party to the very steps of the gallows, but when it came to putting my neck in the noose I thought it time to part company.' When it came to the Repeal of the Union Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan drew back, and by so drawing back they have vindicated themselves from the stain which will attach indelibly to the ministers who consented to co-operate with Mr. Gladstone after his programme had been disclosed. Nor is it incumbent on me to do more than recall the expedients, devices, and subterfuges by which the Ministry attempted alternately to cajole or coerce the malcontent Liberals into accepting the fundamental principle of the Bill. If they could only have been got to admit that Ireland was henceforth to be administered by a parliament and an executive of her own, there was no concession the Ministry were not prepared to make, no assurance they were not ready to give, no engagement into which they were not willing to enter. Happily the snare was too apparent to be successful, and the malcontents stood firm. The Bill was doomed unless the opposition of the Liberal secessionists could be overcome, and to attain this end the Ministry stooped to intrigues and expedients of which happily our political history has had but scant experience. The Prime Minister of England was not ashamed to appeal to the lowest instincts of the masses, and to declare that the question at issue was one not to be decided by reason or argument, but by class prejudices and class sympathies. The whole organisation of the Liberal party was set in action to coerce any Liberal member who dared, after Mr. Gladstone had become a convert to Home Rule, to adhere to his own opinion. Social, personal, and political influences of all kinds were brought to bear upon every member whose vote was doubtful. Every art of Parliamentary strategy was resorted to in order to secure the passing of the Bill: no petty artifice, no device, however small, was rejected as unworthy of the occasion. And yet dodges, devices,

artifices proved in vain, and Mr. Gladstone's own measure was rejected in Mr. Gladstone's own Parliament by a majority of thirty. At any other time and under any other Premier the Ministry would have resigned. In face, however, of the fact that the present Parliament was only elected six months ago, and elected on a programme in which the Repeal of the Union was not even mentioned, Mr. Gladstone has declined to resign, and has appealed to the constituencies. It is with the answer that should be given to this appeal that I have to deal.

If ever there was a case in which the dead might be left to bury their dead, it is that of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill. I have dwelt upon its history simply and solely because it is necessary to bear this history in mind in order to dispel a delusion which is likely to produce a certain effect on the coming elections. In the organs of the Ministry one meets frequently with the assumption that whether Home Rule is right or wrong, wise or unwise, it is part of the Liberal platform, and is therefore certain to be carried at no distant date. Even granting the assumption, the conclusion may well be disputed. But the assumption is utterly without foundation. Up to the present time Home Rule has never even been submitted for acceptance to the Liberal party, and still less accepted by them as an article of the Liberal creed. It is Mr. Gladstone, not the party he leads, whom Home Rule can claim as a convert. So much is this the case, that if Mr. Gladstone were removed from the arena of politics there are not fifty Liberal members who would vote for such a measure as he has proposed; not one of his own colleagues, except Mr. John Morley, who would make himself responsible for its authorship. Indeed, if Mr. Gladstone had not declared for Home Rule, the assertion that the Liberal party was in favour of Home Rule would have been treated, till only the other day, as a malignant misrepresentation. No doubt the Liberal party, as a body, have not repudiated Mr. Gladstone's leadership on account of his conversion to Home Rule. That they should not have done so shows how the party has become demoralised, how Liberalism has grown to represent names and individuals rather than ideas or principles. But the fact that the Liberals as a body still remain faithful to Mr. Gladstone does not prove that they are in favour of Home Rule. All it shows is that they know Mr. Gladstone's influence to be essential to the maintenance of their political ascendancy, and that sooner than abandon that ascendancy they are prepared to support whatever Mr. Gladstone proposes. Whether Home Rule is or is not to be adopted formally as part and parcel of the Liberal programme depends entirely upon the result of the coming election. If, as I believe and hope, the result shows that the country declines absolutely to entertain the idea of any Repeal of the Union, then we shall hear no more of Home Rule being an accepted article

of the Liberal programme. Whether this result is so shown depends mainly upon the action of the moderate Liberals.

Now, preaching to the converted is a waste of labour. I may take it for granted that the Liberals to whom this appeal of mine is once more addressed share with me the view that the maintenance of the Union is a matter of paramount importance. Granted this, it follows that there is no sacrifice we should not be prepared to make in order to secure this object, supposing its attainment to be possible. The arguments on which the partisans of the Ministry rely with most confidence is that after what has come and gone the maintenance of the Union is no longer within the limits of possibility; that we who are struggling against its disruption are only retarding for a brief period the accomplishment of an inevitable event; and that, as the cost of our so retarding it, we are embittering the future relations between England and Ireland, and are breaking up the Liberal party. Considering that the main difficulty in upholding the Union is due to the action of Mr. Gladstone, there is an almost sublime impudence in the supporters of the Ministry alleging that difficulty as a reason for our accepting their policy. But the assumption so far rests on assertion only. No rational person doubts that as a matter of fact Great Britain can uphold the Union by force of arms if she is so minded. It is more than doubtful whether the Irish Nationalists are prepared to fight for a repeal of the Union; if they do fight they are certain to be defeated. It is, therefore, idle to say that we have no choice except to acquiesce in the severance of the Union. If we do acquiesce it will be because we are not willing to exercise our power of resistance, and this, in as far as the argument in question has any meaning at all, is what it really means. It is worth while then to say something as to the reasons why it is alleged that we should never, in practice, be able, or willing—for it comes to the same thing in the end—to exercise our undoubted power.

We are told, then, by our self-constituted mentors that it is impossible in this age—when the triumph of oppressed nationalities has become the order of the day—to resist the demands of the Irish nation; that the moral sense of the community will never tolerate any prolonged exercise of coercion; that the British democracy is at one with the Irish democracy; and that, even if this were not so, the Home Rule contingent can in the present division of parties render all Parliamentary government impossible, and thereby compel England in the end to grant Home Rule as the price of securing the control of her own affairs. Even if we shared the belief that Home Rule must be granted sooner or later, we should say, in the interest of the United Kingdom, the later the better. But the belief rests upon assertions which, to say the least, are open to dispute. In the first place, before you can claim for Ireland the status of an oppressed nationality, you must show that there is such a thing in existence

as an Irish nation, and that this nation, admitting its existence, labours under oppression. Now, as a matter of fact, there never has been an Irish nation. There never has been, there is not in Ireland now, a united people, having a language, a religion, or a history of their own. All you can say is that some two-thirds, at the outside, of the population of Ireland would possibly prefer having a local government. The remaining third—and the third, too, which in industry, prosperity, and intelligence immeasurably outweighs the other two—is passionately averse to any severance of the compact under which Ireland is an integral part of the United Kingdom. The plea, therefore, of nationality falls to the ground. The plea of oppression is even weaker. I confess that I am sceptical as to whether, after all, Ireland was worse treated in bygone times than other countries in a like position. In public as in private life it is generally people's own fault if they are the victims of perpetual wrong-doing at the hands of everybody with whom they come into contact. Moreover, even admitting that Ireland has cause for complaint as to the treatment she may have received from England in days of old, there is obviously a statute of limitations for offences of such a nature. There is no possible redress for wrongs whose victims and whose perpetrators have alike faded away into the far-off past. For the last hundred years Ireland has had no possible ground to complain of oppression on the part of England. She has enjoyed the same civil and religious rights as those possessed by England. As popular liberties have been developed in England, they have been developed in Ireland also, and at the present moment there is in Ireland, as there has been for two generations, absolute liberty of political and public life. Agitators against the Union in the Southern States, Italian sympathisers in Nice and Savoy, Scandinavian propagandists in Schleswig, would be only too grateful for a tenth part of the immunity enjoyed by the Irish Nationalists under the so-called tyranny of the Saxon oppressor.

Limits of space preclude my entering at any length on this branch of the subject. I think, however, it would not be difficult to prove that the Repeal of the Union is not really desired by any decisive majority of the population of Ireland. It would be still more easy to prove that the concession of this desire, if it exists, would not promote the welfare or the interests of Ireland. But I attach the less value to any demonstration of the kind, as I admit freely that even if I entertained an opposite opinion, and believed that separation from England was ardently desired by a large majority of Irishmen, and would prove a blessing instead of a curse to Ireland, I should not waver for one moment in my view as to the paramount necessity of upholding the Union. After all, the whole is greater than the less. We, each of us, in as far as we possess any political influence, hold that influence in trust for the United Kingdom.

We have not the right, even if we had the wish, to benefit any one part of that kingdom to the detriment of the whole. If, as I hold, and as those to whom I address myself hold also, the maintenance of the Union is essential to the well-being, the greatness, and even the existence of the British Empire, then it is idle to talk to us about the wish of Ireland for Home Rule, or of the advantages she might possibly derive from the Repeal of the Union.

If, then, in order to maintain the Union it is necessary to employ coercion, I fail to see why we should deem it necessary to find excuses for its employment. I fail also to see why we should assume that the democracy are incapable of following a very simple process of argument. If they deem it their interest and their duty to uphold the Union, and if the employment of coercion can be shown to be essential to the maintenance of the Union, then I feel convinced the democracy will have as little scruple about employing coercion as the most high-handed of autocrats. There is not a population in the world so wedded to what I may call the commonplaces of Liberalism, so imbued with respect for the stock shibboleths of democracy, as that of the United States. Yet the moment this population awoke to the fact that their Union was endangered, they flung all their favourite theories and platitudes to the winds, and sanctioned the enforcement of such a system of coercion throughout the Southern States as the most fanatical of Orangemen has never dreamt of applying to the Irish secessionists. It is all very well to declare beforehand that the British democracy will never consent to any course of action; but, in so far as my observation goes, our democracy are very like other Englishmen, fully determined to hold their own, and in no wise particular as to the means by which they so hold it. Moreover, though words go a long way with us, there is amongst Englishmen of all classes a certain innate respect for sober fact and plain common sense. 'No Coercion' is undoubtedly a good election cry; but when the masses learn, as they cannot fail to learn before long, that coercion means nothing more nor less than the enforcement of the law, the protection of individual liberty, and the prevention of brutal crime and savage outrage, they will be the first to call out for its employment. Humanitarianism, both for good and bad, is the attribute of the well-to-do classes whose lives are easy and cultured. A morbid dread of inflicting pain and a distaste for rough and ready modes of punishment are not characteristic of the masses who toil and labour.

The objection that if we refuse to grant Home Rule, the Home Rulers will make our system of Parliamentary government unworkable, rests entirely on the assumption that the British Parliament is willing to consent to its own extinction. If, as there is good grounds to hope, the coming elections result in the return of a decisive majority elected on a Unionist platform, this majority, so

long as they remain united, can always defeat the Separatist minority. Given the will, there is no difficulty in putting down wilful obstruction, and if the Home Rulers attempted to repeat in the new Parliament the tactics which they adopted in the last Parliament but one, they would soon discover, to their cost, that though the resources of obstruction may not be exhausted, the resources of repression are still farther from exhaustion.

Thus all the arguments by which Liberals who disapprove of Home Rule are exhorted not to manifest their disapproval, on the ground that the Repeal of the Union is a foregone conclusion, are shown to be assumptions only. The future still lies within our own hands, and it is for us to decide whether the Union shall be dissolved or maintained. By our recent legislation the ultimate appeal in all supreme issues lies to the masses. It is in the end, by their verdict, that the Union must stand or fall. Now it would be idle to imagine that the masses as a rule have any very distinct or intelligent conviction of their own as to the merits or demerits of the controversy on which they are called to give judgment. It is our duty, as Liberal Unionists, to bring home to them the conviction that we hold ourselves. We have many cards in our favour.

The fact that the Home Rule Bill has been rejected by a decisive majority in the most democratic Parliament England has ever known, and that the opposition to Home Rule is supported by all the most honoured and trusted members of the popular party, with the solitary exception of Mr. Gladstone, cannot fail to influence public opinion. Then, too, we have on our side the instincts of a ruling race; the religious sympathies which unite the men of Ulster with the Protestants of Great Britain; the anti-Irish prejudices which prevail so largely in our working classes. But all these influences cannot be relied on with any confidence, unless we can convince the masses that the question at issue is one of life and death to England, one in comparison with which all political and party issues sink into insignificance. In order to bring home this conviction we must practise what we preach, we must teach by example as well as precept. And this brings me to the practical application of the various considerations I have endeavoured to bring before my fellow-Unionists.

Let us look at facts as they are; not as we could wish them to be. Now, as a matter of hard fact, the real strength and backbone of the opposition to Home Rule lies in the Conservative party. The Conservatives have voted as one man against the repeal of the Union, and of the majority by whom the Home Rule Bill was thrown out, over three-fourths were contributed by the Opposition. No candid observer can doubt that the Conservatives have gained ground very materially in public opinion by their attitude on this question. Their conduct since they were turned out of office has

been honest, straightforward, and patriotic. With a public spirit and a disregard of immediate party advantage, only too rare in our political annals, they have given, and are prepared to give, a loyal support to the Liberals who voted against Mr. Gladstone's Bill. They have shown, in a way their countrymen will not fail to recognise, that they have the welfare of England more deeply at heart than the triumph of their party; and by so showing they have done all that in them lies to impress upon the public mind the conviction that the question at issue is one on which the fate of England is at stake.

It is by following this example the Unionist Liberals must enforce the same lesson. If they show in their turn that they are willing to subordinate their own party interests and preferences to the return of a Unionist majority, they will teach the constituencies that whether they are right or wrong in regarding Home Rule as fatal to England's welfare, they are at any rate honest in their belief. I, for my own part, say most sincerely that if the price of securing a majority pledged to resist Home Rule was the forfeiture of every single seat held by a Unionist Liberal, I would gladly consent to such a bargain. So long as the candidate whom I am asked to support is a Unionist, I care little or nothing whether he is called Liberal or Conservative. All I require to know is that his chances as a candidate are not impaired by the political opinions he professes. This point of view of mine should, I hold, be that also of all Liberal Unionists who have the cause of the Union at heart.

It is folly in such a crisis as this to cherish delusions. And the idea that it is possible to form an independent Liberal party which will be able to hold its own without coalescing with the Ministerialists on one hand or the Conservatives on the other seems to me an utter delusion. The Liberal-Unionist movement is one with which I, for one, sympathise most heartily, and which I have done what little lay in my power to set on foot. I should be the last, therefore, to say a word in its disparagement. But to misrepresent the nature of this movement is to injure the cause it is intended to serve. I can see no reason to suppose that the Liberal secessionists are likely to form an independent party of their own. The secession is intended to effect a definite object—the defeat of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy; and when once that object is accomplished I am at a loss to understand what reason of existence the Liberal Unionists as a party will possess. As a matter of argument, the Unionists may be right in contending that it is not they who have seceded from the Liberal party, but the Liberal party who has seceded from them. Just in the same way, for aught I know, the Anglicans may be right in saying it was not they who seceded from the Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation, but the Catholics who seceded from them. But in all such matters the public

counts by results, and somehow or other it is the Radicals, not the Liberal seceders, who will popularly be regarded as the party of progress. The British public likes clear colours, not neutral tints. Radicals it knows, and Conservatives it knows, but it is slow at understanding the exact position of Liberals who are neither Radicals nor Conservatives. The Liberals who voted against the Ministerial measure, and now seek re-election, have a clear and intelligible position. They have a fair claim to the votes, not only of all Conservatives, who put the maintenance of the Union above party interests, but of their own Liberal supporters. They have done nothing, they may reasonably urge, to forfeit the confidence reposed in them only six months ago. But Liberal Unionists who were not members of the last Parliament, and who come forward to contest a seat held by a Ministerial Liberal on the strength of the support they expect to receive from the Conservatives, occupy a very different position. A Liberal who endeavours to defeat another Liberal by the aid of the Conservative vote will always be popularly regarded as a Conservative; and in consequence of this impression he will labour, however unjustly, under a certain disadvantage.

The reason why I dwell on these considerations is to point the moral, that in all cases where the vote on which a Unionist candidate must rely for his return contains a preponderating Conservative element, the Liberals would do wisely to support a Conservative candidate, instead of attempting to enlist the aid of the Conservatives on behalf of a candidate of their own. The assumption on which my whole argument is based is that the end and aim of the Unionists should be to secure the return of a majority pledged to uphold the Union, and that it is a matter of comparative indifference in what proportion that majority is composed of Liberals or Conservatives. Granted this assumption, it is obvious that in constituencies where the mass of the Liberal vote will go solid for the Government, a Conservative is more likely to carry the seat with the aid of the malcontent Liberals, than a malcontent Liberal if supported by the Conservatives. My advice, therefore, to Unionist Liberals, in all cases where a Home Rule Liberal is opposed by a Conservative, especially in the rural constituencies, is to canvass actively and vote steadily for the Conservative. If you wish the end, according to a French proverb, you wish the means also. Now the best means to uphold the Union is to strengthen the hands of the Conservative party; and those Liberals who hesitate about doing this have not really at heart the attainment of their end.

Of course, it will be said that this advice of mine, if it were followed, would lead to a permanent, in lieu of a temporary, disruption of the Liberal party. To this my answer would be that, in the first instance, the maintenance of the Union is infinitely more

important, from my point of view, than the ascendancy of any particular party; and, in the second place, that the disruption which we are implored to avert is already an accomplished fact. Even Mr. Gladstone could never have induced the Liberal party to adopt Home Rule as their platform unless the party had gradually been indoctrinated with ideas which, whether right or wrong, are not in accordance with the principles on which the old Liberal creed was based. But for Mr. Gladstone's inordinate greed of power the coalition between the Radicals and the Home Rulers might have been deferred for years. But even if, happily for himself and his country, Mr. Gladstone had retired from public life last year, the conclusion of such a coalition would always have been a possible, and not a probable, contingency. Home Rule is, indeed, only the logical development of the theories which find favour with Radicalism as distinguished from Liberalism.

The plain truth is, that the Liberal party, as we have known it hitherto, has well-nigh fulfilled its mission. All the important political reforms, consistent with the existing political and social institutions of the country, have been accomplished; and it is impossible to advance much further than we have done already in the way of democratic legislation without attacking the Constitution or the established order of society. Whether such an advance is desirable or otherwise is not a question we need consider here. It is enough for my present purpose to say that the Liberals, whom I am now addressing, are anxious to preserve our existing Constitution, and are opposed to all Socialist ideas. This being so, co-operation with the Conservatives is a thing to be desired in itself, apart from the immediate object this co-operation has in view—namely, the maintenance of the Union. The Conservatives of to-day have practically become converts to the principles which formerly were associated with Liberalism. The Radicals, on the other hand, have largely abandoned these principles. I should be loth here to say a word against Mr. Chamberlain, whose manly attachment to the Union has enlisted for him the sympathy of those who do not share his political views. But truth compels the admission, that Liberals of the class represented by Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen have much more in common with the views held by Lord Salisbury than with those propounded by Mr. Chamberlain. If the fundamental institutions of the country are to be secured against attack, if individual liberty and the rights of property are to be protected in the future against the encroachments of Socialism, it must be by the combined action of the Conservatives and the Liberals. Far, therefore, from regretting that the necessities of the present crisis have led to a coalition between the Conservatives and the Liberals, I rejoice at the probability of this coalition leading to a permanent fusion. Our old party names have ceased to represent facts. Whether

as Unionists or Constitutionals, or under whatever name fortune may assign them, the friends of law and order and individual liberty will soon have to form one united party. If, then, the alliance for the defence of the Union should, as I hope, achieve this consummation, so much the better.

On the eve, therefore, of the new election I would once more repeat the advice I proffered to Liberals, as opposed to Radicals, at the last election, and urge them to support the Conservatives openly and loyally, as fellow-workers in the same cause with themselves. By this policy alone can the Union be maintained. To uphold the Union is the common duty of Liberals and Conservatives, and if the fulfilment of a common duty by common action lead to a permanent fusion between the two great sections of the party of law and order, I for one shall be well content.

EDWARD DICEY.

THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF CANADA.

CANADA is the greatest of the self-governing colonies; her political history is the most important: she is trying an interesting experiment in Confederation, a form of government to which attention is just now specially directed; and her example is being cited for momentous legislation here in a manner which, I think, is misleading, and which, if it is misleading, is extremely dangerous. I believe that the Prime Minister is wrong in saying that she was ever provoked to rebellion by the tyranny of the mother country. I am sure that he is wrong in saying that she was satisfied, or that she ever would be satisfied, with that which he proposes for Ireland.

Canada is called a British colony, and over all her provinces waves the British flag. But as soon as you approach her for the purpose of Imperial Federation you will be reminded that a large part of her is French. Not only is it French, but it is becoming more French daily, and at the same time increasing in magnitude. The notion which seems to be prevalent here, that the French element is dying out, is the very reverse of the fact. The French are shouldering the British out of the city of Quebec, where not more than six thousand British inhabitants are now left, and out of the Eastern Townships, which have hitherto been a British district; they are encroaching on the British province of Ontario, as well as overflowing into the adjoining states of the Union. The population multiplies apace. There, as in Ireland, the Church encourages early marriage, and does not teach thrift; and were it not for the ready egress into the States, we might have Irish congestion and misery in French Canada. Had French Canada been annexed to the United States, it would no doubt have been absorbed and assimilated, like other alien nationalities, by that vast mass of English-speaking population. As it is, instead of being absorbed or assimilated, the French element rather absorbs and assimilates. Highland regiments disbanded in French Canada have become French. In time, apparently, there will hardly be anything British left in the province of Quebec, except the commercial quarter of Montreal, where the more energetic and mercantile race holds its ground. Had the conqueror freely used his power at first, when the French numbered only about sixty thousand, New France might have been made English; but

its nationality has been fostered under the British flag, and in that respect the work of conquest has been undone. It is difficult indeed, if Canada remains separate from the United States, to see what the limits of French extension will be.

French Canada (now the province of Quebec) is a curious remnant of the France before the Revolution. The peasantry retain with their *patois* the pre-revolutionary character, though, of the allegiance once shared between the king, the seigneur, and the priest, almost the whole is now paid to the priest. There were seigneuries with vexatious feudal incidents; but these have been abolished, not by legislative robbery, in which the rude Canadian is inexpert, but by honest commutation. The people are a simple, kindly, and courteous race, happy on little, clad in homespun, illiterate, unprogressive, pious, priest-ridden, and, whether from fatalism or from superstition, averse to vaccination, whereby they brought upon themselves and their neighbours the other day a fearful visitation of small-pox. They are all small, very small farmers; and, looking down from the citadel of Quebec upon the narrow slips of land with their river fronts on the St. Lawrence, you see that here, as in old France, subdivision has been carried to an extreme.

It has been said that the Spaniards colonised for gold, the English for freedom, the French for religion. New France, at all events, was religious, and it has kept the character which the Jesuit missionary impressed on it. The Church is very strong and very rich. Virtually it is established, since to escape tithes you must avow yourself a Protestant. Clerical influence is tremendously powerful. A French Liberal at Montreal told me that as an advocate he had received a retainer from a bitter personal enemy in a suit brought to break a will for undue priestly influence, other advocates not daring to appear. It is due to the clergy to say that they seem to make the people moral, though in ecclesiastical fashion. What they deem immorality they put down with a high hand; they restrain dancing and thunder against *opéra bouffe*. The Church has a strong hold on the peasant's heart through its ceremonial, which is the only pageantry or poetry of peasant life. Till lately the Church of French Canada was Gallican, and lived, like the old national Church of France, on perfectly good terms with the State. But now comes the Jesuit, with the Encyclical and the declaration of Papal Infallibility in his hand. There is a struggle between Jesuitism and Gallicanism under the walls of the citadel of Gallicanism, the great Sulpician Seminary at Montreal. The Jesuit, having all the influences of the day upon his side, prevails. A new chapter of history is opened and troubles begin between Church and State. My readers may perchance have heard of the Guibord case. Guibord was a member of the Institut Canadien, which had been excommunicated as a society for taking literature prohibited by the Index. He died, and was about to be buried in his family

lot in the Roman Catholic cemetery, when the Church interposed on the ground that he was excommunicate. There was an appeal to the Privy Council, which, dealing with the case as a religious case might have been dealt with by a Roman proconsul, decided that excommunication was personal, that a society could not be excommunicated, and that Guibord consequently was entitled to burial in the consecrated ground. The Church seemed determined to resist; a crisis was impending; the militia were under orders; a huge block of granite was prepared to secure the body against exhumation; when suddenly the Bishop of Montreal found a way of escape. He solemnly unconsecrated the particular spot in which Guibord was to be laid, leaving the rest of the cemetery consecrated as before, so that the faithful might rest in peace. The operation was delicate, since Madame Guibord had already been buried in the odour of orthodoxy, in the same lot.

The conqueror might have suppressed French nationality. Instead of this, he preserved and protected it. He gave the conquered a measure of his own liberty, and perhaps as large a measure as at that time they who had known nothing but absolute government could bear. He gave them a representative assembly, trial by jury, Habeas Corpus, an administration generally pure in place of one which was scandalously corrupt, deliverance from oppressive imposts, and an appeal in case of misgovernment to Parliament instead of Pompadour. He gave them liberty of opinion and introduced among them the printing press. The one successful colony of France owes its success to British tutelage. French writers are fain to acknowledge this, and if some of them complain because the half-measure of liberty was not a whole measure, and the conquering race kept power in its own hands, the answer is that conquest is conquest, and that the monarchy of Louis the Fourteenth was neither unaggressive nor invariably liberal to the vanquished. It is rather the fashion now to traduce as well as to desert the country; and we are told, as an argument in favour of the dissolution of the Union, that Englishmen, owing to their pride and want of sympathy, can never get on well with any subject race.¹ To get on well with a subject race is not easy; but, if the Englishman has not succeeded in doing it, who has? Has the Spaniard succeeded in doing it in South America, or the Frenchman in Algeria? The Roman, we are told, was popular with the vanquished. The Roman took the straight road to popularity with the vanquished. Cæsar began by putting a million of Gauls to the sword; no wonder he was popular with the rest. The Englishman in Canada has in the main got on perfectly

¹ Mr Joseph Cowen despairs of seeing the English even get on well with the Irish, because the Irish Celt is so poetic and the Englishman is so prosaic. The Englishman has produced a greater body of first-rate poetry than has been produced by any other nation, except perhaps the Greeks, the Irish Celt has produced Tom Moore.

well with the conquered Frenchman; even if there has been sometimes political antagonism between them, their social relations have been good. The French fought for England in the revolutionary war, and again in the war of 1812. If the hostile attitude of the Puritans of New England towards their religion decided them in the first case, it can hardly have decided them in the second; at least, the rule under which they had lived in the interim can hardly have been oppressive. It was one of their leaders, Etienne Taché, who said that the last gun fired in favour of British dominion on the continent would be fired by a French Canadian. The late Sir George Cartier, the political chief of French Canada in his day, was proud to call himself a British subject speaking French.

It is not easy to make conquest an instrument of civilisation; and we may doubt whether, by the nations most advanced in morality, the attempt will ever be made again; but where has it been made in such good faith or with so much success as in British India? In British India there have been military mutinies, but there has been no political insurrection. In an American review the other day there appeared a furious invective against British rule in India, penned by one of the set of people called, I believe, 'cultivated Baboos,' who would be crushed like eggshells if the protection of the Empire were withdrawn. The best answer to the Baboo was that his invective could be published with impunity. If most has been said against the British conqueror, it is because the British conqueror has allowed most to be said against him. To accuse England of having played the Turk or the Austrian to the least favoured of her dependencies would surely be the grossest injustice.

There was a disastrous quarrel between the American colonies and the Government of George the Third, arising out of the retention by the Imperial Parliament of legal powers over the colonies, which could not be practically exercised—a most dangerous relation, which the proposed plan of reserving to the British Parliament powers over the Irish Parliament would, in the teeth of experience, reproduce. George the Third was legally in the right, while morally and politically he was in the wrong. The quarrel was inflamed, I strongly suspect, by a Republican party at Boston and by Boston merchants, who were suffering from the Imperial restrictions on trade. But if it were asserted that the connection was regarded by the colonists generally as oppressive, or that it was not affectionately cherished by them, abundant evidence to the contrary might be adduced. Washington himself, on taking the command, felt it incumbent on him to declare, in answer to an address, that the ultimate object of the war was the restoration of the connection on a righteous footing.

There is, I believe, no feeling whatever among the French Canadians against England. But French nationality grows daily more

intense and daily finds more political as well as literary expression. We had trouble with it the other day, when Quebec sympathised on national grounds with the rising of the French half-breeds under Riel in the North-West, as she had with previous attempts to secure that vast realm for the French race and religion. Regiments from Quebec were sent to the theatre of war, but they were not sent to the front. The priests, of course, hate the French Revolution, and this has hitherto retarded the renewal of the connection with the mother country; now, however, the connection is being renewed, and it can hardly fail to affect both the relations of French Canada to British Canada and the state of French Canadian opinion. From contact with the American Republic also the priests have shrunk, fearing democratic and sceptical contagion; but the circulation of population between French Canada and the States is beginning to introduce American ideas into French Canadian villages. The ice in which the pre-revolutionary France, like a Siberian mammoth, has been preserved is likely soon to melt.

In the meantime the clergy are powerful in politics as well as in other spheres, and the people, trained in religious submission, are politically submissive also, and follow the political leaders who have the confidence of the priests and represent the interests of French Catholicism at Ottawa. Being thus under the control of an anti-revolutionary Church, Quebec has naturally formed the basis of a Conservative party. There is, however, in the province a party called *Rouge*, but deserving of that name only by contrast with the extremely sable hue of its opponents. Anywhere else it would be simply Liberal. It can hardly fail to be strengthened by the increased intercourse with Republican France.

British Canada, now the province of Ontario,² was the asylum of the Loyalists after the revolutionary war. Their last civil war the Americans generously and wisely closed with an amnesty. Their first civil war they closed not so generously or so wisely with Acts of Attainder. The schism which time would have healed in the first case, as it has in the second, was thus perpetuated in the form of a territorial secession. No doubt the Loyalists had been guilty of atrocities. Lord Cornwallis compares to them the Fencibles who were guilty of atrocities in Ireland. They were largely of the poorest and most unsettled class, the more respectable colonists having been driven by the folly of the King and his commanders into the arms of the rebellion. Still there were many of the better sort, and two thousand exiles for loyalty's sake left the coast of Massachusetts alone. If ever the balance of power with its evil consequences is

² It may seem that here, and perhaps elsewhere, I am giving needless information. But we have read a proclamation of the Privy Council, about the Colorado beetle, beginning with these words: 'Whereas intelligence has been received from Ontario, Canada, that the country round *that town* is being devastated,' &c.

introduced into America, the Americans will have themselves to thank. England would probably have been willing to retire from the continent altogether, as her wisest counsellors advised; but she was bound in honour to protect the Loyalists, and honour still had its seat in the breasts of British statesmen in those days. The United Empire Loyalists, as they are called, carried into exile hearts burning with loyalty and vengeance; they fought heroically for their new home in 1812, and their descendants still form a sort of loyal league cherishing and celebrating the memory of a glorious misfortune.

In her early days British Canada was well content to be ruled by Royal governors. Her constitution was, in fact, what in theory and according to Blackstone the British Constitution is: there was an elective assembly, but the representative of the Crown chose his own Ministers, determined his own policy, and governed as well as reigned. The governors might sometimes make mistakes and sometimes be arbitrary in their behaviour; but they were men of honour, and they were under the control of a Parliamentary Government at home. Their administration was far more economical than that of the party politicians who have succeeded them, and perhaps practically as good in most respects, both material and moral, for the people. For a new settlement, at all events, it was about the best. There was no trouble with the Indians in those days, and had the North-West been under the rule of a governor like Simcoe, instead of being a field for the exercise of patronage by a party Government at Ottawa, we should have had no half-breed rebellion. During the French war and in the period immediately following, while Toryism reigned in the mother country, it prevailed also in the colony; all the more because British Canada was a Tory settlement. But the great tidal wave of Liberalism which afterwards set in extended in course of time to the colony. To the Loyalist exiles had now been added settlers of a different origin and temper, Presbyterians from Scotland and Americans from the other side of the line. At the same time discontent was provoked by an oligarchy of office nicknamed the Family Compact, which kept political power and pelf to itself, though its corruption has probably been overstated, since nothing is more certain than that none of its members left large fortunes, while the land, to which they seem to have freely helped themselves, was a drug in those days. An agitation commenced for responsible government, in other words for the transfer of supreme power from the governor and his council to the representative assembly. The oligarchy of course fought hard for its system and its places, and colonial politicians not being carpet-knights in those days, a good many rough things were said and some rough things were done. The contest raged for some time in the assembly and the courts of law; at last, owing partly to the mismanagement of Sir Francis Head, it assumed the form of a petty civil war. A similar outbreak

took place at the same time in French Canada, where, however, it was mainly nationalist in its character, the less numerous but dominant race having taken to itself the lion's share of power and pelf. The two movements were simultaneous and sympathetic, but distinct. Both outbreaks were easily suppressed, that in British Canada mainly by the loyal settlers themselves. I have called them petty civil wars, and I am persuaded that they had much more of that character than of the character of rebellions against the tyranny of the Imperial country. One of the leaders in Lower Canada expressly disavowed any rebellious feeling against the Home Government, and Mackenzie, the leader in Upper Canada, spoke most respectfully of the Colonial Office. The immediate cause of the outbreak in Upper Canada was not any act of the governor or the Colonial Office, but the defeat of the popular party in a general election by bribery and corruption, as they averred, on the part of their opponents. The Colonial Office was, at all events, guilty of nothing worse than being very distant and rather hard of hearing.

Then came Lord Durham, sent forth by the Whig Ministry as an angel of reform and pacification. He brought with him Charles Buller, who drew up the Report in favour of Responsible Government which forms an epoch in the constitutional history of Canada. Responsible government was conceded. Under the guise of an announcement that Ministers thenceforth were to hold their places not permanently but during pleasure, which was understood to mean during the pleasure of the assembly, supreme power was transferred from the representative of the Crown to Parliament and to Ministers designated by the majority. The representative of the Crown reigned, but governed no more. Thenceforth Canada enjoyed legislative independence. To make people content with your rule by altogether ceasing to rule over them is a notable device of statesmen, for proof of the efficacy of which they may no doubt appeal with reason to the example of Canada. But if they mean that the continuance of legislative union can be combined with legislative separation, they will appeal to the example of Canada in vain.

The two Canadas, British and French, were at the same time united, and the Parliament became, as it still is, bilingual, speeches being made and the records kept in both languages, though English decidedly prevails in the debates, and is spoken by most of the French members. The union was a very questionable step, as soon appeared; but probably a vain hope was still cherished of Anglicising French Canada.

The new system commenced brusquely. The Liberals, having now the majority in Parliament, passed an Act compensating for losses in the rebellion people whom the Tories classed with rebels. The Tories then rose, burned the Parliament House at Montreal, and pelted the Governor. But Lord Elgin was wise, and allayed the

storm. Some corollaries of the Revolution followed. The Anglican Church was disestablished, and the reserves of land which formed its endowment were secularised. It might, perhaps, have kept them if it would have gone shares with the Presbyterians; but privileged bodies and orders usually prefer suicide to concession. The provincial University of Toronto was also thrown open to Nonconformists, unluckily not before the practice of chartering sectarian institutions had been introduced, and Canada had been saddled with the system of petty local universities—'one-horse' universities, as they are called—which is the bane of high education there, as it is in the United States.

An attempt to recover a portion of the royal power was made by Sir Charles Metcalfe, who had been sent out as governor by Lord Stanley, the Colonial Secretary of the Government of Conservative reaction. Sir Charles had been a Liberal in India; but his training there had been bureaucratic, and he did not understand reigning without governing. His attempt failed, and has never been repeated. Sir Edmund Head refused a dissolution, and his act was denounced, and continues to be denounced, as arbitrary and flagitious by the party to the leader of which the dissolution was refused; but I am persuaded that it was constitutional, even if no special allowance be made for any difference with regard to the exercise of a dubious prerogative between the circumstances of the mother country and those of a colony. Of all the encroachments of prime ministers on the rights of the Crown, the seizure of this prerogative is about the most objectionable.

This series of struggles over, the parties, after some complicated shifting and intriguing, formed again upon the issue of Representation by Population, or, as it was commonly called, *Rep. by Pop.* When the legislative Union took place, the same number of representatives had been assigned to each province, though the population of French Canada was larger than that of British Canada. But when the proportion of population was reversed, British Canada demanded a rectification. The political struggle was envenomed by the religious hatred which the strong Protestants of Upper Canada bore to the Roman Catholics and their priesthood. Numbers being equally balanced, a Ministry subsisted on a majority of one. At last there was a deadlock. From this an escape was sought in a Confederation of all the provinces of British North America. For that purpose the leaders of parties coalesced, and sat for a time scowling at each other in a Confederation Cabinet. Such was the main cause of Canadian Confederation. There was another, analogous to that by which previous confederations—the Achæan, the Swiss, the Dutch, and the American—had been brought about. The *Trent* affair had frightened the colonists, set them all drilling, and disposed them to seek increase of military strength in confederation.

The polity thus founded may be described as a Federal Republic with a false front of monarchy. The pseudo-monarchical element is represented by a governor-general, who is a figure-head, and delegates his impotence to a lieutenant-governor of each province nominally appointed by him, but really by the Minister. The constitutional forms of the British monarchy are observed; there is a faint imitation of its state; but to introduce etiquette has been found impossible, and an order to wear low dresses at a viceregal reception was flouted by a caricature representing an Irish servant-girl, bare-legged, asking the master of the ceremonies whether nudity below would not do as well as nudity above. King's speeches, penned by the Minister, are delivered both by the governor and the lieutenant-governors; and if a lieutenant-governor happens to have belonged to the party opposed to that of the provincial Minister, he is sometimes made to slap himself in the face.

The Dominion Parliament has two Chambers, and the state of the Senate is a warning of the danger which attends the use of constitutional fictions as well as the use of falsehood of other kinds. If it had been simply proposed that the members of one branch of the Legislature should be nominated by the leader of the party in power, everybody would have recoiled. But nobody recoiled when it was proposed that they should be nominated by the leader of the party in power under the alias of 'the Crown.' The nominations are used as rewards for old partisans, and three-fourths of the House are at this time the nominees of a single man who has long held power. No attempt has been made to give the Senate the character which it was probably intended to have, and which in some measure the Napoleonic Senate had, of a representation of general eminence and of interests unconnected with party. It is little better than a cipher: its debates are seldom reported, and it confesses its inability to initiate by habitually adjourning at the opening of the Session to wait for the arrival of Bills from the Commons. Its only special function is to hear divorce cases, like the House of Lords in former days, French Catholicism forbidding the establishment of a Divorce Court. Its members, though, being appointed for life, they are independent of public opinion, are not, or are not believed to be, independent of influences of other kinds. As a check on the popular House the Senate is powerless: still more powerless would it be as a barrier against the tide of revolution. It is in the interest of Conservatism that a change is needed. Most of the Provincial Legislatures have two Houses, but that of Ontario has only one, and I am not aware that the Upper House is missed. Two elective Houses, on the other hand, are apt to produce deadlocks, as they did in Victoria, as they are now doing in the United States, where there is a paralysis of legislation, owing to the predominance of different parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives. Has this system of

two Chambers, let me once more ask, any more rational origin than a misconception about the House of Lords, which is taken for a Senate, when it is really an old estate of the realm? Can any answer be given to the question, which must be settled before the mode of election or appointment can be determined, of what special material the Upper House is to be composed? If it is a House of old men, will it not be impotent? If it is a House of the rich, will it not be odious? If it is a House of the best men, will it not deprive the popular assembly, where power after all must centre, of leadership and control? A single Chamber directly elected by universal or nearly universal suffrage would no doubt be revolutionary, if not anarchic, as from the condition of the House of Commons is beginning too plainly to appear. But a single Chamber elected on a principle sufficiently Conservative, and with a procedure sufficiently guarding against haste, still appears likely to prevail over other forms in the end, if elective government continues. The project of dividing a single Chamber into two orders with vetoes on each other's action, in the manner proposed by the Irish Government Bill, needs no discussion. It is nothing but a pair of handcuffs, and very ineffectual handcuffs, for the Irish propensity to confiscation.

There can be no doubt that of Canadian Confederation generally the model is American. But in one most important respect the model is British. The Executive, instead of being a president, elected by the people, holding his office for a term certain, irrespec- tive of parties in the legislature and appointing his own Ministers of State, is, as in England, a party Cabinet, with a prime minister at its head, always dependent for its continuance in office on a majority in the Legislature. Thus we have a thoroughly party, and consequently in its own nature a thoroughly unstable, government. Party is everywhere alike, in a state of apparently hopeless disintegration; it is everywhere breaking up into sections, which multiply as independence of mind increases, and are severally incapable of affording a basis for a government. Even in England sectionalism has visibly set in at last. The consequence is universal instability, the only exception in Europe being the government of Bismarck, who disregards party, and makes up a majority as he can.

When, the list of organic questions having been exhausted, as in Canada it has been, and no real line of division being left, party allegiance has no rational or moral basis, parties can be held together only by corruption and the Caucus. Of the Caucus it is enough to say that, if we may judge from Canadian or American experience, where it prevails electoral freedom worthy of the name must cease to exist.

The Canadian Constitution gives more power than the American to the central government. The central government in Canada has the command of all the militia, the appointment of all the judges,

and a veto on provincial legislation, while to the central legislature belongs the criminal law: the civil law was withheld from it by the separation of Quebec, who clings to her French law. The Canadian statesmen fancied that American secession had been produced by want of power in the central government. In this they were mistaken. The cause of American secession was slavery, and slavery alone. If anything, it was not the want of power in the Federal Government, but the apprehension of its power to interfere with the domestic institutions of the South, that led the South to revolt. The strength of Federation lies in respect for State right. Nobody will rebel against a mere immunity from external danger and internal discord, such as a Federal government, confined to its proper objects, affords. So long as a Federal government is confined to its proper objects, there seems to be no reason why a Federation should ever break up, or why it should not embrace any extent of territory or even great varieties of population. But if subjects are assigned to the Federal government about which there are sectional divisions, and which may give rise to violent agitation, there will always be a danger of disruption.

The instrument of Federation, which is the British North America Act, gives the principal details, but refers for general guidance in working to the well-understood principles of the British Constitution. All very well, so long as the understandings are preserved by a group of political families, or by statesmen who pass their whole lives in the public service. But understandings are not likely to be preserved or respected by democratic politicians who are always being changed. The power of dissolution is still subject to some understood restrictions here, though even here it has been greatly abused; but in Canada it is becoming a power vested in a party premier of bringing on a general election whenever the chances seem good for his party; so that members of Parliament hold their seats, not for the legal term, but during the pleasure of the prime minister—a system manifestly subversive of legislative independence. Written constitutions strictly defining and limiting all powers will surely be found necessary for all democracies, including the British. In the United States the Constitution as a revered and almost sacred document has a strong Conservative influence.

For the decision of questions between the Dominion and the provinces or between one province and another, Canada has the Privy Council, a tribunal perfectly impartial, thoroughly trusted, and backed by the force of the Empire. The United States have the Supreme Court appointed by a president, who is himself elected by the whole Union. For the decision of questions between the Imperial Parliament and the proposed Parliament at Dublin, what tribunal would there be? There would be no arbiter but the bayonet. Even the Supreme Court of the United States, though absolutely

impartial in cases which are strictly legal, is not in all cases absolutely impartial. The judgment in the Dred Scott case was political. The judgment in favour of the Legal Tender Act was political, since the Act, though supposed to be a financial necessity by the Government, was a clear violation of that article of the Constitution which forbids legislation subversive of the faith of contracts, inasmuch as it practically enabled a debtor to repudiate half his debt. I was present when President Lincoln, discussing with a friend an appointment to the Supreme Court, avowed that the man should not, if he could help it, be unsound on the great political question of the day. If the Federal system is to be adopted for these islands, care will have to be taken in the constitution of a tribunal which is to stand between the nation and civil war.

The Colonial Office has still a legal vote; but Canada, I repeat, enjoys to all intents and purposes full legislative independence. Fiscally, she legislates for the protection of Canadian against British goods. Her militia also is in her own hands, though the Crown still appoints a commander-in-chief, not, however, without reference to Canadian wishes. It is needless to say that she neither pays nor would consent to pay any sort of tribute. The parallel which has been drawn between Canadian self-government and the vassal and tributary Parliament proposed for Ireland is therefore totally futile. Besides, Canada is three thousand miles off, and so friendly that, invest her with what power you will, she never can be a thorn in the side of Great Britain. That any analogy should have been supposed to exist between the cases is most strange. Was Canada a part of the United Kingdom? Had she, at the time of the so-called rebellion, a full share of the representation at Westminster?

Two excellent things Canada has inherited from the mother country—a judiciary not elected, but appointed for life, and a permanent Civil Service. To any State an independent judiciary is an inestimable blessing; to a democracy it is a blessing unspeakable: and hitherto, in Canada, party has tolerably spared the appointments, though we now begin to fear that they are going into the all-devouring maw. Party nibbles at the Civil Service; but, so far, we have in great measure escaped that particular kind of corruption from which President Cleveland is so nobly and bravely struggling to rescue the American Republic.

To place the political capital of the Dominion at Ottawa, a remote village subsisting on the lumber trade, was a mistake, like that which has been committed in placing the political capitals of several large States of the Union in second-rate towns. The politicians of a young and crude democracy need all the tempering, liberalising, and elevating influences which general society and a well-filled strangers' gallery can afford. The fear of mob-violence in a great city was

futile, notwithstanding the burning, by the exasperated Tories, of the Parliament House at Montreal. Equally futile was the notion that military security could be obtained by going two or three days' march from the frontier. The enemy, if he came, would be resistless; but he will never come.

New Brunswick came at once and of her own free will into the Confederation. Nova Scotia was dragged in, her political leader having been, as everybody believed, bought, and she has been restless ever since. The little colony of Prince Edward's Island came in after the dignified delay due to its greatness. The Dominion has since incorporated the vast hunting-ground of the Hudson's Bay Company, called the North-West; and if that territory becomes peopled in proportion to its size and fertility, to it the centre of power must in time shift, supposing the Confederation endures. Confederations are not made so easily as omelets. In the operation all the centrifugal forces of rivalry, jealousy, and sectional interest, as well as the centripetal forces, are called into play. If you are going to dissolve the Union of these kingdoms to make raw materials for a Federation, take care that you do not break the eggs and fail to make your omelet after all. The people of the several States must be, as Professor Dicey well expresses it, desirous of union, but not of unity. Moreover, the group of States must be pretty well balanced in itself; at least there ought to be no State of such overweening power as to give constant cause of jealousy to the rest, and tempt them to combine against it. A Confederation of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales would probably be a standing cabal of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales against England. The territory, as I have said, may, so long as the Federal principle is observed, be indefinite in extent; but it must at least be in a ring-fence, and it must have in a reasonable degree unity and distinctness of commercial interest. The territory of the Canadian Dominion can barely be said to be in a ring-fence, still less can it be said that there is unity and distinctness of commercial interest. The Dominion is made up of four perfectly separate blocks of territory lying in a broken line along the northern edge of the habitable and cultivable continent. The maritime provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, are severed from Old Canada by a wide and irreclaimable wilderness. Old Canada is severed from the North-West by another wilderness and by a fresh-water sea four hundred miles in length; the North-West from British Columbia by a triple range of mountains. Old Canada is moreover divided between two nationalities, British and French, of the amalgamation of which there is not the slightest hope. Each of the four territories is connected commercially, not with its political partners, but with the States of the Union to the south of it. A grand effort is being made to bind the four together by political railroads; but commerce will not follow merely political lines, and the Intercolonial Railroad,

which cost forty millions of dollars, hardly takes up a passenger or a bale of freight over the greater part of its long course. There are even doubts whether it will not some day be abandoned.

The disjointed and heterogeneous character of the elements of which the Dominion is made up, while it renders the continued existence of Confederation itself precarious, has had the curious effect of producing an apparent stability of government, which it would be a mistake to set down to the credit of party. The parties not only are destitute of any basis in the shape of dividing principles, but they have never really extended beyond the two provinces of Canada which are their native seat. The government has been really personal, almost as personal as that of Bismarck. One man has held power with little interruption for forty years by his skill, ever increasing with practice, in holding together miscellaneous interests of all kinds, provincial, sectional, and personal, and in forming them into a motley basis for his government. He has no doubt made his address go as far as it would, and it has gone a long way; but he has also been compelled to have recourse to corruption in all its protean forms and in all its varied applications, though his own hands are believed by all to have remained clean. Probably no fisher of votes ever had a stranger medley of fishes in his net. Roman Catholics and Orangemen go to the poll for him together. An effective opposition to him cannot be formed simply because there is nothing for it to be formed upon. He stands not upon principle, but upon management. In management he has no rival, and counter principle there can be none. It is needless to say that the system is demoralising as well as expensive. Its existence depends on the life of a man past seventy, after whom there is a fair prospect of political chaos.

In the governments and legislatures of Ontario and Quebec the Dominion parties prevail; though in Quebec, for reasons already mentioned, the dominant party is Conservative, or, as it might more truly be called, Macdonaldite, while in Ontario the Liberal or Anti-Macdonaldite party has the upper hand. In the other local legislatures local interests mainly prevail.

At the outset there was what might be roughly called a freehold suffrage, reasonable and safe enough. But in Canada, as in England, demagogues dish each other by extensions of the franchise, and extend it blindly, not revising the Constitution to see that its Conservative portions will be strong enough to bear the additional strain. It has come at last to giving votes to the Red Indians, as though self-government were a blessing to a savage. The question is no trifling one. The agricultural freeholders are Conservative, especially on the subject of property. The mechanics are beginning to be infected with communism, which, though mostly imported, not native, is, as you see, already breeding trouble, and seems likely to breed more.

In the minds of the British statesmen who promoted Confedera-

tion it was probably a step towards independence. In fact, if it was not a step towards independence, where was the use of it? The Colonies were already united under the Empire, and might at any time have combined their forces for mutual defence. Freedom of internal intercourse, the other great object of Confederation, was also secured, and any questions arising from time to time might have been settled by delegation and conference. It would be difficult, I am afraid, clearly to show that the provinces had actually gained anything by the operation, except a vast development of faction, demagogism, corruption, expenditure, and debt.

We have had since Confederation some political incidents illustrative of the working of the system. The Pacific Railway scandal fatally illustrated the character of the expedients to which party government, resting on no principle, is reduced for support. The enormity of the scandal awakened for a moment the moral sense of the country, and the Government fell. The same affair illustrated the constitutional position of the governor-general; for Lord Dufferin felt himself bound to take the advice of his Ministers regarding their own trial for corruption, prorogued Parliament at their instance, and allowed them to transfer the inquiry from the House of Commons, which was already seised of it, to a Royal Commission of their own appointment. Lord Lorne subsequently, after a faint struggle, consented to the removal of a lieutenant-governor, his own representative, for no assignable offence, merely to gratify party vengeance, which the lieutenant-governor had provoked by the dismissal of a provincial Ministry connected with the party dominant at Ottawa. When it has come to this, one is inclined to ask whether a personal representation of monarchy is of any use at all, and whether a stamp to be affixed to public documents would not do as well. The fiction, as has been already said, is not only futile but mischievous; it masks the necessity, which is most urgent, of real Conservative safeguards and of substantial securities for the stability of government.

Illustrative of the legislative independence of Canada is the adoption of the new fiscal system called the National Policy, which is now avowedly protective against British as well as American goods, and which takes Canada definitively out of the commercial unity of the Empire. There has been no remonstrance on the part of the Home Government, and the author of the measure has since received the Grand Cross of the Bath. There is now a perceptible gravitation towards commercial union with the United States, which would allow the commercial life of the continent to circulate freely through the veins of Canada, and would at once enhance the value of all Canadian property. There are some who think that commercial union would necessarily bring political union in its train. For my part, I can see no such necessity. Rather, I think, the removal of

the Customs line, and the enjoyment of freedom of trade with the rest of the continent, would tend to make Canadians contented with the political system as it is. A nationality must, at all events, be weak if it depends on a Customs line. There can be no doubt that, as it is, the action of economical forces, which draw Canada towards the great mass of English-speaking population on her continent, is strong. It cannot be too often repeated that to speak of the colonies and their destinies in the gross is most fallacious. Australia is in an ocean by herself. Canada is a part of a continent inhabited by people of the same race and language; and a young Canadian thinks no more of going to push his fortunes at New York or Chicago than a Scotch or Yorkshire youth thinks of going to push his fortunes in London. The accuracy of the statistics of Canadian emigration into the United States is a constant subject of dispute; but it is certain that New York and Chicago are full of Canadians, and that there is also a considerable emigration of Canadian farmers to Dakota and other western States.

Not only has Canada asserted her complete fiscal independence by the adoption of the National Policy, but she has begun practically to claim the privilege of making her own commercial treaties, through the High Commissioner who acts as her ambassador, though ostensibly under the authority of the British Foreign Office. Negotiations have been opened with France and Spain, while overtures for the renewal of reciprocity are made from time to time to the United States.

The thread of political connection is wearing thin. This England sees, and the consequence is a recoil which has produced a movement in favour of Imperial Federation. It is proposed not only to arrest the process of gradual emancipation, but to reverse it and to reabsorb the colonies into the unity of the Empire. No definite plan has been propounded; indeed, any demand for a plan is deprecated, and we are adjured to embrace the principle of the scheme and leave the details for future revelation—to which we must answer that the principle of a scheme is its object, and that it is impossible to determine whether the object is practically attainable without a working plan. There is no one in whose eyes the bond between the colonies and the mother country is more precious than it is in mine. Yet I do not hesitate to say that, so far as Canada is concerned, Imperial Federation is a dream. The Canadian people will never part with their self-government. Their tendency is entirely the other way. They have recently, as has been shown, asserted their fiscal independence, and by instituting a Supreme Court of their own, they have evinced a disposition to withdraw as much as they can of their affairs from the jurisdiction of the Privy Council. Every association, to make it reasonable and lasting, must have some practical object. The practical objects of Imperial

Federation, would be the maintenance of common armaments and the establishment of a common tariff. But to neither of these, I am persuaded, would Canada ever consent; she would neither contribute to Imperial armaments nor conform to an Imperial tariff. Though her people are brave and hardy, they are not, any more than the people of the United States, military, nor could they be brought to spend their earnings in Asiatic or African wars. The other day when there was talk of sending a regiment to the Soudan, the most Conservative and Imperialist journals anxiously assured their readers that no expenditure of Canadian money on such an object was contemplated or need be feared. Remember that Canada is only in part British. The commercial and fiscal circumstances of the colony again are as different as possible from those of the mother country. Canadian statesmen visiting England, and finding the movement popular in society here, are naturally disposed to prophesy smooth things; but not one of them, so far as I know, advocates Imperial Federation in his own country, nor am I aware that any powerful journal has even treated the question as serious. It is right to be frank upon this subject. A strong delusion appears to be taking hold of some minds and leading them in a perilous direction. It would be disastrous indeed if the United Kingdom were broken up or allowed to go to pieces in expectation of an ampler and grander unity, and the ampler and grander unity should prove unattainable after all.

Why not leave the connection as it is? Because, reply the advocates of Imperial Federation, the connection will not remain as it is; the process of separation will go on and the attenuated tie will snap. Apart from this not unreasonable apprehension, there are, so far as I know, only two reasons against acquiescence in the present system. One of these may be thought rather vague and intangible. It is that the spirit of a dependency, even of a dependency enjoying the largest measure of self-government, is never that of a nation, and that we can make Englands only in the way in which England herself was made. The other is more tangible, and is brought home to us at this moment by the dispute with the Americans about the Fisheries. The responsibility of Great Britain for the protection of her distant colony is not easily discharged to the distant colony's satisfaction. To Canadians, as to other people, their own concerns seem most important; they forget what the Imperial country has upon her hands in all parts of the globe; they have an unlimited idea of her power; and they expect her to put forth the whole force of the Empire in defence of Canadian fishing rights, while perhaps at the same moment Australians are calling upon her to put forth the whole force of the Empire in defence of their claims upon New Guinea. Confiding in Imperial support, they perhaps take stronger ground and use more bellicose language than they otherwise would. But the more democratic England becomes, the more impossible will it be to get her people to

go to war for any interests but their own. The climax of practical absurdity would be reached if England were involved in war by some quarrel arising out of the Canadian customs duties, imposed partly to protect Canadian manufactures against British goods. Trusting to the shield of the Empire, Canada has no navy of her own, and though she has a militia numbering forty thousand, it is not likely that more than two or three regiments at the very outside could be got ready for the field within the time allowed by the swift march of modern war. Again, if England were involved in a war with Russia, or any other maritime power, the mercantile marine of Canada would be cut up in a quarrel about an Afghan frontier or something equally remote. Nothing could be more calamitous to the colony than a rupture with the mother country. The separation of the American colonies from Great Britain was inevitable; their violent separation was disastrous. The Republic was launched with a revolutionary bias which was just what it did not want, and it was left without a history to steady and exalt the nation. Both in freedom from revolutionary bias and in the possession of a history Canada has a great advantage over her mighty neighbour. On these points opinions and sentiments differ. For my own part, I attach little value to the mere political bond. I should not mourn if nothing were left of it but mutual citizenship without necessity of naturalisation, which might remain even when the governments and legislatures had been finally separated from each other and diplomatic responsibility had ceased. This part of the political connection is little noticed, yet it seems to me the most valuable as well as the most likely to endure.

But, let what may become of the political connection, the nobler dominion of the mother country over her colony, and over all her colonies on that continent, those which have left her side as well as those which still remain with her, is assured for ever. The flag of conquering England still floats over the citadel of Quebec; but it seems to wave a farewell to the scenes of its glory, the historic rock, the famous battle-field, the majestic river which bore the fleet of England to victory, the monument on which the chivalry of the victor has inscribed together the names of Wolfe and Montcalm. For no British redcoats muster round it now. The only British redcoats left on the continent are the reduced garrison of Halifax. That morning drum of England, the roll of which, Webster said, went round the world with the sun, is now, so far as Canada is concerned, a memory of the past. But in blood and language, in literature and history, in laws and institutions, in all that makes national character and the higher life of nations, England, without beat of drum, is there. Nor—if one may be believed who has lived much among Americans and watched the expression of their feelings—is the day far distant when the last traces of the revolutionary feud will have disappeared,

when the hatred which the descendants of British colonists have been taught to cherish against their mother country will cease to exist, even in the most ignoble breast, and when Westminster Abbey and Westminster Hall will again be the sacred centre of the whole race. This is that realm of England beyond the Atlantic which George the Third could not forfeit, which Canadian independence if it comes cannot impair, upon which the Star of Empire, let it wend as far westward as it will, can never shed a parting ray.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

THE PRIMROSE LEAGUE.

MANY seek to know the origin and purposes of the Primrose League, and how it has come to possess a Creed, a Prophet, and a Symbol, and to be a distinct and vivifying factor in the politics of England.

It is the manifestation of the latent strength inherent in the patriotic and constitutional party. The old Tory had become too fossilised to march with the age, while the Conservative as he existed a few years ago was sadly deficient in vigour. To the Radical cry of 'Peace, retrenchment, and reform' he could only respond that he was more peaceful, more disposed to retrenchment and to reform. At the battles of the hustings men haggled at words and were supported on either side by endless arrays of figures. The contest waxed fierce about small measures and raged about still smaller persons, till the bewilderment of the newly enfranchised voter was complete. To remedy this state of things on the Radical side, Birmingham called the Caucus into existence. This new institution does not pretend to enlighten, but only to control the elector. It compels him to delegate his choice to a select few, who in their turn are subordinate to a central authority, which imposes its will both upon the constituency and the representative. The Primrose League, on the contrary, interferes neither with the choice of electors nor with the candidates. It seeks to educate the masses and to organise them, so that they shall voluntarily vote for the cause of order.

In October 1883, when the fortunes of the party were at their lowest ebb, a few friends met in a private room of the Carlton Club, to discuss the depressing subject of Conservative apathy, and to listen to a scheme which had sprung from the brain of Sir Henry Drummond Wolff. This was a project for enlisting the young men of various classes, who hitherto had borne no active part, in some body which should replace with advantage the paid canvassers, abolished, and wholesomely abolished, by Sir Henry James's new Act. It was thought that if the opportunity were offered, there was abundance of active spirits willing and ready to enrol themselves in small clubs of friends, and to take up the work of aiding registration, promoting sound principles, and generally encouraging the nearest Conservative association. The 'Habitation' or club scheme was founded on the

probability that a strong spirit of emulation would be developed among the members and also among the Habitations. There was ample ground for believing that recruits might be obtained with ease, by appealing to the veneration with which the memory of Lord Beaconsfield was cherished. Gifted as that statesman was with marvellous political instinct, he had touched chords which did not cease to vibrate when he expired, and he left to his countrymen a legacy of convictions which only needed expression in a formula. Of the profound regard in which the memory of Benjamin Disraeli was held we had ocular demonstration every nineteenth day of April, the anniversary of his death, when all classes in numberless thousands bore the primrose. It was obvious that if the young and energetic of these multitudes, instead of wearing the flower for the day, were to take it as a permanent badge of brotherhood, a confraternity might be established with an unlimited future.

The principles of Lord Beaconsfield and of the constitutional cause were pre-eminently those opposed to the spread of atheism and irreligious teaching, to the revolutionary and republican tendencies of Radicalism, and to the narrow and insular mode of thought which despised our colonies and found utterance in the words 'Perish India.' The creed of the League, therefore, was set forth as 'the maintenance of religion, of the Constitution of the realm, and of the Imperial ascendancy of Great Britain,' or, in shorter form, 'Religion, Constitution, and Empire.'

At first the intention prevailed of shrouding the appearance of the League under a certain veil of mystery. Those who belonged to it were to have grades, but 'the Ruling Councillor' was not to be publicly named. There were several excellent reasons for this. Never was an important undertaking more modestly begun. We did not approach the chiefs of the party. We did not communicate with the men of leading or even with the rank and file, because we knew—and it proved so for a long year and more—that so novel a conception would not find favour amongst those wedded to old methods of procedure until it should command attention by success.

The League was started in a somewhat dismal and dilapidated second floor in Essex Street, Strand, where the original band of enthusiasts met constantly. A paragraph in a newspaper and a few advertisements at once awakened public curiosity and interest, and adherents speedily sent in their names.

The very class for which the League was instituted was the first to respond, and only a few weeks had elapsed when already some hundreds had joined, and the work of forming Habitations was in full swing. The hundreds soon swelled to thousands, and a grand banquet in Freemasons' Tavern marked the first public appearance of the League upon the world's stage. Since that day it has increased by hundreds and tens of hundreds until this moment, when a thou-

sand a day is the average entry of new members. It is needless to say that the offices necessary for conducting so gigantic a business have expanded into extensive premises (in Victoria Street), with a vast staff of employées, occupied in sorting and attempting to cope with masses of correspondence from all parts of the country. The chiefs of the party have been glad to accept the highest honours of the League, and have testified to the great results achieved. Many and many a public man, who laughed at first at our 'strange nomenclature,' and was incredulous of our success, has since eagerly sought our aid in founding Habitations in his county or borough, and has largely benefited by the work done by the Knights, Dames, and Associates.

Perhaps the simplest key to a comprehension of the procedure of the Primrose League is to state the conditions and mode of conduct of a Habitation.

Any person can join the League by sending his name to the central office in Victoria Street, with a 'crown'—half-a-crown being his entrance fee, and half-a-crown his year's tribute. Upon his signing a declaration of fidelity to the principles of the League, he receives his diploma of Knight Harbinger, and provided with this he, with not less than twelve other knights, can apply for a 'warrant' to form a Habitation. After this follows the election of a Ruling Councillor, the appointment of secretary, treasurer, wardens, and other officials. Great latitude is allowed to all Habitations so long as they are careful to keep within the strict statutes of the parent League. They may admit associates and fix their tribute at sixpence or whatever sum they deem proper, and they may keep within small limits or extend themselves, as some have done, to thousands, according to the necessities of the town or county in which they are situate. The first and most obvious business of a Habitation is to attend to Registration. I could name counties, such as Suffolk and Hampshire, where the network of Habitations is so complete that every vote in every house in the various electoral divisions is accounted for. The members of Habitations volunteer to take some small district or half a street, and to notify all deaths, departures, or arrivals, so that the Registration may be carefully kept up by the Conservative Association to which they communicate these results. The next duty is to maintain a permanent canvass by means of individual persuasion or public meeting, and to be ready to canvass out-voters at times of by-elections. *E.g.* an election comes off at York or Devonport; the election agent sends to the central Conservative office at Westminster the names of out-voters resident in London, Leamington, Brighton, &c. The central office sends in the names and addresses to the Grand Council in Victoria Street. They are at once classified and sent to Habitations in the towns named, and the various districts of London; and each local Habitation has it at once in its power to

send voluntary canvassers for each name sent in. Of course, when an election comes on, all Habitations, following the example of the Conservative Associations, suspend their existence, and can take no corporate action. But the individual members, acting no longer as members of the Primrose League, but as individuals, can volunteer to join the committees organised by the election agent. And in these days, when expenses are curtailed and it is no small difficulty to meet the demands of an election from the exiguous sums allowed by the law, the services of volunteers are invaluable, when, as in elections I could name, a number of ladies undertake to write out the addresses on thousands of envelopes, or when scores of young men volunteer two hours a day each for the purpose of delivering circulars, &c., all of which reach their destination, since it is a point of honour to hand them in—a very different state of matters from that which obtained in the days of paid agents and messengers.

Excepting at the election period, the Habitation can organise public meetings, invite able speakers, or obtain from the central office some of their staff of lecturers to explain and develop the objects of the League and further its spread. One of the chief duties incumbent on every Primrose centre is to combat and destroy the Radical fallacy that in modern politics classes are antagonistic. The League, on the contrary, brings all classes together. All vote on a footing of absolute equality, and all meet on terms of the truest fraternity. To this end, it is best that all social gatherings should be held in some public hall, where every knight, dame, or associate can contribute of his knowledge or talent to the instruction and amusement of the evening. We have seen hundreds of such meetings where the enunciation of sound constitutional principles has been varied by ballad-singing and instrumental performances volunteered by those best qualified to please.

Within its limits the Habitation preserves strict order and discipline. It obeys the precepts of the Grand Council, and annually sends delegates to Grand Habitation, which is held in London on or near the 19th of April, on which occasion the Grand Council renews its members and its life by the votes of those present. On the last occasion, besides spectators, there were 2,500 delegates present. Important statutes and ordinances were framed or modified, for, as this new institution grows, many are the new requirements to meet its vast expansion, as well as to satisfy the demands for progress and improvement which are put forward from active centres.

The Habitation such as it has been described is bound to take heed of precepts issued by the Grand Council, such as, for instance, the suspension of its functions during election time; but in all other matters it is left a wide liberty, and frames its own by-laws subject to superior approval, which is rarely withheld. No questions of the smaller current politics disturb its deliberations. These should tend

only to the upholding of religion, constitution, and empire, and necessarily embrace men of different tenets, united firmly in support of these cardinal principles.

The members of the League work for the return of constitutional candidates whenever they present themselves, irrespective of their professions on minor points. Only when the question of the day touches one of its three great principles does the League take distinct action. When the honour of the Empire was at stake with the life of the heroic Gordon, every Habitation sent up a petition for his rescue; and now again, when the existence of the United Kingdom is menaced, the League has been active in the defence of our imperilled Constitution.

The most remarkable feature, however, of this stirring political development has been that for the first time in our history women have taken an active part in controversies hitherto reserved to men. The reason of this, in the first place, is the novelty and suddenness of the Radical and Fenian onslaught. Women, with an instinct peculiarly their own, divined at once the dangers involved in the new doctrines and theories—perceived that if churches were to be overthrown, education divorced from religion, property held to ransom, the Constitution to be riven asunder, England must be in presence of as serious a revolution as ever threatened social order or preceded a Reign of Terror. The women of England speedily adopted the Primrose banner, and the dames, armed with sweet influence and persuasive eloquence, boldly came forward to take their share in the labours of the organisation. Their aid has proved invaluable. Many a lady well known in the world has spoken at meetings, chiefly of friends and neighbours, who have surrendered to the expressions of heartfelt conviction. Many another has devoted all her time and energy to the formation of Habitations in her county or borough; while the working woman has not been behind her sister in enthusiasm or self-sacrifice. The first badge of honour for special service given by the League was conferred on a woman in the West of England, whose daily bread depended on her labour, but who had devoted all her spare time to the cause, and who had richly deserved the honour by her conspicuous services. The ladies have an Executive Committee of their own—meeting every week—working in conjunction with the chief authority; and in business capacity, attention to their manifold duties and powers of management, they have proved themselves in every respect fitted for the responsible duties they have undertaken. The ladies have a fund of their own, and employ it well in the distribution of Primrose literature.

The reader of the London and country press, on taking up almost any newspaper, will see what constant activity is everywhere displayed by the dames, who in every parish in England are endeavouring to promulgate the fundamental principles necessary for the

safety of the commonwealth. No ranting pothouse politician, full of fallacies, can compete with the men and women who, stepping out from the accustomed reserve of their own homes, come forward to meet their fellows in fraternal intercourse, and to discuss with them the origin of error and the ways of truth. The enormous increase in the number of the League dates especially from the time when the ladies first took up their place in its organisation, and it is only due to them to acknowledge in how large a measure the great success achieved has been owing to their efforts.

When the first Festival was held in 1884, after the newborn institution had been nine months in existence, there were a few thousand members, chiefly knights. By Primrose Day 1885, more dames had joined, and 2,000 associates, and our muster-roll was upwards of 11,000. Before and after the election of 1885, the League expanded so rapidly that it was difficult at headquarters to keep pace with the demand for diplomas and warrants. On Primrose Day 1886, the third hundred thousand was reached; while to-day there are more than 350,000 knights, dames, and associates banded together in an enterprise that may now be esteemed a permanent institution.

In round numbers there may be said to be 50,000 knights, 30,000 dames, and 280,000 associates. The knights pay a tribute of half-a-crown yearly; so also do the dames, with the exception of those belonging to the Dames' Grand Council, who pay a guinea. The associates pay nothing to the Grand Council, but a small tribute, generally sixpence, to their own Habitation. The books and balance-sheets of the League have been audited by public accountants, and were approved by a committee of delegates at the last Grand Habitation. It is not usual to publish the accounts of political associations. Three years ago opponents would have laughed at the poverty of the League; now they carp at its wealth. But with the money it receives it has to maintain an organisation that has become very large. It issues millions of tracts and leaflets; provides thousands of lectures where local eloquence is deficient or timid; maintains a large staff that necessarily increases with the work, and finds, for instance, that a thousand pounds does not cover the year's postage. Of the Grand Council, which meets once a fortnight with an average attendance of thirty, there is hardly a man of whom it may not be emphatically said that he is a man of business, and the best interests of the League are therefore closely looked after. It may be mentioned that already a portion of the tribute is remitted to Habitations to aid them in maintaining and perfecting their individual organisation.

Some sorry sneers have been directed against the nomenclature and decorations of the Primrose League, but the answer to these is found in the fact that all are proud to bear the titles which testify to their energy and chivalrous work. The badges are of enormous value, for they are not only a certificate of membership but an absolute

introduction into all Primrose circles, and thus give every member the opportunity of using his talents and influence in every part of the country. They afford also the opportunity of promotion in rank, and are accompanied by the distinction of clasps conferred for good service. Every associate can earn promotion, without fee or tribute, to high rank, upon representation by the Habitation to which he belongs that he is deserving of the honour.

And here occurs the obvious reflection that any man making his way to distinction through the grades of the Primrose League has the road open to him for all political eminence. He who cares to study public affairs and to cultivate his talents, with a view to the persuasion of others and the defence of approved principle, will soon make his mark and be welcomed as one of those who can guide men aright.

The people have sought for a new faith in these times of change and turmoil. Many were led astray by the loud outcry of Radicals and Revolutionists. But a true doctrine has now been propounded. It is based on the highest traditions of British statesmanship as handed down by Pitt and Palmerston and Beaconsfield. The symbol is the popular flower, that suggests lessons of patience through the winter time, and breathes all the bright promise of spring; that blossoms beneath the imperial oak, and to all Englishmen speaks of home. It appeals to a people the most adventurous that the world has ever seen, ready to quit the mansion or the cottage at the call of the country on its world-encircling mission of colonisation and empire. It reminds all of the blessings of constitutional government and true liberty based on the choice and the devotion of the people.

'Peace with honour,' 'Imperium et Libertas,' and many another glorious motto are emblazoned on our banners. They will be carried to victory with all that determination and tenacity which has ever characterised the nation. The land of all the great kings and statesmen who have guided us from small beginnings to our high estate will certainly vindicate their memories, and take care that under the reign of our illustrious Sovereign her realm shall suffer no loss, but shall be maintained and extended and consolidated as a glorious heritage for our children, a blessing to civilisation, and an example to mankind.

ALGERNON BORTHWICK.

MODERN CHINA.

CHINA is rather a vast field to cover in a single article, and I cannot pretend to do more than touch upon a few prominent features of that hoary and time-honoured country. A land which contains at the least computation some 250,000,000 of the human race must surely be destined to play no unimportant part in the history of the world. China is no longer the isolated nation she once was, and now that she has frequent communication with Europe, her people may hope to be better understood in the West. Until quite lately everything Chinese was the butt of ridicule: a nation whose mourning garb was white, whose books were read from right to left, and whose every action was almost the exact opposite of ours, was naturally considered somewhat eccentric. Closer acquaintance has, however, gradually removed earlier impressions, and Europeans are now beginning to realise that in the far East there exists an empire which was civilised when their ancestors were rude savages, and whose language, civilisation, and morality, surviving the wreck of centuries, have still much that will bear comparison with modern Europe. It is only within the last forty years that our knowledge of China has attained any degree of accuracy. For a century or more before that a sort of desultory intercourse had been maintained with Southern China, but the movements of Europeans were so restricted and hampered that there were few opportunities of acquiring knowledge. England's only representatives were the members of the East India Company who lived and traded in Canton, while France had her missionaries in Peking, and to the latter we owe almost all we know of China before 1840, the year of our first war with China, the war which Mr. Justin McCarthy calls the Opium War, but of which opium was only one of the many causes. English bayonets soon gained what years of diplomacy had failed to attain, and China consented to admit Europeans on terms of equality with her own subjects. Twenty years passed away, and in 1860 we were again involved in a war with China. With the help of the French we reached Peking, and, striking a blow at the very heart of the Government, we sacked and levelled to the ground one of the most magnificent palaces in the world, and concluded a treaty which still forms the charter of all our privileges

in China. Since then things have gone on fairly smoothly, and China's respect for Western nations, especially the English, has considerably increased.

That China did not receive us at first with much eagerness is scarcely to be wondered at, nor is it strange that she still at times shows a desire to revert to her former state of isolation. China produces in abundance all that its people require; the Chinese are of an eminently conservative turn of mind, and for some three thousand years they had got on tolerably well without us. Dynasties had been overthrown and revolutions often attempted; emperors had passed away by the score, and rebellions past number had swept over the face of the country, but still their old institutions, their moral codes, their language, and their habits of thought had scarcely been affected all through the centuries. All at once they found the European trader obtruding himself with his go-ahead notions of material progress, and saw looming up in the distance visions of the steam-engine, the electric telegraph, and all the other accompaniments of modern civilisation. All these things jarred sorely with their ideas of a philosophic life. Confucius, who lived 500 years before Christ, and whose teachings and precepts form the Chinese Bible, held worldly advancement of little account, and sought to attain rather the moral than the material elevation of mankind. Even now, few Chinese will admit that the European standard of morality is equal to their own.

Christianity they consider to be a good enough religion in as far as, like Buddhism and other native cults, it teaches men to do good, but they cannot see that in practice it has made much impression upon the nations of Europe. Their own country has seldom waged an offensive war, while all Europe appears to them an armed encampment. England prides herself upon her religion and her big ships of war; France sends her missionaries far into the interior, and her torpedo boats cruise round the coast and sink all the unoffending junks that come in their way. This is, of course, the unfavourable side of European character as it presents itself to the ordinary Chinaman. He does not, however, fail to discern our good as well as our bad points. That we are truthful he knows well by experience, and that no bribe will ever tempt an Englishman is a thing he often regrets, but never fails to admire. Though he does not altogether accept our ideas of progress, still he is willing to adopt some of our inventions. Steamers are rapidly supplanting the clumsy junks, and one very large and flourishing line is entirely supported by native capital and conducted by native talent.

Telegraph lines connect the principal cities in the Empire, and even Peking itself now condescends to hold communication through this medium with the rest of the world. To the introduction of railroads, however, China has hitherto offered a most decided opposition. Their history in China is a brief one, but not without interest.

One was constructed about ten years ago from Shanghai to Woosung, a distance of about eight miles. The land was purchased by a British firm under the pretext of making an ordinary carriage-road, and the goodwill of the local officials having been secured, the railway was in working order before the Peking authorities got wind of what was going on. When it became known that the 'fire-carriage' was actually running and puffing on the Flowery Land, and that natives were flocking from all parts to have a ride on the mysterious flying coach, the indignation of the Peking Government passed all bounds. Efforts were made to move the British press on the subject, and a Chinaman having been killed on the line, it was suspected that he had been induced by the payment of a sum of money to his family to forfeit his life for the purpose of involving the company. Human life is, it must be remembered, sometimes a marketable commodity in China. At all events the British engine-driver was indicted for manslaughter, and at last things became so bad that the British company consented, on the payment of a heavy indemnity, to give the line over to the Chinese Government. The latter no sooner assumed possession than they tore it up and carted away all the material. It now lies crumbling to decay in the forests of Formosa, and the track is only frequented by wheelbarrows and pedestrians. Such is the history of the first and only passenger line of rail that has yet existed in China.

The Chinese are by no means blind to the advantages of railways, but they see many obstacles to their introduction at present. Foreign engineers and foreign capital would be required for the purpose, and they prefer to wait until they are in a position to command the men and money themselves.

The water communication is excellent in most parts of the Empire, and the sudden introduction of railways would, they imagine, throw a vast number of people out of employment, and cause an economic shock which might lead to a general rebellion—a comparatively frequent occurrence in China.

There are silent influences at work which impel China onward in the path of progress, and foremost amongst these in the future will be the teaching of the native press. As in most other things, China is a standing anomaly in the matter of newspapers. She can boast of having the oldest paper in the world, and altogether she has only three at the present day—the *Peking Gazette*, which was first issued nearly eight hundred years ago, and two papers published at Shanghai, both of which are of very recent origin. The *Peking Gazette*, as it is called in Europe, can scarcely be considered a newspaper in our modern sense of the term. Like the *London Gazette*, it is purely an official publication, containing little but imperial decrees and memorials from the high provincial authorities on State affairs. It is the source from which we get our most reliable knowledge of the working

of the national machinery, of the financial condition of the country, of the movements of officials, and of the whole government of China. As all the documents it contains have been presented to the Emperor, its phraseology is extremely stilted and formal. The first two or three pages generally open with Court announcements and Imperial decrees which are couched in a very commanding and majestic tone, for the Emperor does not spare his abuse in dealing with his servants. The highest Viceroy in the Empire may rise one morning and find that his imperial master has decreed his removal from office, or some obscure country girl may learn with surprise and pleasure that imperial honours have been showered upon her for having tended her aged parents during a long illness. Her name will be handed down among the brilliant examples of filial devotion, and no young lady in this country could be prouder of her university degrees than her Chinese sister is of this mark of imperial favour. In times of national calamity the Emperor often issues a special decree, dwelling upon his own shortcomings and the great crime he has committed in failing to secure the favour of Heaven for his suffering people. Despotic as the Chinese Government is, the right of freedom of speech is well recognised, and there is a class of officers stationed at Peking whose special duty it is to keep watch over the doings of the Emperor and all his Court, and their representations seldom go unheeded. Foreign affairs rarely find any mention in the *Gazette*, and all secret documents are carefully excluded from its pages. Of late, however, the *Gazette* has been less reticent than usual, and during the recent crisis with France the Emperor frequently used it as a medium for letting the French know his opinion of them as a nation. When Mr. Margary was murdered in 1875, the British Government made it a condition of the settlement of the case that the apology tendered to the Queen of Great Britain should be inserted in the *Gazette*; and no more effectual means could have been taken of informing the Chinese people of the humiliating position their Government had been obliged to assume.

About ten years ago an enterprising Englishman in Shanghai started a newspaper with the object of educating the Chinese on European matters. The experiment proved a decided success, and has now become a very valuable property. This paper has its correspondents and agents in most of the principal cities of the Empire, and for variety of information and curious details respecting the life of the people it is a mine of wealth to the foreign student. Its publication is, however, a thorn in the side of the official classes, for it often contains disclosures of a nature little complimentary to them. The Empress is said to peruse its columns daily, and to learn therefrom a deal about the conduct of her servants in the provinces. No other publication has done so much to stir up the inert mass of Chinese indifference. The *Shên-pao* and the *Hu-pao*, another native

paper recently established under still more favourable auspices, stand alone as the pioneers of journalism in a country whose population numbers nearly a third of the human race!

It is now perhaps time to glance at the social life of the people, and here our knowledge is necessarily very scanty. The separation of the sexes is rigidly maintained in China, and no Chinese gentleman would ever dream of introducing his wife or daughters to his most intimate male friend. That would be a shocking breach of etiquette which no respectable family would tolerate. When the last Chinese Minister to the Court of St. James, H. E. Kuo Sung-t'ao, returned to his native country, it was made a serious charge against him that, while in Europe, he had allowed himself to be photographed, and had encouraged his wife to move in the society of barbarian lands. Every house in China has a special wing called the inner hall, which is exclusively appropriated by the ladies. Here they spend their days in such occupations as become their sex, and nothing more shocks a Chinaman's sense of propriety than to see a foreign lady dancing a quadrille, mounting a horse, riding a tricycle, pulling an oar, or even playing an innocent game of tennis. Europeans, with their deference to the weaker sex, seem to them to be the slaves of their women. Despite the drawbacks attending their sex, Chinese women occasionally display remarkable ability, and some of the most accomplished minds the country has produced were among the female sex. At the present moment the destinies of the Empire are guided by the Empress Dowager, and few women have shown greater skill in statecraft. As a rule, however, girls are supposed to make better wives without any training, except in needlework and housekeeping.

Marriage is a very important element in Chinese family life, and is arranged in a manner which would scarcely satisfy European notions. Lovers' sighs, hidden interviews, and all the other preliminaries which go to swell the romance of courtship in more civilised lands, are quite unknown in China. A very prosaic arrangement takes their place. In every village and town there is a class of women, generally widows, who act as intermediaries in these delicate questions. A girl generally gets married about seventeen, a man about twenty. A father, for instance, has a son whom he wants to see settled in life; he looks around among his acquaintances, and comes to the conclusion that So-and-so's daughter would form an eligible partner. Etiquette forbids him broaching the question directly to the girl's parents, and so he employs one of these lady intermediaries to undertake the task. She is furnished with full particulars in writing of the boy's antecedents and prospects, and, armed with these, she goes to the young lady's parents, and presses the suit with all the persuasion that long practice in such matters confers. If successful, the parents meet and arrange the details, and the parties most interested in the whole affair generally see each other for the first time on the wedding-day, to live,

it is to be hoped, happily ever after. Often the first proposal comes from the girl's family, and in that case a direct refusal is never given. A previous engagement is always pleaded, and regret expressed that such a fine offer cannot be accepted. Marriages are most expensive ceremonies in China, and it often takes a man a long while to clear off the debts he has contracted on this festive occasion. I have known men who were earning about 2*l.* a month spending as much as 40*l.* or 50*l.* over the affair.

The Chinese have a firm belief in marriages being made in heaven. A certain deity, whom they call 'the Old Man of the Moon,' links with a silken cord, they say, all predestined couples. Early marriage is earnestly inculcated, and one of their maxims states that there are three cardinal sins, and that to die without offspring is the chief. As in other countries, spring is the time when young people's minds turn to thoughts of love, and most marriages are celebrated in February when the peach-tree blossoms appear. Among the marriage presents are live geese, which are supposed to be emblematical of the concord and happiness of the married state. A Chinaman may divorce his wife for seven different reasons, and in the list are ill-temper and a talkative disposition. The birth of a son is the occasion of much rejoicing, for without sons a man lives without honour and dies unhappy, with no one to worship at his grave and none to continue the family line. The boy is lessoned in good behaviour from his earliest years, and commences to read at the age of four or five. The Chinese language is by far the most difficult in the world, and even Chinese boys make but slow progress in its acquisition. All the sacred books composed by Confucius, Mencius, and other sages of the past, have to be committed to memory, and commentaries without end have to be waded through, analysed, and carefully digested. After days and nights of weary study a Chinese youth is fortunate if he gets his first degree at the age of twenty. This gives him only an honorary title, and if he aspires to a more substantial rank, he must compete again at the provincial capital against some thousands of his fellow provincials. When he gets through this, as he seldom does until after four or five trials, another and still more severe ordeal awaits him. He works hard for three years more, and goes to Peking to pit himself against all the rising talent of the Empire. There some ten thousand of the ablest students from all parts of the country are closeted in separate cells in an immense hall for nine days, during which they undergo all the agony attending the severest examination in the world. The list of successful candidates appears a few days later, and some three hundred out of the large number who have entered find themselves the fortunate possessors of a degree which at once opens up to them the path of official distinction. The first on the list is a far greater celebrity in his own country than a senior wrangler of Cambridge is with us, and if he is not a mere bookworm, he is pretty

certain to rise in the course of years to be the ruler of millions of his fellow-subjects. There is no limit of age for the examination, and instances have occurred where the grandfather, father, and son were all candidates at the same time. At nearly every one of these examinations one or more deaths occur amongst the candidates, and so strict are the regulations against unfair practices that the dead body is lowered by a rope from the wall of the building to prevent any ingress or egress. A few years ago one of the examiners went mad during the holding of the examination, and rather upset things generally.

The Chinese attach the greatest importance to ceremonial observances, and the impetuous European whose duties bring him frequently into contact with them finds it often rather irksome to go through a good quarter of an hour's bowing and scraping before proceeding to discuss business. If your visitor be an official whom you are meeting for the first time, and of whom you may have heard little or nothing before, Chinese politeness requires you to open the conversation by assuring him that his great reputation has reached your ears, and that you have been long yearning to see him. He returns the compliment by observing that your younger brother deems himself highly honoured by being admitted within your stately mansion, and expresses delight at the prospect of being a recipient of your instruction. You then ask his honourable surname, to which he replies that the debased one is called Chang. How many young gentlemen his family contains may elicit the rejoinder that he has seven young brats at home; and so the conversation continues until the stock of terms is exhausted. If the interview is an official one, a table has been laid containing a certain number of dishes according to the rank of the guest. After a little while tea is brought in, and on receiving your cup you rise, walk round to your guest, and, raising it up in both hands, present it to him in as respectful a manner as possible. He repeats the same ceremony to you with the cup which has been handed to him, but your position as host makes it incumbent upon you to offer a show of opposition to such a proceeding on his part. A favourite exclamation on such an occasion is: 'Do you really, my dear sir, consider yourself a stranger, that you treat me thus in my own house?'

After these preliminaries, business commences, and then the real word-fencing is called into play. The business may be of the simplest nature, still it cannot be transacted without a great deal of finessing. Let us take as a common instance the following:—The Chinese *employé* of a British firm has absconded with a lot of dollars, and you go to demand his arrest. The man's name is Chang, and he belongs to the district of Lo. There are in all probability half-a-dozen places in the district called Lo, and after a careful scrutiny, in which the Chinese official gives little help, you find the identical one to which the guilty Chang belonged. The difficulty does not end

here, for you will find that there are at least a dozen Changs in the place, all of whom, according to their own account, have led highly respectable lives from their youth upwards. If you persevere still further, you may find at last the real and veritable Chang, but not the dollars, for these have been spent in bribing the officials to screen him so long from punishment.

Prince Bismarck complained not long ago of the way our Foreign Office inundated him with despatches, but even the writing powers of Downing Street would not be a patch upon those of Chinese statesmen. A masterly policy of inaction is there studied to perfection, and it is rare that any case is settled until reams of paper have been covered in threshing out every detail. A Chinese despatch must be written in a certain stereotyped form, and in acknowledging a despatch you must first begin by quoting *in extenso* all the documents to which you are replying. This system of reproducing all the previous correspondence proves very cumbersome as the case gradually develops. Like a lady's letter, however, the pith of a Chinese communication generally lies in the postscript, and a practised hand will grasp the meaning at a glance. The viceroy of a Chinese province peruses some hundreds of these documents every day, and attaches a minute to each in a business-like style which is not excelled by our best organised departments at home.

In social life Chinese officials are pleasant companions, and are often only too glad to make their escape from work and have a chat with a foreigner who takes an interest in their country. No official is allowed to be seen walking on foot within his own jurisdiction, and as their only mode of locomotion is by covered sedan-chairs, their range of vision is somewhat limited. Often they learn little things from the foreigner which would never have reached their ears in the manipulated reports of their subordinates. They are generally deeply read in the history and literature of their own country; and when it is stated that China has been a country of book-making for thousands of years, and that the art of printing was introduced there several centuries before it was known in Europe, it can easily be imagined that Chinese literature is far more bulky than that of any other nation. As an instance of the size of a single book, I may mention that, when leaving Peking some years ago, I brought down an encyclopædia, which formed a cargo for two moderately sized boats, as far as Tientsin, whence it was shipped to the British Museum. The Chinaman makes a laudable effort to meet the foreigner halfway. As a rule, he knows no European language, but he makes up for the defect by evincing the deepest interest in the student of his own tongue. If you are reading a Chinese work and have stumbled upon a disputed passage, you have only to mention your difficulty to an educated native, and he will take no end of trouble to assist you. When you quote the passage, his eye brightens and a smile passes

over his whole countenance to find that an outer barbarian is dipping into his own favourite studies. He not only throws light upon the difficulty under review, but treats you to a long disquisition, quoting passage after passage in a way that makes one surprised at the tenacity of the human memory.

No notice of China would be considered complete in this country did it not contain some reference to opium, pig-tails, and small feet. At home mention of China seems always to suggest visions of opium, and the very vastness of opium literature has given rise to rather confused opinions on the subject. Several eminent medical authorities both in India and China maintain that the use of opium is a comparatively harmless enjoyment, while others, whose opinions deserve equal respect, hold that it is the cause of untold evil to the Chinese. As usual in such cases, the truth probably lies between the two extremes. In China I have visited scores of opium shops, have seen hundreds of smokers in all stages of intoxication, and observation has convinced me that physically they are an inferior class. The sunken eye, haggard look, and lack-lustre expression of countenance too often clearly mark the habitual smoker; still, withal, he is certainly no worse than the dram-drinker in this country, and it may be as well to commence at home and put our own house in order before trying to reform that of our Chinese friend at a distance. It must be remembered that, opium apart, the Chinese are eminently a sober race, and few are the people who have no indulgence. Whatever may have been the case in the past, the British Government can now no longer be charged with forcing its Indian opium on the Chinese. The Chinese Government receives a very handsome revenue from the import of the article, which it has frequently shown a desire to retain and increase as far as possible. The amount of opium grown in China equals, if it does not exceed, the total imported from India, and were the trade stopped to-morrow, the only result would be an immense increase in the cultivation of the poppy in China. The Chinese Government, fully appreciating the importance of establishing a good reputation in the West, does not object to pose as a martyr in the matter of opium before the British public, and this explains the contributions which its officers occasionally send to the Anti-Opium Society's publications. There are, it must be admitted, a few statesmen in China, like H. E. Chang Chih-tung, who are earnestly anxious to put a stop to the consumption of opium of every kind, but their action has no more influence on the policy of the Government than has that of the advocates of total abstinence in the direction of affairs in England. The practice of opium-smoking is undoubtedly increasing. Chinese will tell you that twenty years ago no respectable person would be seen smoking; now every fashionable young fellow prides himself on his pipe, and no social meeting would pass off well without it. High and low, nearly all take a whiff of the seductive

drug. Some members of the imperial family are said to be hard smokers, many of the royal princes smoke, the majority of officials do the same, and working men squander a good deal of their hard earnings in the opium shop.

Of small feet and pigtails it is not necessary to say much. Both are considered ornaments in their way, and a nation whose sons wear bell-toppers, and whose daughters go in for a variety of distortions, must be chary of criticising other people's peculiarities. Pigtails, it may not generally be known, are not in their origin Chinese. When the present rulers of China, who are Manchus, seized upon the Empire over two centuries ago, they issued an edict commanding all Chinese to shave their heads and grow a tail like themselves. There was a good deal of trouble at first in enforcing such an order, but the Chinese have long ago forgotten that the appendage of which they are now so proud is a badge of conquest. It would be hard to find anywhere a more submissive subject or a more thoroughly good-natured being than the Chinese peasant. His hard struggle for existence scarcely leaves him time to grumble with his lot. No mechanical inventions have yet relieved him from the burden of toil. His rice-fields have to be irrigated by the old-fashioned water-wheel, the fields themselves are ploughed by a primitive wooden plough which he carries home on his shoulder when his day's work is over, and his crop is reaped with the rudest of sickles, and brought to the stackyard on wheelbarrows. Night and morning he worships the tablets of his ancestors, and twice in the year—once in spring and once in autumn—he repairs to the graves of his family, and communes in spirit with the forefathers of his race. His knowledge of the world extends only to the next market town. No newspaper brings him intelligence from other lands, and to him China is the first and only nation in existence. All other countries are subordinate to the Emperor of China, and all the princes of the earth owe allegiance to the Court of Peking. Tell an ordinary countryman in the North that there are nations in Europe independent of China, and he smiles at your thinking him so innocent as to believe such a story. Peking itself still remains the head-quarters of Celestial ignorance and prejudice. Nearly every state in Europe has its representative there, and in the streets you meet jolly, broad-faced, grinning Mongolians from the bleak North, stately yellow-robed Lamas from Thibet, the puny white-clad Corean from his forbidden land in the East, Anamese and Siamese from the South, and Nepaulese from the confines of our Indian Empire. The spectacle presented by such a motley variety of all nationalities only confirms the ordinary native in the belief that they have, one and all, come to pay their respects and offer their tribute to the 'Lord of all under heaven.' In Southern China knowledge is a little more widely diffused, for émigration has there introduced a slight leavening of foreign influence. Still, its effect has

been minimised as much as possible, and the natural prejudices of the people too often assert themselves on their return to the Flowery Land. The Cantonese go in large numbers to America and Australia; while abroad they dress as foreigners, but once they set foot again on their native soil the foreign dress is discarded, and the returned exile, with his loose trousers and flowing garments, meets his friends with as much ease and grace as if his limbs had never been encased in the tight-fitting barbarian costume. No length of residence abroad ever naturalises a Chinaman. High and low, rich and poor, they all long to get back to China and have their bones mixed with those of their ancestors. About two years ago I came across a Chinaman who had left his native village when a boy of ten, and had returned a wealthy man after thirty years' residence in Boston, having almost entirely forgotten his native dialect. At first he despised his native surroundings and boasted of American freedom, but after a few months he settled down to the life of his neighbours, took great pains to cultivate a pigtail, married, Christian though he was, a couple of wives, and became a model citizen of the Celestial Empire. *Ex uno discite omnes.*

J. N. JORDAN.

TAINE · A LITERARY PORTRAIT.

I.

TAINE'S real name is Hippolyte Adolphe Taine, but he is usually called 'Henri Taine,' which he himself, in a letter to me, attributes to a whim of the Editor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. He was born on the 21st of April, 1828, at Vouziers, a small town between Champagne and the Ardennes. His family may be counted among the intellectual aristocracy of France; all were well educated and also in fairly prosperous circumstances, though not exactly rich. Some were members of the Chamber of Deputies; his grandfather was Sous-préfet. His father, a very learned man, taught Hippolyte Latin; an uncle, who had resided for a long time in America, made him familiar with the English language. All that was English fascinated him from an early period; even as a boy he found delight in reading books in the language of Shakespeare. While French novels were forbidden fruit to the young people, foreign literature was thrown open to them without any restrictions, and their elders rejoiced when a youth showed a disposition to acquaint himself in this way with the languages of other countries. Our hero devoted himself to the study of English classics, and thus at an early age laid the foundation of the accurate knowledge of English literature to which he afterwards owed a large amount of his celebrity.

The promising boy was only thirteen when he lost his father. A year later his mother brought him to Paris, where she at first placed him as boarder in an excellent private school. Not long after he entered the Collège de Bourbon (now Lycée de Condorcet), where he distinguished himself above all his schoolfellows by ripeness of intelligence, by industry and success. At the same time he was the constant object of tender care and unremitting watchfulness on the part of his admirable mother, a woman of warm affections, who did all in her power to bestow a thorough education on her children. In the year 1847 he obtained the first prize for a Latin essay on rhetoric, in 1848 two prizes for philosophical treatises. These achievements threw open to him the doors of the so-called Normal School, a kind of seminary in which the pupils were trained for professional chairs in the universities. This higher preparatory course of study is, how-

ever, utilised by many only as a stepping-stone to a literary career. Many celebrated writers were Taine's colleagues at the Normal School; Edmond About, Prévost-Paradol, J. J. Weiss, Francisque Sarcey—these all were professors only for a short time, and soon embraced definitely the career of literature and journalism.

At the Normal School,¹ which Taine attended for three years, the soundness of his judgment and solidity of his intelligence met with universal recognition. His companions bowed before his superiority, did not venture to address him otherwise than as 'Monsieur Taine,' and called him in as umpire in their quarrels. He had the wonderful gift of being able to study more in a week than others in a month. As the pupils were free to read what they pleased, he devoted the leisure obtained by his rapid work to the study of philosophy, theology, and the Fathers. He went through all the more valuable authors on these topics, and discussed with his colleagues the questions which arose out of them. It was one of his enjoyments to test them, to ascertain their ideas and to penetrate into their minds. The method of instruction pursued in the college was admirably calculated to stimulate the intellectual activity of the students. Ample nourishment was provided for the mental energies of the ardent youths. The debates were carried on with the greatest freedom, every question was submitted to the touchstone of reason, and worked out according to the requirements of logic. Day by day the most varied opinions, political, æsthetic, and philosophical, came into collision in these youthful circles, without any restrictions imposed by the liberal professors, among whom were such men as Jules Simon and Vacherot. On the contrary, they encouraged the utmost freedom of expression in the enunciation of individual views. Their own system of teaching was not so much in the form of lectures as of discussions with the students, who themselves had to deliver orations, followed by a general debate, at the close of which the professors gave a *résumé* of all that had been said. Thus Taine had once to read a paper on Bossuet's mysticism, About one on his politics. Due attention was also given to physical exercise; there were frequent open-air excursions and occasional dances in the evening in the domestic circle, one of the students acting as musician. It is needless to say that under such circumstances as these the years spent in the Ecole Normale sped on pleasantly and profitably. The advantages of the intellectual gymnastics as practised there were enormous, and far outweighed the slight drawbacks, such as a tendency to hyperbole observable in the *élite* of those who issued from that fertile, effervescent, genuinely French mode of education. But none of the pupils of the Normal School did it so much honour as Taine, who had the good fortune to be there at precisely the right time, for

¹ For the description of the then life at this school I am principally indebted to Mr W. Fraser Rae's biographical sketch of Taine.

after his departure in the year 1851 the establishment suffered an organic transformation in the opposite direction. The collegians had imbibed so strong a feeling of intellectual independence that it was not to be wondered at if they were little inclined to bear the yoke of spiritual oppression. Unfortunately, the times upon which they had fallen were not propitious to freedom of thought, for the 'uncle's nephew' was at the helm. The third Napoleon had attained the goal by the aid of the clergy, and was bound to give them the promised reward. The 'strong hand' of the Buonapartist government did its utmost to chicane those whose ideas were not acceptable in high places. Anyone who, when put to a certain test, was ready to sign a political and religious confession of faith consonant with the views of the reigning powers, obtained an easy and lucrative post. Taine was rejected, because it was found that his philosophic theories indicated 'erroneous' and 'mischievous' tendencies. But Guizot and Saint-Marc Girardin, who took a warm interest in the talented young man, engaged themselves on his side, and endeavoured to procure at least a modest post for him. They succeeded; but, to show how reluctantly the wishes of even such advocates were granted, Taine's petition that he might be sent to the north for his mother's sake was disregarded, and he was sent to the south, to Toulon.

Only four months afterwards he was transferred to Nevers, where again he was only allowed to remain four months; then he was removed to Poitiers. His salary was exceedingly small, but by strict economy he contrived to make it suffice. He devoted his leisure hours to the pursuit of his philosophical studies; he had a special preference for Hegel. The authorities kept an eye upon him as a 'suspect'; from time to time calumnies were not spared him. Great offence arose out of the fact of his declining to follow the suggestion of the chaplain, that he should write a Latin ode or a French dithyramb in honour of the bishop. This disrespectful refusal was regarded as a confirmation of the charges which had been raised against the objectionable professor, and drew upon him the censure of the Minister of Public Instruction, who threatened him with summary dismissal if such an act of insubordination should occur again. He began to feel uneasy, and when, some months after, he received a decree from the Government appointing him master of a primary school at Besançon, he took this unmistakable hint to heart, and accepted it as a sign that it was time to give up a struggle in which he always came off second best. Was it worth while for the State to bring up young giants, and afterwards set them to collect firewood instead of felling oaks? Taine was relieved of this post by his own request, threw off the yoke of State education, and made his way to Paris. It was no bad exchange, for he at once obtained an advantageous professorship in a superior private school. But the persecutions of the Government were unremitting; he was obliged to

give up his situation, and had a hard struggle to earn his daily bread. In order to be able to wield his pen independently of the tyranny of public authorities, the much-tormented man betook himself to giving lessons in private families. At the same time he threw himself eagerly into new studies, chiefly of a mathematical, medical, and philosophical character. He frequented the lectures at the Sorbonne, the *École de Médecine*, and the Natural History Museum. But his special predilection was for modern languages, a considerable number of which he learned.

At Nevers he had occupied himself very much with a new method of psychological criticism, which he steadily followed out in Paris. His literary and biographical essays in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, the *Journal des Débats*, and the *Revue de l'Instruction Publique* created attention by the novel theories upon which they were founded. In the year 1853 our author took his degree as Docteur ès lettres, on which occasion, in addition to the ordinary Latin doctoral dissertation (*De personis Platoniciis*), he wrote a French treatise on Lafontaine's *Fables*, the diametrical opposite to a regulation academic thesis. He worked it up afterwards with due attention to the hints of criticism, and published it as a book with the title *Lafontaine and his Fables*, in which form it has already passed through nine editions. This literary outburst of the young doctor created much stir, and no wonder, for the public before whom Taine presented himself were utterly unaccustomed to such originality of treatment, such fecundity of expression, so rich a flow of ideas, such individuality of views, such elegance of style, such thoroughness and versatility of information. 'It was,' says Karl Hillebrand, 'a philosophico-historical carnival after weeks long of fasting;' the whole reading world threw itself upon it with avidity.

In this essay on the great fabulist, Taine started new canons of criticism, set up a bold paradox, and illustrated it from the life and works of Lafontaine. He submits to an exhaustive analysis the causes which co-operated to make him a poet, as well as the method by which he constructed his fables and the aims which he pursued in them. Lafontaine's native place and the peculiarities of its inhabitants are described. Then it is demonstrated that Lafontaine in his own person combined the most prominent characteristics of this race, and that these characteristics were intensified in him by the climate, the quality of the soil, and the scenery of Champagne. From all these constituents he supposes him to have derived the light and unfettered versification which he employs so skilfully in his fables. To the same causes he attributes the failure of Lafontaine's attempts to imitate the ancient poets. As he possessed, together with these qualifications, an intimate acquaintance with the necessities of his age and his country, he could not fail to become a really popular national poet. Taine analyses every innermost recess

of Lafontaine's brain, every feature in his poetry; Lafontaine himself would have been amazed, could he have read the book, to find himself credited with aims and purposes of which he in reality had not the faintest conception when he wrote his fables, to hear himself proclaimed to be the representative and mirror of his time, to discover, finally, that he owed his achievements, not to his own genius and abilities, but to the united co-operation of all the conditions and circumstances in the midst of which he lived.

That every human being is born with certain tendencies peculiar to his race, which guide his thoughts and actions; that all his ideas and his deeds, whether good or evil, are to be traced to these innate tendencies, as a river to its sources,—these are the views which Taine, since his Lafontaine *début*, has ever and everywhere asserted, maintained, and, according to his own conviction, established.

Established! yes, that is the crucial point. As a rule it is admitted that the critic can do no more than express his own opinion. He fulfils his duty when he carefully studies his subject and deals with it dispassionately and as impartially as possible. More is not, and cannot be, demanded from him. Every critic judges according to his circumstances, his experiences, his degree of culture, his fancy, his prejudices, expectations, and sympathies; hence each single criticism remains in every respect an expression of individual opinion. If a criticism commends itself to a majority of men as true and just, it is adopted; but it is not *necessarily* competent to establish the real worth or worthlessness of the subject under discussion. Quite different are Taine's views of criticism. He deems it possible to bring *certainty* into criticism; he insists upon endowing criticism, like physics and mathematics, with the fixedness of scientific formulæ, hedging it round with irrefragable dogmas. His point of view is that criticism must no longer be unreliable, its results no longer fluctuating. At the age of five-and-twenty he springs, a modern Pallas, into literature, ready armed at all points with a critical system, a philosophy, and last, not least, a style of his own. All that he has more minutely developed in the course of several decades is already to be found in his maiden work on Lafontaine. The novelty of the theories, as well as the fresh, forcible, vivacious style of the young doctor won him many friends among the public. 'Nothing venture, nothing have.'

It was not long before another opportunity offered of making his voice heard and applying his theories afresh. In the year 1854 the French Academy offered a prize for the best essay on Livy. The life of the historian was to be related, the circumstances under which he wrote, and the principles according to which he planned his history, were to be discussed, and his place in the ranks of historians was to be determined. None of the essays sent in was considered worthy of the prize, but Taine's was pronounced the best;

only the stricture was added, that it betrayed 'a deficiency in seriousness and in admiration for the brilliant name and the genius of the distinguished man whom he had to criticise.' Taine re-wrote his paper, sent it in again, and this time obtained the prize. Villemain, as spokesman of the Committee of Adjudicators, commended the work in the highest terms, though he was not in harmony with the contents, and said: 'We feel bound to congratulate the author on this creditable *début* on the territory of classical learning, and only wish that we may find similar competitors for all our other offers of prizes, and that we may have such teachers in our schools;' a sarcastic allusion which drew a gentle smile from the dignified Immortals.

The happy author published his prize essay under the title of *Essai sur Tite-Live*, with a preface which was an unpleasant surprise to some of the members of the Academy, and made them wish it were possible to retract their eulogiums and distinctions. In it Taine pushed farther the consequences of his new theories. He maintained with Spinoza that the relation of man to nature is not that of an *imperium in imperio*, but that of a part to the whole; that the mind of man is, like the outer world, subject to laws; that a dominant principle regulates the thoughts and urges on the human machine irresistibly and inevitably. In a word, our author regards man as a 'walking theorem.' Naturally he was charged with denying freedom of will and being a fatalist. His opponents also, and not unreasonably, pointed out the necessary irreconcilability of the ideas represented by two such different names as Livy and Spinoza, and showed how paradoxical it was to cite the writings of the Roman historian in support of the philosophical speculations of the Dutch Jew. But paradox is Taine's element. As to the book itself, it was received with universal applause. The reading public sympathised as little with the author's speculations concerning the historian as with those on Lafontaine, but they appreciated the undeniable merits of both works. Taine contends that the birthplace and mode of life of Livy, the time in which he lived, the events of which he was witness, the direction of his taste and of his studies—that all these co-operated to make him an 'oratorical historian.' The want of method in the arrangement of his great work, the sentiments expressed in it, the prevailing tone and style, the frequency of the speeches occurring in it—all these things are adduced by Taine in support of his hypothesis, and he goes so far as to assert this to be incontestable certainty. Now everyone will allow that the 'surrounding circumstances,' which Taine makes the foundation of his deductions respecting Lafontaine, Livy, and others—time, place, conditions of life, &c.—are valuable and weighty factors in forming a decision about individuals and peoples; but nobody can allow them to constitute infallible certainty in questions of criticism, least of all when we are discussing persons and races long gone by, and whose 'surrounding circumstances' we have not before our eyes, but are obliged

to *construct* in a great measure; such a necessarily inductive criticism must ever remain hypothetical. It does not follow that it must be erroneous; it may quite ~~and~~ possibly be correct; but Taine's conclusions with regard to Livy are not only hypothetical and fallible, but actually false. His argument is that Livy was rather a great orator than a great historian. He holds him not to be a good historian because he wields the pen as an orator; he calls him an 'oratorical historian,' and attributes the beauties as well as the defects of his historical style to the preponderantly rhetorical character of his mind. The principle on which he bases this estimate of Livy is evidently erroneous, for Montesquieu, Macaulay, Gibbon, and others were no contemptible historians, notwithstanding their very eminent oratorical power. The same method by which Taine stamps Livy as an 'oratorical' historian might lead to the conclusion, equally hypothetical, that Livy was capable of writing the *History of Rome* only because he was endowed with the genius of a painter or poet. The logical premisses which Taine holds to be unassailable are by no means so. He tries to prove too much, and in his impatience to reach his conclusion, overlooks many things which make against his point of view. The fact that Livy—in contradistinction to the philosophical Thucydides and the practical Tacitus—neglects the grouping of incidents, the consultation of original authorities, and places characteristic expressions in the mouths of his personages, proves, not that he was an 'oratorical' historian, but that he was a careless writer. Facts are in direct opposition to Taine's hypothesis; he has only *maintained*, but not *proved*, that the absence of philosophical generalisations and of diligent research is the characteristic of an orator, and that therefore Livy deserves to be called an 'oratorical historian.' Many great orators, as we have said, have been admirable historians, and have exhibited remarkable powers of research. Taine seems to demand from Livy what is simply an impossibility: faultless, absolutely perfect writing of history.

Much more might be alleged against the propositions maintained in the *Essai sur Tite-Live*; suffice it to emphasise once more that the effort to constitute criticism an exact science has been as unsuccessful here as in the book on Lafontaine. In spite of diligent and careful application of the demonstrative method, criticism remains fallible and individual. By the repetition of 'because' and 'therefore' a case may be made clearer and less unreliable, but that is not equivalent to proof. As a result of Taine's process we have only a series of paradoxes and generalisations, which, indeed, are always most ingeniously carried out, testify to earnestness and ardent pursuit of truth, and are worthy of the highest recognition, but unfortunately are not always infallible. While this clever mode of generalisation in Taine's hands served to enhance the poetic inspiration of Lafontaine, it served also to depreciate the historical endowment of Livy.

II.

Shortly after the publication of the *Essai sur Tite-Live* an obstinate affection of the throat compelled our author to seek the healing influence of the Pyrenean baths. The course of treatment extended through two years. For a short time he even lost his voice. During this journey in search of health his favourite study was Spencer's *Faerie Queene*, which perhaps no other Frenchman had at that time read. This explains the high praise which Taine bestowed on the great Elizabethan poet at a later period in his *History of English Literature*. The life among the mountains furnished the invalid with material for fresh literary work. The result was a book entitled *Voyage aux Pyrénées*, which was afterwards enriched with admirable illustrations by Gustave Doré. To judge by the number of editions, this would seem to be the most popular of all Taine's works. In this he avails himself freely of the opportunity of employing his critical method in a new sphere: the art of travelling. His colleague, Edmond About, has also written valuable books of travel, but the author of *A B C du Travailleux* regards things from an entirely different point of view. He directs his attention rather to administrative questions, organisations, taxation, lighting, pavement, in short all that concerns modern civilisation. Taine, on the other hand, dwells more on the intellectual and artistic side of things; he surveys all with the eye of the learned critic; he compares the present with the past, and loves beautiful picturesque scenery. Lest he may become dry and stray too far from the subject in hand, he adopts the plan, instead of clothing his views in the didactic garb, of introducing persons who are to give expression to them, and others to advance opposite opinions. As we should naturally expect, right is always on the side of the author. 'Monsieur Paul' is always right; hence Monsieur Paul evidently represents Monsieur Taine. This being so, the following portraiture of Paul may be taken for an autograph description—intentional or otherwise—of the author himself:—

A daring traveller, an eccentric lover of painting, who believes in nobody but himself. A *raisonneur* much addicted to paradoxes with extreme opinions. His brain is always in a state of effervescence with some new idea which pursues him. He seeks truth in season and out of season. In spirit he is usually about a hundred miles in advance of other people. He enjoys being contradicted, but still more enjoys the pleasure of contradicting. Occasionally his pugnacious temperament leads him astray. In his egotism he regards the world as a puppet-show, in which he is the only spectator.

The book now under consideration showed Taine in a new light: as a descriptive writer of the first order. Hitherto he had been known as an acute critic and an original philosopher; but now it was discovered that in him lay also a fanciful poet, a profound observer of men and manners, a genial and amusing *raconteur*, a close observer and interpreter of Nature. Books of travel may be

divided generally into two classes: the first pretentious, in which the author decides dogmatically upon all that comes across him, without possessing the necessary information and capabilities; these books overflow with stupidity, vanity, and shallowness. The second class are less pretentious, but equally valueless: the author contents himself with transcribing from his guide-books descriptions of what he has seen, with some slight modifications, and giving a tolerably accurate list of the hotels in which the best beds, the cheapest dinners, and the lowest fees are to be secured. The only travels worthy of notice are included in neither of these two classes; among these Taine's works on the Pyrenees and Italy take a foremost place. He looks not so much on the external aspect of things as on their inner, their psychology; he only occupies himself with the outward so far as is necessary to draw from it arguments for the demonstrations and ratiocinations which he applies to all that he sees and observes. If he describes a landscape—and he does it in the most effective and picturesque manner—he at the same time analyses its separate constituents, and makes it clear how and why their combination produces the impression of beauty. He seeks to explain why many things appear beautiful to us to-day which formerly passed for ugly, and *vice versa*. He inquires into the influence of civilisation on the inhabitants of a region, and the changes which take place in the course of time in the condition of these inhabitants, as well as in their physical and moral constitution. He traces all things up to their causes, and endeavours to investigate all, even the geological, botanical, and climatic conditions of the Pyrenees, but he dwells only so long upon them as to instruct the general reader without boring the initiated. He draws delicate pictures of the customs of the people and the tourist life. No doubt there may be errors and mis-statements in his travelling descriptions, as they are made subordinate to the illustration of his theories. But on the whole they are of considerable merit and the reverse of superficial.

His next publication was, *The French Philosophers of the Nineteenth Century* (1856), a witty, telling, acute analysis of 'official philosophy,' a positivist irruption into the reigning school of the Eclectics, an attack upon that rhetorical spiritualism which, in the eyes of the authorities, had the advantage of giving no umbrage to the clergy, in the eyes of thinkers the disadvantage of tripping airily over the difficulties which it undertook to clear up and do away with, or else of evading them altogether. Taine slays the tenets of five men with the sacrificial knife of ridicule on the altar of sound human reason. Here also he excels in treating a dry subject in an amusing manner. Thanks to his clearness and his *esprit* the public found itself surprised into taking interest in a scientific tournament. Why did Taine select Cousin, Laromiguière, Royer-Collard, Maine de Biran, and Jouffroy for his target? Apparently because he found

most to censure in them. However, we are far from being ready to endorse the whole contents of the book. Victor Cousin, the high priest of the Eclectics, is the most fiercely handled of all; Taine denounces him as a charlatan, and satirises him vigorously in five long chapters. This specimen of Taine's polemics excited great attention. Cousin's enemies applauded vehemently, and even his friends rejoiced secretly while they condemned openly. If we are to give credit to Mr. Fraser Rae, the distinguished man himself cherished henceforth a more than merely scientific antipathy to his young assailant; he could not forgive the former student of the Ecole Normale for this shock to his throne hitherto held sacred. At the close of the volume, which had originally appeared serially in the *Revue de l'Instruction Publique*, the writer gives a sketch of his own method of pursuing philosophic investigations; for this purpose he again adopts the form of a dialogue between 'Peter' and 'Paul.'

In 1858 Taine republished a collection of articles, which had formerly appeared in magazines, on Macaulay, Thackeray, Dickens (these three were afterwards incorporated in the *History of English Literature*), Fléchier, Guizot, Plato, Saint-Simon, Madame de Lafayette, Montalembert, and Michelet under the title of *Essais de critique et d'histoire*. His method is here the same as in his larger works. Seven years later he followed this up with a similar volume of *New Critical and Historical Essays*, in which the articles on Balzac, La Bruyère, Racine, Jefferson, and Marcus Aurelius are conspicuous for their merit. In the interval he had made his first journey to England, in order to become more closely acquainted with this country, for which he had always had a great predilection, and to pursue his studies of English literature in the reading-room of the British Museum. He met with the most hearty reception and enjoyed intercourse with the most eminent personages. During his somewhat protracted stay he contributed a series of letters to the *Paris Temps*, afterwards published in book form as *Notes sur l'Angleterre* (1861), and again with considerable revision in 1871 after his second visit (the eighth edition appeared in 1884); these are admirable pictures of the social, political, and domestic life of the English. Taine is very favourably disposed towards them without flattering them; he censures what appears to him deserving of censure, but never degenerates into incivility. This work, Mr. W. F. Rae's translation of which has obtained great popularity in England, would be his best book of travels had he not so often allowed himself to be misled by his inductive process into superficial and inaccurate conclusions. He methodically and with exaggerated acumen ascribes influences to 'surrounding circumstances,' which anyone acquainted with England, and unbiassed by foregone conclusions, sees to be purely imaginary. Numerous are the erroneous generalisations founded on superficial and imperfect comprehension of facts. We are sometimes reminded

of the traditional traveller who, finding a red-haired chambermaid at an inn in Alsace, recorded in his journal 'Alsatian women have all red hair,' or the other who saw some wandering gipsies making nails by the roadside, and drew the inference that the inhabitants of the country led a nomad life and subsisted by manufacturing *quincaillerie*. But such slips are too trifling to militate against the reputation of the author as an exceptional traveller, delicate observer, and master of descriptive style. He is the ideal of the 'intelligent foreigner.'

In the year 1863 Taine was appointed examiner in the German language and French literature at the Military Academy of St. Cyr; when he was removed from this post in 1865, the press raised so vigorous a protest that he was recalled a few days afterwards. In October 1864 he was made professor of æsthetics and the history of art at the 'Ecole des Beaux-Arts' in Paris. Here he found a rich field for his activity, as is proved by the works, *Philosophy of Art, The Ideal in Art, Philosophy of Art in Italy, Philosophy of Art in Greece, Philosophy of Art in the Netherlands*. He travelled through these countries in the Sixties. We recognise all through the learned, delicate, animated critic. Every sentence bears the stamp of originality and is full of suggestive meaning. Taine does not need to repeat what others have said before him, he thinks for himself. He never writes without a special purpose. He always says what he believes to be true, and not what people like to hear—and that means something in France. As in the above-named books he applies his consistently defended 'method' even in the domain of art, they were as vehemently attacked as his philosophico-historical works. Apart from numerous essays, there is a whole array of pamphlets and lesser books which are directed against Taine's critical method. On the other hand, it is held in high esteem in certain quarters, as, for example, in three issues of Sainte-Beuve's *Nouveaux Lundis*, in Emile Zola's paper *Taine as an Artist (Mes Haines)*, &c.

Now we arrive at a very remarkable and characteristic book. We are only half agreed with its contents; yet it is so charmingly written, so bright, fascinating, and flowing in its style, that in spite of all differences of opinion we felt impelled to translate it into German. We allude to Taine's chief work, the *History of English Literature*, the first three volumes of which appeared in 1863, while the fourth followed a year later, and under the title of *Contemporaries* contains monographs of Macaulay, Dickens, Carlyle, Mill, Thackeray, and Tennyson, in which he takes six of the greatest authors of the time as representative types of their different classes of literature, and in the most skilful manner uses them as illustrations of his subject. This history is the best which a foreigner has yet written on English Literature. In France also it created great excitement. The author tendered it to the Academy, which handed

it over to a committee appointed to decide upon the bestowal of a special prize of four thousand francs. Each member of this committee read the book, and each declared it to be worthy of the prize which had been founded 'for historical works which show talent.' Yet an unprecedented occurrence took place—this unanimous decision was thrown out by the full assembly of the Academy. The majority confessed indeed to not having read the work which was the object of contention, yet they left unheeded the representations of the spokesman—the aged Villemain, who himself had written so well about England. The Bishop of Orleans pronounced the book irreligious and immoral, because the author denied free will, preached fatalism, slighted the Fathers of the Church, and distinctly commended the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. In short, Monseigneur Dupanloup denounced Monsieur Taine as a heretic in religion and a sceptic in philosophy. Victor Cousin seized this favourable opportunity, on the one side to show that he was completely reconciled with the Church, on the other to avenge himself on his assailant. The learned assembly lent an ear to these two distinguished speakers; without proceeding to a closer examination, they denied the prize to Taine, although its founder had demanded simply talent and not the defence of particular views. A year before, they had refused to admit Littré into the ranks of the Forty. Since that time there has been a considerable change in the spirit and in the constituent members of the Academy. Littré and Alexandre Dumas took their seats in the halls of the Immortals, and a few years ago the gates of the palace on the Quai Conti were thrown open to Taine himself. As a drawback, however, he, who had ever exercised the full rights of free criticism with regard even to the highest intellects, was compelled by the rules of the Academy to pronounce, on this occasion, the panegyric of his somewhat mediocre predecessor, M. de Loménie.

Exceptions, numerous and justifiable, may be taken to the *History of English Literature*, but its importance can never be denied. The fact is, Taine builds up his system with such a loyal striving for accuracy, that it is impossible to refuse our attention to it, even though we may consider that the desired accuracy has not been attained. Emile Zola designates the *History of English Literature* 'a delicately and finely constructed valuable work of art.' Any reader who takes up the work with the expectation of finding a methodical *history* of literature will be disappointed, but not disagreeably so, for instead of a history he will be introduced to a series of portraits on a large scale. He will miss much which appertains to an actual history of literature; many an estimable work and many an author of eminence is barely named or even altogether omitted; hardly any regard is paid to chronology; all literature since Byron, with the exception of the six great portraits above mentioned, is passed over in silence, or only acknowledged by a stray mention of

isolated names; nor is there the slightest allusion to the periodical literature which plays so conspicuous a part in the modern life of England. With all these omissions, however, what remains is sufficient to bring clearly before our eyes the rich treasures to be found in the field of British authorship. The main reason, however, why this masterpiece of Taine's fails to deserve the title of *History of Literature* lies in the prominence which it gives to the treatment of the *psychology* of England. He uses literature only as a delicate, sensitive apparatus, with the aid of which he measures the gradations and variations of a civilisation, seizes all the characteristics, peculiarities, and *nuances* of the soul of a people. In short, he applies his 'method'—an ingenious conglomerate of the Hegel-Condillac-Taine inductive philosophy—to the literature of a nation as a whole, as he has hitherto applied it to individual men, to individual works, to art and to observations by the way. The book has met with universal appreciation, but even its admirers cannot overlook its faults. It would no doubt have been easier to disarm opposition, if Taine had given to the work a title more corresponding to its contents, such as 'Psychology of the History of English Culture illustrated by Portraits from Literature;' or, as a somewhat less long-winded title, 'Psychology of English Literature;' Sainte-Beuve suggested 'Histoire de la race et de la civilisation anglaises par la littérature.'

Here as elsewhere Taine shows himself to be an acute critic, and even his errors reveal the subtle thinker. But he is something besides that—he is also a true artist. He wields, indeed, not the brush, nor the chisel, nor a musical instrument, nor does he write verses or novels; his art is that of treating learned and scientific subjects attractively and beautifully, of raising them to a high level, especially in the *History of English Literature*. As a rule, those who have to deal with a dry theme, think they have done quite enough if they have expressed their ideas and views with perspicuity and in appropriate language, and how frequently they do not even succeed in that! The possibility of working up the material and arranging it so as to produce the greatest possible effect did not enter the mind of many writers before Taine. He understands better than most how to impart not only instruction but literary enjoyment at the same time. If only for this reason, his *English Literature*, as we have said, remains, in spite of all deficiencies, a remarkable and unique work.

After its completion Taine began to suffer the ill-effects of over-exertion, in the form of total intellectual paralysis. For a considerable time he was incapable of study, of writing, of concentrating his thoughts; even the reading of a newspaper was too much for him. It was not till after a long period of absolute rest from every kind of intellectual effort that he recovered permanently. He afterwards published *Jean Graindorge; or, Notes on Paris*, a very amusing and popular book satirising modern customs in the French capital;

Universal Suffrage, a little brochure; a French translation of the English work, *A Residence in France from 1792 till 1795*; *La Raison* (1870), two volumes in which he transfers his method to a purely philosophical domain. In 1868 Taine married a daughter of the rich merchant Denuelle; since that event he spends the summer and autumn of every year at his country seat at Menthon, in Savoy, the winter and spring in Paris. Just before the outbreak of the last Franco-German war he travelled through Germany, apparently with the intention of producing a work on that country, which, however, he did not do, perhaps in consequence of the hostile attitude towards everything German which his countrymen assumed after Sedan. He is a great admirer of German culture and literature, and has read a good deal of German; a large share of his intellectual tendencies are rooted in German soil. In France, as Paul Janet remarks, 'he generally passes for an interpreter of German ideas, especially as a follower of Hegel and Spinoza.' He himself has no objection to be called a Hegelian, though he stated some years ago, in a private letter to me, that he owed his ideas specially to Montesquieu and Condillac. Hillebrand classes him as nearly allied intellectually with Herder. In two points Taine bears a certain resemblance to Hegel; over-haste in drawing conclusions, and fearlessness in starting, combined with wit in maintaining, the most extravagant assertions.

III.

The latest and also the most considerable work of our author is *Les origines de la France contemporaine*. It certainly bristles with all Taine's peculiarities, but with this difference, which we gladly acknowledge, that in this case he applies his method with much greater caution and moderation than hitherto, and consequently stumbles into fewer hasty and illogical paradoxes and generalisations than on former occasions. This is a great advantage, and adds to the charm which we find in the book.

Taine is first and foremost a psychologist and historian of civilisation, or we may say a psychological historian of civilisation. He dissects English literature in order to lay open the essence of contemporary English society. He writes the social history of France with the object of deducing from it the essential character of contemporary France. The first section of the comprehensive work now before us issued from the press in the beginning of 1876. The first volume of the second section happened to appear shortly before the centenary of the death of the sponsors of the great Revolution—Voltaire and Rousseau—therefore immediately before the appearance of Renan's *Caliban* (1878), which is neither more nor less than a treatment of the same theme in the same sense, only in a dramatic, poetic form, instead of that of dry analysis. The second part of the second section appeared in 1882, the third in January 1885.

It may be said generally that in this work Taine allows himself to be guided chiefly by an accurate study of facts. He plods with incredible patience through archives and libraries, deeds, reports, correspondences, and memoirs. His work is strong, solid, and trustworthy, so far as the term is applicable in speaking of historical research, because it is eminently conscientious and founded on well-authenticated contemporary records. As soon as we open the first volume (*Pre-revolutionary France, or L'ancien régime*) we observe at the first glance what a difference lies between the manner in which Taine regards and handles these themes, and the way in which they have been treated by Carlyle, Thiers, Mignet, Louis Blanc, Michelet, and others. The most striking circumstance is that Taine has no political sympathies or antipathies whatever. Facts are more important to him than theories. Instead of attaching himself to a party, his chief concern is to fathom the causes of events, to inquire into their connection with other events, and to reveal the results arising out of them.

A. de Tocqueville in his valuable work *L'ancien régime et la Révolution* has treated the very same subject as Taine. But there is no kind of similarity between the methods of treatment followed by the two authors, although both occasionally arrive at the same conclusions. Taine cannot be denied the merit of being more original than most other modern authors. His style here is as brilliant and pithy as in any of his works. Tocqueville's dry facts become in his hands living and real. In the arrangement of his material Taine is immeasurably superior to his famous predecessor, whom, however, he highly esteems and frequently quotes. In contradistinction to Tocqueville, Taine divides his subject-matter into compact, well marked-off sections, thus securing an exactitude and clearness which afford great help to the reader. On the other hand, he is inferior to Tocqueville in the point of discretion in the choice of citations and in loftiness of reflection. He often loses freedom of vision in his attention to detail, and thus fails to command a large horizon and large fields of view. He forgets Michelet's warning that the microscope may become a snare to the writer of history—'It is only too easy to mistake low mosses and fungi for high woods, or insects for giants.'

The author of the *Origines de la France contemporaine* has his own Ariadne clue through the labyrinth of controversy on the question of the great Revolution. He holds that no nation can attain to a stable form of government if it entirely detaches itself from the past, neglects the problem set before it by history, founds a constitution upon theories, and in its experiments treats men as if they were the pawns on a chess-board. He says that modern France, instead of being governed according to its natural requirements, has constantly been supplied with alien and artificial constitutions. 'The coat is

not fitted to the man, but the man must accommodate himself to the coat.' Naturally the man is uneasy under these circumstances. Abbé Sieyès said he would undertake to draw up a constitution without knowing anything of the country beforehand, and Rousseau's *Contrat Social* bears witness to a thorough ignorance of history and its lessons. Taine cannot reconcile himself to such 'constitution-mongers,' and insists that the framing of a constitution must be preceded by an intimate familiarity with the character of the people for whom it is designed. For this purpose the study of the past is indispensable.

In the first section of the *Origines* Taine introduces us to French society, as it was immediately before 1789. He shows that the edifice of the State, which had been maintained at such enormous expense, was so shaken to the very foundation that it could not but fall. The representative of the pre-revolutionary régime was the absolute monarch surrounded by a privileged class. One half of this class belonged to the ecclesiastical order. The manner in which the latter came into possession of its privileges is set forth with lucidity. At a time when society in France was disintegrated and brute force prevailed, Christian priests taught their religion and founded the Church. They terrified barbarous warriors with vividly drawn pictures of future torments, and threatened with the horrors of hell all who refused obedience to the Divine commands, while the faithful were to be rewarded with eternal bliss in heaven. Other priests cultivated the ground, and taught the people improved modes of agriculture. The monks showed a perseverance and industry which could not fail to bring success, and which gave them an actual superiority over others. It was only natural that the priests who won rich harvests from the soil and the priests who were the spiritual guides of the leaders in war, should soon become powerful, honoured, and wealthy. They *deserved* the position which they had gained, for they were benefactors to the people; their successors, however, the inheritors of their brilliant position in society, became unworthy of it, but unfortunately without forfeiting it. The same holds good of the other half of the privileged class—the nobles. They also began by being benefactors of a people deficient in natural leaders. A man, stronger than the rest, built himself a castle and enforced peace and quiet in the territory which he was pleased to call his own. Peasant and merchant found protection from robbers under the shadow of the castle walls; the lord levied a tax upon them for his own subsistence, but they paid it willingly, coming off cheaper after all than if they had been plundered, and being secure of protection besides. This was the origin of feudal rights, which the feudal lords transmitted to their descendants. In the same manner in which the nobility acquired lordship over small districts, the power of a king developed till he became lord over all France. He again exercised the right of the stronger, till in

course of time he was acknowledged to be absolute master of the nobility and the peasant class. His claim was enforced by the declarations of the mediæval doctors of law that the king was the only representative of the nation, and by those of the theologians that he was consecrated and crowned by 'the grace of God.' Taine paints in glowing colours the privileged classes in the days of their glory; the time when the feudal lords ceased to be men of the people and became courtiers after a long struggle against the tyranny of the crown; the time when they enjoyed all their hereditary privileges without rendering the former counter-services to their vassals, when they even forsook their feudal castles and crowded to Versailles to swell the train of the monarch.

Taine judges and illustrates the spirit of the eighteenth century in a masterly manner; he develops clearly and criticises ably the theories of Rousseau and Voltaire. The most remarkable chapters are those on the condition of the people towards the close of the *ancien régime*; this portion of the book is at once the saddest and the most interestingly written. Weighed down by taxation, in danger of imprisonment for every slight offence, dying of hunger in consequence of bad harvests, Taine calculates that from 1672 to 1715 about one-third of the poor people died of hunger; the 'tiers état' had no other consolation than the very dubious one that 'all would be better if only the truth could reach the king's ears.' The peasants led a life not a whit removed from that of the lower animals: It is, therefore, no wonder that they behaved like wild beasts when their turn of power came; that they held the 'rights of man' to be identical with the right to murder and to rob, and brought back the savage condition of the fourth century.

The first section shows us, then, how and from what causes the Revolution originated; it was inevitable, and inevitable also was its violence and fury. 'In ten years revenge was taken for thirteen centuries of sufferings, humiliations, and nameless cruelties.'

The delineation of this violence and rage of the Revolution forms the subject of the three volumes of the second section. From a purely literary point of view this differs considerably from the first. Whereas *L'ancien régime* contains many artistic brilliant descriptions of the Salon life, of the Court, of the so-called French 'classicism,' of the customs of the time, &c., which, apart from the psychological and historical interest of the book, afford most interesting and stimulating reading, all this is absent in *La Révolution*; this section is veritably dry—i.e. purely scientific and analytical; bare facts are recorded in it and knit together by philosophico-psychological comments strictly pertinent to the subject in hand. We do not miss the long spun-out metaphors and the like which stamp Taine's literary style with so unique a character; but not much actual description is to be found; on the contrary, the author often oppresses us with

the weight of his evidence; the excessive multiplication of minute details—however valuable they may be for his purpose—becomes wearisome at last. His study of original sources is here more thorough, more careful, and more comprehensive than ever. His judgments betoken such practical wisdom and sound common sense as is rarely found in abstract thinkers like Taine—more especially in those who, like Taine, have never taken an active share in politics.

It is almost impossible for one who has not lived in France, and does not know what an enthusiastic veneration most Frenchmen—above all most French writers—cherish for the Revolution of 1789, to realise what courage it requires to raise one's voice against it; and this is what Taine does. He dares to confess that he has arrived at the same conclusions as Burke; he dares, through many stout volumes, to give in his adhesion to Burke's views on the great Revolution; he dares to pronounce Burke's *Reflections*, which Michelet called a 'miserable piece of declamation,' 'a masterpiece and a prophecy.' What daring! Who could have expected it from an author avowedly liberal, equally denounced by the reactionary party and the clericals? Only one who has kept himself immaculate, who enjoys such a reputation for political impartiality, scientific accuracy, and literary conscientiousness, only one who stands so absolutely independent as a man, a thinker, and an investigator as Taine does, can venture to permit himself such heresy without incurring grave suspicions on the part of liberally minded people. He is certainly no *Le Maistre*, but a man of the modern type, with a leaning to positivism, an open enemy of positive religions.

And this man (remarks Karl Hillebrand) declares the great Revolution to be a group of historical facts, in which evil passions, senseless notions, and purposeless actions far outweigh noble-mindedness, depth, and common sense. If up to this time modern men blamed the Revolution, it was only the Convention, whose terrorism and enactments they painted in dark colours, in order to place the year 1789 and the Constituent Assembly in a favourable light. But now Taine comes forward, throws to the winds all that thousands before him, and side by side with him, have maintained, and says, 'I determined to institute my own researches, instead of consulting historians; I determined to obtain my information from unprejudiced eye-witnesses, and I have come to the conviction that the chief calamity dates not from 1792 but from 1789.'

The results of his investigations are expressed more clearly in the following passage:—

During the three years subsequent to the storming of the Bastille, France offers us a singular spectacle; in the speeches of orators reign the purest humanity, in the laws the fairest symmetry, but in deeds the most savage roughness, in affairs the direst confusion. Surveyed from a distance this system seems to be the triumph of philosophy; closely inspected, it unmask itself as a Carlovingian anarchy.

He speaks of the street mob giving itself the airs of the 'sovereign nation' with a contempt and in language which unconsciously remind

us of Shakespeare's 'Coriolanus.' He compares 'le peuple-roi' and its rule with Milton's hell-monsters:—

Black it stood as night,
Fierce as ten furies, terrible as hell,
And shook a dreadful dart; what seemed his head,
The likeness of a kingly crown had on.

In short, he shatters the ideal of his compatriots in the most cruel and reckless fashion, and does not leave the Revolution a leg to stand on.

That Taine, despite his well-known antecedents, could come to such conclusions, can only be explained by what we may call his boundless impartiality. He is so free from bias, and forgets himself so completely in the handling of his subject, that many a reader, taking up *La Révolution*, without any previous acquaintance with his method and his earlier writings, would take him for a Conservative; while there are some passages which, severed from the context, might mislead a superficial reader of reviews into the supposition that he was even a reactionary. In truth there can be no question here of tendency in one direction or another. Taine is, as he always has been, without political bias, but he is sufficiently free from prejudice to desire a *good* government for his country; and as his investigations have convinced him—not in accordance with his inclinations, but in defiance of them—that France was *ill* governed under the Revolution, he makes no secret of his conviction. He quite sees how desirable it was that the miserable state of things under the *ancien régime* should be improved to the advantage of the people, but he fails to see this desirable improvement in the changes introduced in 1789; he even considers that they made things worse. He looks upon the *contrat social* as a very beautiful ideal, but sees the impossibility of its being carried out in practical life, so long as men remain what they always have been and still are. He proves himself through the whole course of his attack upon the constitution of 1791 to be thoroughly acquainted with human nature. To say that Taine wrote against the Revolution in order to ensure his election to the Academy—as was suggested by his recently deceased 'friend' and schoolfellow, About—is nonsense. Taine's impartiality and love of truth are evident and indubitable to everyone who is familiar with his literary character on one side, and on the other with the later literature of the Revolution. The truth lies in the following words of Taine: 'J'ai tracé le portrait [of revolutionary France] sans me préoccuper de mes débats présents; j'ai écrit comme si j'avais eu pour sujet les révolutions de Florence ou d'Athènes. Ceci est de l'histoire, rien de plus.' This may probably prove unsatisfactory to some one-sided French Chauvinists. But the unbiassed foreigner—however radical his tendencies—is not obliged to take umbrage at it, and he must be allowed to rejoice that there are historians who deal with their subject as the anatomist with his,

using the dissecting-scalpel dispassionately. It does not follow that such historians are infallible—nor do we endorse Taine's conclusions as to the French Revolution—but at least they are worthy of more respect than the fanatical sort, or those who overcharge their colouring.

Taine insists on justice above all and in all things, and it is all the same to him whether it is violated towards the people or the king, towards one rank or party or another. This standpoint is certainly a noble, a truly liberal one, and hence it is that he, the free-thinker, enters the lists for the clergy and the Church, for the king and the nobility, wherever injustice is dealt out to any of these powers. In the first volume he sets forth the encroachments of the higher classes and the sufferings of the people. Why should he be forbidden in the second to describe the encroachments of the people and the injuries inflicted on the upper classes? Doubtless his speculations will be distasteful to theorists, and politicians will condemn him for having no political views on points which usually call forth party strife; doubtless he refuses to allow either to monarchs or to philosophers the right to rule despotically, to model the world according to their respective fancies, and his impartiality may be censured as lukewarmness by partisans, but it is precisely for these very reasons that his book will awaken the interest and secure the confidence of unprejudiced readers.

A definitive judgment must be deferred till the whole completed work lies before us. The concluding volume may be expected in the year 1887; it will treat of 'Post-revolutionary France'—*i.e.* the various changes which have befallen Taine's fatherland during the present century.

IV.

While discussing Taine's works individually, we have taken occasion to explain his critical method; let us now attempt a general survey of this method as running through them all.

When we invite a critic to pass judgment on a book, a picture, an author, a nation, a school of painting, a style of architecture, a national literature—what course will he pursue? He will either compare the object submitted to his criticism with a pattern of the same nature held to be standard or classical, and pronounce it to be good, very good, bad, very bad, second rate, &c., according as it approaches the pattern or diverges from it more or less. Or else he will estimate the worth of the object to be appraised according to the personal impression which it has made on him—*i.e.* he will only consult his own approval or disapproval. In the former case he is in danger of blaming, in the latter of praising, extravagantly. Now arise the questions how the person of the critic is to be kept apart from his decisions, whether there is a third mode of criticism, and

whether it is possible to attribute convincing force to a critical judgment, instead of regarding it as an opinion or a view. In short, can criticism be made an exact science with absolute and incontrovertible conclusions? One would suppose, considering what human nature is, that an application of the critical faculty in a uniformly mechanical manner, without any regard to the individual feelings of the critic, was an impossibility. But Taine thinks otherwise. He not only believes that this apparently incredible feat can be performed, but even thinks that the results of criticism may be as certain as those of a mathematical problem. And how is this mighty end to be attained? All we have to do—suppose that it is an author who is the subject of criticism—after having read through his works, is to draw up three groups of questions:

- (a) Where was the man born? Who were his parents and ancestors? What were the root ideas of his race?
- (b) Under what conditions and circumstances was he educated? What position did he hold in society? To what influences was he exposed? How did the spirit of the age affect him?
- (c) What were the peculiarities and tendencies of his time, and how did they manifest themselves?

Having obtained certainty on all these points (as if that were so easy!) we shall find the *faculté maîtresse* of the intellect of the author, the fundamental quality which underlies his capabilities and gives them their peculiar direction, and which, therefore, supplies the key for a definitive adjudication of his merits.

Let us take for example Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Addison, a critic coming under the first category of those mentioned above, compares Milton's verse with the requirements of Aristotle, and finds that it so answers to them, that this epic is worthy of the highest commendation. Macaulay, a critic of the other category, does not undertake an exact or detailed criticism; he gives glowing praise to the richness of the imagery, the diction, and versification; he is enchanted with the poem, and his judgment is in unison with the favourable impression which it has made on him. And now, how does Taine proceed? After having by the application of his method answered his three test-questions—'Race, period of time, surrounding circumstances'—and having thence deduced that Milton's *faculté maîtresse* is 'the sense of the sublime,' he seeks to prove by examples how this quality finds expression in his life and works. Milton is compared with Shakespeare as a poet; the difference between the two is said to be that Shakespeare is the poet of impulse, Milton of reason. Then Taine goes on to point out, as a consequence of this assumed fact, that Milton's prose writings and minor poems are admirable, whereas the *Paradise Lost* is a 'sublime but incomplete' poem, a series of reasonings alternating with beautiful images. The leading personages, who were to bear the stamp of

their own individuality, are said to be impersonations of contemporaries; God and the first human pair are transformed into orthodox persons. The genius of the poet, he says, stands out only when he describes monsters and landscapes, or speaks through the mouth of Satan in the tone of a stern republican. If we look closely into the question, we shall find Taine's mode of criticism quite as subjective as Macaulay's. Only the latter *confesses* his criticism to be subjective, whereas Taine holds his to be *objective*, which, however, it is only in the sense of 'impartial,' and not in the sense of 'unprejudiced' or of 'scientifically incontrovertible.'

Were Taine's method really perfect, objective, and infallible, it would necessarily yield the same results in the hands of others as in his own; as in the case of the exact sciences; all difference of opinion would be at an end. But in reality another, armed with Taine's capability of analysis, his keen critical faculty, his comprehensive knowledge, and his charming and effective style, might with the very same method consistently obtain quite opposite results. Taine frequently delights to compare himself to the anatomist wielding the scalpel, to the botanist, or the zoologist. But in the first place these men of science, when they institute their researches, lay aside all human passions, personal predilections, national prejudices, and individual feelings, whereas the critic who can divest himself of all these things in pronouncing judgment is not yet born, and is not likely ever to be born, so long as men remain only human. And, secondly, the anatomist, the zoologist, the botanist can actually make good what he demonstrates in concrete form, for he has the objects bodily before him, while the critic who has to deal with abstract conceptions—such as beauty, goodness, &c.—can only conjecture or surmise, as conceptions are almost always open to various interpretations. Taine's critical method is then not a science, his conclusions are not proofs, they are, on the contrary, often fallacious. Nevertheless his process has, as we have already remarked, the advantage of enhancing the reliability of criticism by continuous grouping of facts and constant endeavour to obtain certainty.

On the other hand, this virtue is apt to degenerate into a fault. The effort to prove too much frequently misleads Taine to wander into false paths. He eagerly sweeps along all that serves his purposes, and thus not infrequently falls into self-contradiction. It happens sometimes that he brings forward the same evidence to confirm one assertion, at another time a quite opposite one. By high-sounding generalisations he magnifies phenomena and occurrences, which appear to anyone else quite harmless or unimportant, into weighty and portentous records. He ascribes much too great and wide-reaching an influence to his three forces or 'surrounding circumstances.' However much, as everyone must admit, this influence of race, of sphere, and of the spirit of the age may operate on the life and the activity of

the man, we cannot go so far as to assume that it alone moulds individuality. If so, how does it happen that brothers and sisters can be so unlike one another? Taine is too inductive by half. He appears to set about his reading with all his preconceived theories and foregone conclusions mustered before him, and to note all that seems to him to confirm them, while he ignores all that tells against them. But this is the direct opposite of objectivity, which can only be approached by the deductive process.

But however far we may be from finding ourselves on the whole in harmony with Taine the philosopher, or rather the anatomist, we must adjudge the highest praise to Taine the writer, the artist. In the former capacity he is, as Zola aptly remarks, a 'thought-mathematician,' a systematician, a slave to the consistent application of his own theories; and the reading of his works often conveys the impression that we are attending the lectures of a professor of geometry. This side of his nature is the result of his erudition, it is not the side from which we can fairly judge our author. The real Taine must be sought in the other direction—in his style, his pictures, his descriptions, his narrations. The merits which he unfolds here are his own, and are not due to study. The poet Taine, the man of flesh and blood, is far preferable to the cold mechanician Taine. Stripped of the 'method,' his writings would be all the more beautiful; indeed, this method would play but a miserable part in the hands of a less skilful and gifted writer; it is only Taine's style that holds it above water. In this clear, trenchant, vivid, glowing, luxuriant style stands revealed, as Zola says in *Mes Haines*, 'the prodigality and love of splendour which characterise a fine gentleman.' This style is deliberately unequal and unpolished, in order to produce the more powerful effect. We see that nothing is undesigned, that the author has his pen well in hand. It possesses all the glow and inspiration of fancy, though fettered by a 'method' which directly tends to the suppression of fancy. His highly finished diction always accommodates itself to the subject under discussion. Apart from the too frequent heaping up of epithets and metaphors à la Shakespeare, Spenser, Milton, and Bunyan, we are as much surprised by their suitability as by the ease with which they flow from his pen. This is attributable in great measure to the amount of reading, in which he rivals Macaulay, and the assimilatory power of his memory, akin to that of Buckle. His method is mechanical, analytical; his literary individuality, on the other hand, synthetic in its character. Karl Hillebrand says very gracefully in his *Profiles*—'In Taine philosophy is only the frame in which the . . . always lifelike pictures of times and men are set. It is a pity that in the artist's eyes the frame is more important than the picture, that the latter seems to exist only for the sake of the frame.' It is no exaggeration to call Taine an artist in style.

LEOPOLD KATSCHEB.

THE ANIMALS OF NEW GUINEA.

If we consider Australia as a continent, New Guinea, or Papua as it is better to call it, is the largest island in the world. It lies outstretched across the northern frontier of Australia, between 130° and 150° East longitude, and reaches from near the Equator to about 12° South latitude. By recent computations it is estimated to contain an area of about 306,000 square miles—that is, as much as England and France put together. In striking contrast to the parched-up plains of Australia, New Guinea is traversed throughout by ranges of lofty mountains, whence flowing and abundant rivers find their way into the surrounding ocean. It is consequently covered by a luxuriant vegetation; and although large districts are low and swampy, there can be no doubt that the uplands will eventually be found to supply large areas of fertile land suitable for European colonisation.

For reasons that I shall presently enter upon, Papua is of special interest to the naturalist, and, more than one fourth of its vast area having now definitely passed under the sovereignty of Great Britain, a sketch of its fauna, so far as this is known to us, will probably be the more acceptable to English readers. Before, however, I enter upon a discussion of the animals of New Guinea, I propose to give a short account of the principal scientific expeditions whereby our present knowledge of its fauna has been obtained.

The period and merit of the actual discovery of New Guinea are, like many other events of the same nature, a matter of dispute between the earlier Portuguese and Spanish navigators.¹ But the first naturalist who has given us any particulars as to its fauna is undoubtedly Sonnerat,² a Frenchman. It is, however, doubtful, to say the least, whether Sonnerat ever himself landed on the mainland of New Guinea, and it is even affirmed that he advanced only as far as the Papuan island of Guebé, or the adjoining island of Waigion. Here he may have obtained from native traders the skins of the Paradise birds and other undoubtedly Papuan species, which he subsequently figured and described in his *Voyage à la Nouvelle Guinée*.

Passing by Carteret and Bougainville, who in 1767 and 1768 touched at certain points on the north coast, we come to our

¹ Antonio de Abreu in 1511, and Alvaro de Saavedra in 1528.

² *Voyage à la Nouvelle Guinée* 2 vols. Paris, 1776.

countryman Forrest, who, so far as we know, was the first discoverer in 1774 of the afterwards celebrated 'Havre Dorey' in the bay of Geelvink, so called after the Dutch ship ('Geelvink' = Yellow-finch') by which it was first entered. At Havre Dorey in 1824, scientific naturalists of the present epoch first put their feet on Papuan soil. From the 26th of July to the 9th of August of that year, the French discovery-ship 'La Coquille' remained at anchor at this well-known harbour in the bay of Geelvink. The celebrated naturalist, Lesson, was attached to the expedition, with his companion Garnot. During their twelve days' stay examples of many new Papuan animals were procured, and afterwards described in their joint work on the Zoology of the voyage of the 'Coquille.'³ M. Lesson's other works, his *Traité* and *Manuel d'Ornithologie* and *Histoire des Paradisiens*, likewise contain many interesting notices arising from observations made on this occasion.

Three years later, in 1827, a second French discovery-ship, the 'Astrolabe,' under the command of Dumont d'Urville, passed another twelve days in the same place. The additional animals obtained on this occasion were afterwards described and figured in the Zoology of the voyage of the 'Astrolabe.'⁴

The next event to be recorded in the scientific history of Papua sprang from the energy of a different people. A few months after the visit of the 'Astrolabe' to Havre Dorey, in the beginning of 1828, the Government of the Netherlands sent the corvette 'Triton' and schooner 'Iris' from Batavia to found a permanent settlement on the coast of New Guinea. The expedition had on board a royal commissioner and several other members of the scientific expedition which was then engaged in the exploration of the Dutch possessions in the East Indies. They first traversed the Dourga Strait on the southern coast, and, thence returning northwards, discovered in the district called Lobo what they describe as a deep and spacious bay, shut in by elevated land, and of a picturesque aspect. Here they constructed a fort, and, on the 24th of August 1828, took formal possession of the whole coast with the usual solemnities in the name of the King of the Netherlands. The bay was named 'Triton's Bay,' and the strait leading to it 'Iris Strait,' to commemorate the names of the two vessels. After several years' occupation 'Fort Dubus' was evacuated (about 1835) on account of the unhealthiness of the locality, and is now said to be in ruins. But the two naturalists, Macklot and Muller, were by no means idle during their stay, and it was to their energy that the National Museum of Leyden is mainly

³ *Voyage autour du Monde, exécuté par ordre du Roi sur la corvette de sa Majesté la Coquille, &c.* Zoologie, par MM. Lesson et Garnot. Paris, 1826.

⁴ *Voyage de découvertes de l'Astrolabe, exécuté par ordre du Roi pendant les années 1826-29, sous le commandement de M. J. Dumont d'Urville.* Zoologie, par MM. Quoy et Gaimard. Paris, 1830.

indebted for a splendid series of Papuan animals which remained for many years unrivalled in Europe. It is much to be regretted that no complete account has ever been given of the discoveries of Macklot and Muller. In the magnificent work in which the labours of the Royal Scientific Commission were reported,⁵ it is stated that examples of 119 species of birds were obtained in New Guinea, but no complete list is added of them, though several important monographs are given on various groups of Papuan animals, and many new species are shortly described in footnotes attached to the Ethnographical volume of the series.

In 1839 again a French discovery-ship touched at Triton's Bay and other spots on the south-west coast of New Guinea. This was the 'Astrolabe,' under her former commander M. Dumont d'Urville, on her way to the Antarctic seas. Messrs. Hombron and Jacquinot, the naturalists of this celebrated expedition, commonly known as the 'Voyage au Pôle Sud,' made on this occasion several additions to our knowledge of Papuan animals, which were described in the subsequently published account of the Zoology of the voyage.⁶

In 1842 H.M.S. 'Fly,' under the command of Captain Blackwood, made a survey of about 140 miles of the southern coast of New Guinea bordering on Torres Straits, and discovered the mouths of the 'Fly' river afterwards ascended by D'Albertis. The well-known naturalist Jukes was on board the 'Fly,'⁷ and made considerable collections in natural history, which were deposited in the British Museum.

The 'Fly' was succeeded in Torres Straits by the still more important surveying expedition of the 'Rattlesnake,' under Captain Owen Stanley, which left England in 1846. During this expedition, which lasted until Captain Stanley's death at Sydney in 1850, the 'Owen Stanley' range of mountains, several of the summits of which exceed 10,000 feet in altitude, was discovered, and the heights of the more important peaks were determined. John Macgillivray was the naturalist, and wrote the subsequently issued narrative of the expedition.⁸ The collections were sent to the British Museum.

We now come to 1858, in which year, on the 11th of April, our well-known countryman, Mr. A. R. Wallace, was landed by a Dutch trading vessel at Havre Dorey⁹ for a three months' sojourn in this famous spot. Mr. Wallace, however, emphatically asserts that Havre Dorey is 'not a good collecting station for the naturalist.' The

⁵ *Verhandelingen over de Natuurlyke Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche overzeesche Bezittingen, &c.*, uitgegeven door C. J. Temminck. Leyden, 1839-1844.

⁶ *Voyage au Pôle Sud et dans l'Octane sur les Corvettes l'Astrolabe et la Zélée, sous le commandement de M. Dumont d'Urville.* Zoologie, Paris, 1812-53.

⁷ See his *Narrative of the Surveying Voyage of H.M.S. Fly*, 2 vols. London, 1847.

⁸ *Narrative of the Voyage of H.M.S. Rattlesnake, &c.* By John Macgillivray 2 vols. London, 1852.

⁹ See Mr. Wallace's *Malay Archipelago* (London, 1869), vol. ii. ch. xxxiv.

ground is low and swampy, birds and butterflies are scarce, and even inferior objects of scientific interest are not too abundant. Mr. Wallace sums up his experiences at Havre Dorey in the following pregnant passage:—

On the 22nd of July the schooner 'Hester Helena' arrived, and five days afterwards we bade adieu to Dorey, without much regret, for in no place which I have visited have I encountered more privations and annoyances. Continual rain, continual sickness, little wholesome food, with a plague of ants and flies, surpassing anything I had before met with, required all a naturalist's ardour to encounter, and when they were uncompensated by great success in collecting, became all the more insupportable. This long-thought-of and much-desired voyage to New Guinea had realised none of my expectations. Instead of being far better than the Aru Islands, it was in almost everything much worse. Instead of producing several of the rarer Paradise birds, I had not even seen one of them, and had not obtained one superlatively fine bird or insect. I cannot deny, however, that Dorey was very rich in ants. One small black kind was excessively abundant. Almost every shrub and tree was more or less infested with it, and its large papery nests were everywhere to be seen. They immediately took possession of my house, building a large nest in the roof, and forming papery tunnels down almost every post. They swarmed on my table as I was at work setting out my insects, carrying them off from under my very nose, and even tearing them from the cards on which they were gummied, if I left them for an instant. They crawled continually over my hands and face, got into my hair, and roamed at will over my whole body, not producing much inconvenience till they began to bite, which they would do on meeting with any obstruction to their passage, and with a sharpness which made me jump again and rush off to undress and turn out the offender. They visited my bed also, so that night brought no relief from their persecutions, and I verily believe that during my three and a half months' residence at Dorey I was never for a single hour free from them. They were not nearly so voracious as many other kinds, but their numbers and ubiquity rendered it necessary to be constantly on guard against them.

The flies that troubled me most were a large kind of blue-bottle or blow-fly. These settled in swarms on my birdskins when first put out to dry, filling their plumage with masses of eggs, which, if neglected, the next day produced maggots. They would get under the wings or under the body where it rested on the drying-board, sometimes actually raising it up half an inch by the mass of eggs deposited in a few hours; and every egg was so firmly glued to the fibres of the feathers as to make it a work of much time and patience to get them off without injuring the bird. In no other locality have I ever been troubled with such a plague as this.

We shall, however, see that subsequent explorers, who were able to penetrate further into the interior, give by no means so unfavourable an account of this district.

Dr. H. A. Bernstein, a well-known German naturalist, visited New Guinea in 1863 and the following year, and collected for the Leyden Museum on the north coast and in the islands adjoining the western extremity.¹⁰ Dr. Bernstein died at Batanta in 1865.

C. H. B. von Rosenberg, who succeeded Bernstein, was long in the service of the Government of the Netherlands, and besides minor excursions to New Guinea made a prolonged exploration of the bay

¹⁰ See *Tijdschrift v. Ind. Taal-, Land-, en Volkskunde*, vols XIV and XVI. (1864 and 1869).

of Geelvink in 1869-70, of which he has published an interesting account.¹¹ To Bernstein and Von Rosenberg the Leyden Museum is indebted for a large number of most valuable zoological specimens from New Guinea.

A few years later two travellers from another European nation, which had not previously interested itself in the exploration of this distant land, appeared on the scene, and achieved undoubted success. Signor L. M. d'Albertis, of Genoa, left Italy in 1872, in company with the distinguished traveller and botanist, Dr. Beccari. In the following year, after visiting several points on the southern and western coasts of New Guinea, the travellers finally fixed their quarters at the village of Andai, situated a little inland from Havre Dorey. Hence in November 1872 D'Albertis succeeded in ascending the slopes of Mount Arfak, which rises above the low-lying shore to a height, it is said, of some 10,000 feet. D'Albertis's furthest point was the village of Hatam, about 3,500 feet above the sea-level, and in the midst of the forests inhabited by the finest and rarest Birds of Paradise. On the 9th of September 1872, the very day after his arrival at Hatam, D'Albertis succeeded in shooting specimens of both the Shielded and Six-shafted Birds of Paradise, and shortly afterwards obtained examples of a new and beautiful species, remarkable for its curved bill, which was subsequently named, after its discoverer, *Drepanornis Albertisi*, besides many other zoological novelties of all kinds.

Three years subsequently Mount Arfak was again ascended to a height of 6,700 feet by Dr. Beccari, and upon this occasion again large collections in zoology and botany¹² were made, and the singular playing places made by the Gardener Bower-bird (*Amblyornis inornata*)¹³ were discovered and described.

Signor d'Albertis returned to Europe in 1874, but left again at the close of the same year with the intention of exploring the southern portion of New Guinea. In March of the following year he settled in Yule Island, on the southern shore of the south-western peninsula, and resided there some six months, making large collections in natural history, but not succeeding in reaching even to the foot of the range of lofty mountains which towered above him.

Signor d'Albertis afterwards made three successive voyages up the Fly River, the first in the mission steamer 'Ellan Gowan,' and the two others in the 'Neva,' a small steam launch lent to him by the Governor of New South Wales. In the second of these voyages (in 1876) D'Albertis penetrated far into the centre of the great

¹¹ *Reisochten naar de Geelvinkbaai op Nieuw-Guinea in de jaren 1869 en 1870*, door C. B. H. von Rosenberg. The Hague, 1875.

¹² Dr. Beccari's *Malasia* (Genoa, 1877-84), published in fascicules, contains an account of his principal botanical discoveries.

¹³ See Gould's *Birds of New Guinea*, pt. ix., for a figure of this remarkable bird and its playing place.

southern mass of New Guinea, and reached a hilly country, but only succeeded in getting a few glimpses of the great central range, which he named, as in duty bound, the Victor Emmanuel Mountains, after the then reigning King of Italy.¹⁴

While these expeditions were proceeding in the south, another traveller from Europe was again attacking the northern peninsula of New Guinea.

In March 1873 Dr. A. B. Meyer, now director of the Museum of Dresden, who was at that time travelling in the East Indies, arrived at Dorey and spent some months at that station and at other points in the bay of Geelvink and its various islands. Dr. Meyer, according to his own narrative,¹⁵ succeeded in crossing the mainland of New Guinea from the shores of the bay of Geelvink, over a mountain chain of some 2,000 feet in altitude, to the head of McCluer Inlet on the west coast—a feat previously unaccomplished. Dr. Meyer also made large collections of natural history, and added much to our knowledge of the Papuan fauna.

Returning to the southern coast, we find that Captain Moresby's surveys of the south-eastern extremity of New Guinea in 1873 and 1874 in H.M.S. 'Basilisk' added vastly to our knowledge of the correct outline of this peninsula. Captain Moresby showed that the extreme point of New Guinea in this direction terminates in a huge fork, the lower prong of which ends in an archipelago of islands. Between these new islands and the projection formed by the northern peninsula lies a magnificent sheet of water forty-five miles long, which Captain Moresby named Milne Bay,¹⁶ while the new and convenient passage thus discovered round the south-eastern extremity of New Guinea is designated 'China Straits.' Dr. Comrie, the medical officer of the 'Basilisk' under Captain Moresby, made considerable zoological collections, amongst which were a new Paradise-bird and other novelties.¹⁷

In February 1875, the 'Challenger' passed along the northern coast of New Guinea and made an attempt to visit Humboldt's Bay, which was frustrated by the hostility of the natives, so that very few specimens of natural history were obtained.¹⁸ But Humboldt's Bay had been previously visited successfully by the Dutch on more than one occasion.

Beginning in 1875, numerous expeditions were sent out from

¹⁴ For a full account of D'Albertis's various expeditions see *New Guinea: what I did and what I saw* By L. M. d'Albertis. 2 vols. London, 1880.

¹⁵ See 'Dr Meyer's Expedition to New Guinea,' *Nature*, vol. ix. p. 77.

¹⁶ See *Discoveries and Surveys in New Guinea and the D'Entrecasteaux Islands*, &c. By Captain J. Moresby, R.N. London, 1876

¹⁷ See article 'on the birds collected by Dr Comrie,' by P. L. Sclater, *P. Z. S.* 1876, p. 459

¹⁸ See *Narrative of the Voyage of the Challenger*, vol. i p. 691 (1885).

Sydney to the Torres Straits and the southern peninsula of New Guinea.

The most noticeable of these, from a scientific point of view, was that of Mr. William Macleay in the 'Chevert' in 1875. Mr. Macleay took with him two other naturalists, Mr. Masters and Mr. Brazier, and two well-known Sydney collectors, Messrs. Spalding and Pettard, and was absent five months. Large collections were made in every branch of zoology, and the results have been published in the *Journal* of the Linnean Society of New South Wales,¹⁹ of which society Mr. Macleay is the president. This part of New Guinea has been also for some time a field of missionary enterprise. In 1871 a mission was first established at Darnley Island in Torres Straits, and branches were subsequently sent out to Redscar Bay and Port Moresby. In 1874 the Rev. W. G. Lawes, who has made valuable collections in several branches of natural history, took charge of the last-named station. Missions have been likewise established as far west as the mouths of the Fly River, and at various other intermediate points. By the aid of the missionaries several energetic collectors from Sydney have obtained access to the interior of this part of the island, and have thrown considerable light on its fauna and flora. Amongst these I may specially mention the names of Dr. James (who was killed by the natives at Hall Sound in 1876), Mr. Broadbent, Mr. Goldie, and Mr. Huntstein. The collections of birds thus formed have been described partly by Mr. R. B. Sharpe in the *Journal* of the Linnean Society of London, and partly by Mr. E. P. Ramsay and other naturalists in the *Proceedings* of the Linnean Society of New South Wales.

But we must not close the list of scientific explorers of New Guinea without alluding to the name of the intrepid Russian traveller, Nicholaieff Miklucho-Maclay, who has made three or four expeditions to different portions of the coast in search of anthropological information. Mr. Miklucho-Maclay's first point was on the north-eastern coast, near Astrolabe Bay, or what is now called the 'Maclay Coast,' where he resided alone amongst the natives for fifteen months. In 1873 he visited the south-western coast of New Guinea at a place called Papua-Koviay, situated somewhere near Triton's Bay, and again stayed among the natives for several months. In 1876 Maclay returned to the north-eastern coast and made a second stay of seventeen months amongst his former friends. Besides these long visits, two other shorter excursions were made by this energetic traveller to New Guinea. It is a great pity that no connected account of his travels has as yet been published.

Finally, a few words may be said about the recent annexation of a large slice of New Guinea to the British Empire. In April 1883 Mr. H. M. Chester, the police magistrate on Thursday Island in Torres

¹⁹ See *Journ. Linn. Soc. N. S. Wales*, vol. i. p. 36, for a general account of the expedition, and that and succeeding volumes for other papers.

Straits, acting under instructions from the Government of Queensland, took formal possession of all New Guinea and its islands lying west of the 141st meridian, the supposed limit of the portion claimed by the Government of the Netherlands. This act was disapproved of by the Home Government, but, after various negotiations with the Australian colonies, on the 6th of November 1884 a British protectorate was proclaimed over the southern coast of New Guinea by the commodore of the Australian Station, and shortly afterwards Major-General (afterwards Sir Peter) Scratchley was appointed special Commissioner for the Government of the new Protectorate. At the close of the last year the German Government took similar steps on the northern coast of this portion of New Guinea and the adjacent islands, Dr. Otto Finsch, the well-known naturalist (who was already well acquainted with this part of the world from his previous travels), having been previously sent out by the Imperial Government as special adviser on this subject. After much discussion between the English and German Governments, the difficulty as to the limits of the rival protectorates was finally settled by the division of New Guinea west of 141° East longitude into two nearly equal portions, of which the southern half was assigned to England, the northern half to Germany. Germany, we are told, has already named her newly acquired territory on the mainland 'King William's Land,' and the adjacent islands the 'Bismarck Islands.' I am not aware that any name has yet been assigned by our Government to the portion left to us by Prince Bismarck's politeness. But I venture to suggest that 'Torresia' would be a much better name for the newly acquired protectorate, bordered as it is on its southern frontier by Torres Straits, than any such term as 'British New Guinea.'

Before discussing the results as to the zoology of New Guinea to be arrived at from the information amassed by the explorers above spoken of, and others which I have not had occasion to specify, let us consider for a few minutes the general conformation of New Guinea. It is an elongated piece of land stretching from north-west to south-east through some twenty degrees of longitude. There can be little doubt that a continuous chain of mountains, of varying altitudes from 16,000 to 2,000 feet, traverses the interior throughout. In the northern peninsula these are known as the 'Arfak mountains,' and rise, it is said, to a height of 10,000 feet, though I am not aware that this estimate is founded upon anything but guess-work. These mountains have been partly ascended by D'Albertis and Beccari, as already mentioned. Further south at the head of McCluer's Inlet the range is stated to have been crossed by Dr. Meyer at a height of about 2,000 feet. We then come to the southern point of the great bay of Geelvink, where a series of altitudes along the 'Charles Louis range' have been approximately ascertained by the Dutch. According to their reports the highest of these are covered

by perpetual snow, and attain an elevation of over 16,000 feet. Passing on to the interior of the main mass of New Guinea, what is probably a continuation of the Charles Louis range was sighted by D'Albertis at the highest point attained on the Fly River in 1876, and named the 'Victor Emmanuel range.' This is again, no doubt, continuous with the Owen Stanley range which traverses the south-eastern peninsula, and of which Mount Owen Stanley (13,200 feet) is, so far as is yet known, the highest summit.

Besides this principal chain several other ranges of mountains occur in New Guinea. The whole northern coast from Point d'Urville to Huon Gulf is bordered by mountains of considerable altitude, which have been called the 'Cyclops' range at their western end, and the 'Finisterre' mountains, said to be about 10,000 feet in altitude, and 'Rawlinson' range, above Huon Gulf. In the peninsula of Onin are also mountains at the back of Triton's Bay, but we have as yet received but few particulars about them.

The principal river-basins of New Guinea, so far as they are known to us, are those of the 'Fly,' the 'Amberno,' and the 'Wa-Samson.' The Fly River, which seems to drain the main mass of southern New Guinea, rises no doubt in the Victor Emmanuel mountains, which, as already mentioned, D'Albertis sighted and named when he ascended the Fly River in 1876.

The Amberno or Mamberan river probably rises on the northern slopes of the same range, and drains the country lying between that and the north coast range, flowing into the sea by many mouths at the eastern end of the great bay of Geelvink. Of the importance of this river and of the magnitude of its outfall we may form some idea from the facts ascertained by the officers of the 'Challenger' when they traversed the ocean off Point d'Urville in 1875.

On the 22nd of February of that year, when about seventy miles off land, the specific gravity of the surface water was found to be lower than usual, and the ship was surrounded by large quantities of drift wood, so that the propeller had to be stopped lest it should be fouled. Amongst the logs around them were many whole uprooted trees, one of which was two feet in diameter. Other objects showing the force of the freshwater current were midribs of palms, stems of large cane-grasses, fruits and seeds of trees, of which the surface scum was so full that they could be scooped up in quantities with a fine net. These phenomena, observed at seventy miles distant from the shore, leave no possible doubt as to the magnitude of the current of the Amberno River.

The third principal river of New Guinea is the Wa-Samson, which rises probably on the western slopes of Mount Arfak; and, after draining the greater part of the Onin Peninsula, runs into the sea at Dampier Straits, at the north-western extremity of the island. The Wa-Samson was visited by Dr. Beccari in 1875. After exploring the

mountains east of Sorong, he crossed the coast range rather further east, at an altitude of 1,200 feet, and descended to the banks of the river, which is described as about twenty yards wide, and flowing with a strong current. The natives have a story that the Wa-Samson passes under a kind of natural tunnel before it reaches the sea.

Long as the list of scientific explorers of New Guinea, as above given, may seem to be, we cannot suppose that anything like a thorough knowledge of its zoology has been as yet acquired. But sufficient information has been attained to enable an outline to be given of the principal groups of animals that inhabit this strange country.

As regards the mammals of New Guinea, on which subject our best authority is an article by Dr. Peters and the Marquis Doria, published in the *Annals* of the Museo Civico of Genoa for 1880,²⁹ the total number of this class of animals as yet ascertained to occur in New Guinea is about fifty-three, as will be seen by the following table:—

<i>Mammals of Papua.</i>		
Ungulates (Pig)	1
Bats:		
Fruit-bats	6
Insectivorous	13
		— 19
Rodents:		
<i>Mus</i> (Cosmopolitan)	5
<i>Uromys</i> (Peculiar)	4
<i>Hydromys</i> (Austrian)	1
		— 10
Marsupials:		
Dasyures	6
Bandicoots	3
Phalangers	7
Kangaroos	5
		— 21
Monotremes	2
		— 53

In New Guinea it is at once manifest that all the higher and specially developed groups of mammals are altogether absent. As in Australia, the main mammal population consists of Bats, Rodents, and Marsupials. Of the great group of Ungulates, which in most parts of the world supply such abundant and nutritious food to mankind, only one single representative occurs in New Guinea. This is the pig, which, although certainly also met with in a wild state in New Guinea, is a semi-domestic animal among the natives, and may very probably have been introduced by mankind from the great islands of

²⁹ 'Enumerazione dei Mammiferi raccolti da C. Beccari, L. M. d'Albertis e A. A. Brujia nella Nuova Guinea propriamente detta' *Ann. Mus. Civ. di Genova*, xvi. 1880, pp. 665-707, pts. v-xviii.

the Eastern Archipelago, where several species of the genus *Sus* are known to be indigenous. A small dog is also, according to Mr. W. Macleay, kept in a domestic state by the natives in southern New Guinea.

Of the flying order of bats about nineteen species are known to have occurred in New Guinea, thirteen of which belong to the insectivorous division of the group, while six are fruit-bats. Bats, however, it may be remarked, are nearly cosmopolitan, and have a ready means of migration by flight from one land to another. The presence of bats, therefore, does not enable us to draw any very definite conclusions as to the general character of a fauna.

The Rodents of New Guinea hitherto recognised are about ten in number. Five of these belong to the cosmopolitan genus *Mus*; four to an allied genus, *Uromys*, peculiar to Papua and the adjoining islands; whilst a single *Hydromys*, a genus allied to the mice, but hitherto only known in Australia, has been recently met with in New Guinea.

We now come to the Marsupial order, so well known to us as the prevalent form of mammal life in Australia, where it is represented by five differently organised groups, which constitute so many natural families. Of these five families, four, as will be seen by our table, are also met with in New Guinea. The Carnivorous Dasyures, or 'Native Cats,' as they are called by our colonists in Australia, have at least five representatives in New Guinea, two of which belong to the typical genus *Dasyurus* and the others to *Phascologale*, or one of its subgenera. The Bandicoots of Australia are represented by three species in New Guinea, and the Phalangers by seven. The Kangaroos, so well known as one of the most marked features of animal life in Australia, are represented in New Guinea by two different types. The terrestrial genus *Macropus*, so highly developed in Australia, and to which all the largest and finest species of 'Boomers' and 'Wallaroos' are referable, is also found in New Guinea, together with several members of an allied genus (*Dorcopsis*) which is peculiar to Papua and its islands. But besides these, one of the characteristic features of the fauna of New Guinea is the existence of a form of kangaroo specially modified for arboreal life. It might have been thought that of all known terrestrial mammals, a kangaroo would be one of the least likely to adopt such a mode of existence. But just as in South America Gallinaceous birds, which ordinarily inhabit the ground, have so far altered their habits as to live in the highest trees of the forest, as, in the contrary direction, certain woodpeckers in the Pampas of Buenos Ayres are found to live entirely on the ground, and never to climb a tree, so in the forest-clad hills of New Guinea kangaroos have in the course of long ages become habituated to desert the earth and to live in trees. Two very distinct species of tree-kangaroo (*Dendrolagus*) are found in the forests of New Guinea. It has

lately been discovered that a third species of the same genus occurs in Northern Queensland.²¹

Another strong link to connect New Guinea with Australia has been forged by the discovery in the Arfak Mountains of New Guinea of a gigantic representative of the order Monotremata, the lowest of all existing mammals, which are devoid of teeth and lay eggs like a bird. Until lately the Echidna and the Duckbill of Australia were the sole known forms of this peculiar group, and were believed to be entirely restricted to the Australian continent. But among the spoils from Mount Arfak obtained by Mr. Bruijn and his energetic hunters in 1876 were some bones of an animal that were subsequently proved to belong to a larger form of the Australian Echidna, recognisable not only by its great size, but by having only three toes on its fore limbs. Besides this a slightly modified form of the smaller Australian Echidna is also met with in the south of New Guinea,²² so that two Monotremes properly appertain to the Papuan fauna, although no traces of the still more extraordinary Duckbill (*Ornithorhynchus*) have as yet been met with outside the area of Australia.

The beauty and variety of the birds of New Guinea have greatly attracted the attention of travellers, and many of the explorers of its forests have devoted their energies specially to collecting specimens of this class. It has consequently come to pass that the birds of New Guinea are much better known to us than the mammals. Moreover, Count Salvadori's excellent monograph of the birds of Papua and the Moluccas²³ is one of the best ornithological works of recent days, and contains, it is hardly necessary to say, a complete account of all that was known of the birds of New Guinea up to the period of its completion. The subjoined table shows the numbers of species of each of the nine orders to which Count Salvadori assigns the 1,028 birds hitherto met with in Papua and the Moluccas.

Table of Birds of Papua and the Moluccas.

1. Accipitres	64
2. Pittaci	102
3. Picariæ	113
4. Passeræ	501
5. Columbæ	108
6. Gallinæ	20
7. Grallatores	70
8. Natatores	41
9. Struthiones	9
Total	1,028

²¹ *Dendrolagus Lumholdtzi*, discovered by the Norwegian naturalist whose name it bears. See *P.Z.S.* 1884, p. 387.

²² *Echidna aculeata Larvesi*, Thomas, *P.Z.S.* 1885, p. 329.

²³ Salvadori, *Ornithologia della Papuana e delle Molucche*. 3 vols. 4to Torino, 1880-82.

The Parrots of New Guinea are numerous, the greater number of the 102 species mentioned in Count Salvadori's work being met with within its area. As specially characteristic of the Papuan Avifauna I may mention the great Black Cockatoo (*Microglossus*) with its enormous bill, the dwarf Leaf Parrots (*Nasiterna*) with their curious spiny tails, and the extraordinary *Dasyptilus* with its naked head and harsh plumage. Brush-tongued Lories of the most brilliant colours abound, and are especially characteristic of the Papuan Avifauna, although by no means restricted to it. Count Salvadori includes no less than forty species of this group in his work. The Picarian order in New Guinea is composed mainly of Cuckoos and Kingfishers, both of which groups are well represented. There is but a single Hornbill and a single Bee-eater. On the other hand it should be remarked that, as in Australia, woodpeckers are altogether absent. We now come to the great array of Passeres, of which no less than 501 species are included in Count Salvadori's work. Amongst these Flycatchers, Caterpillar-eaters, and Shrikes play an important part, as might have been expected where insect life is so abundant. The Honey-eaters (*Meliphagidæ*), a group specially characteristic of Australia, are likewise highly developed in New Guinea; Count Salvadori enumerates eighty-nine species. But the greatest glory of the Papuan Avifauna is the family of Paradise-birds. These are, in fact, a group of crows, in which the male sex is decked out in the most gaudy and varied plumage, and extraordinary ornamental feathers of the most remarkable forms are developed from different parts of the body. Taking the group of Paradise-birds as understood by Count Salvadori, that is to include the Bower-birds, we find about forty species attributed to Papua and the Moluccas, and one or two brilliant additions have been made to the group since Count Salvadori's work was finished.³⁴ It is certain from the investigations of recent observers that some of the most brilliant kinds of Paradise-birds are confined to the more elevated mountains, and one of the reasons for predicating a continuous range of high land between Mount Arfak in the north and the Owen Stanleys in the south is that some of the Birds of Paradise previously only known to exist in the highlands of the Onin Peninsula have been lately obtained on the Owen Stanley Range.

The order of Pigeons (*Columbæ*) which succeeds the Passeres in Count Salvadori's volumes is likewise highly developed in New Guinea. Count Salvadori assigns no less than 108 species to Papua and the Moluccas, of which about half belong to the fruit-pigeons (*Ptilopus* and *Carpophaga*), and are of the most gorgeous and varied plumage.

³⁴ A recent letter from Dr. Finsch informs me of the discovery, high on the Owen Stanley range, of a fine new form of Paradise-bird in which the prevailing colour is blue. This is quite a new tint among the *Paradisææ*.

The remaining orders of the Papuan Avifauna may be passed over with little notice as not containing forms of special significance. I must, however, make an exception in favour of the Gallinaceous family of Megapodes, of which New Guinea and its islands may be considered as the metropolis. Count Salvadori includes fourteen species of Megapodes in his work. These birds have huge feet and lengthened toes which adapt them for an exclusively terrestrial life. They are remarkable for depositing their eggs in enormous mounds formed of vegetable matter, sand or earth, and leaving them to be hatched out (like those of tortoises and crocodiles) without incubation by either parent.

To the last constituent division of the Papuan Avifauna, called by Count Salvadori 'Struthiones,' special attention must be given. The Cassowaries form one of the most important and characteristic elements of the Papuan Avifauna. In New Guinea itself at least three different species have been met with; the other six recognised by Count Salvadori are distributed over the adjacent islands, whilst a tenth species of the genus is an inhabitant of the northern portion of Queensland. The Cassowaries, together with the Emu of Australia, form a most distinct group of the 'Ratite' sub-class of birds, quite different from the Ostriches of Africa and the Rheas of America, and entirely confined to the great Australian region. The Cassowaries and Paradise-birds may be appropriately selected as two of the leading ornithic types of the Papuan sub-region.

Before leaving the subject of the birds of New Guinea mention should be made of the splendid series of illustrations of the Avifauna of New Guinea and the adjacent islands contained in Gould's *Birds of New Guinea*.²⁵ This fine work commenced by the late Mr. Gould is now being continued by Mr. R. B. Sharpe, and has already reached its nineteenth number, supplying lifelike pictures of upwards of 200 species.

The Reptiles of New Guinea, although presenting many features of interest, need not detain us so long as the birds: the best account of them is that given by the late Dr. Peters and Marquis Doria in their catalogue of the specimens of this group collected by the travellers Beccari, D'Albertis and Bruijn.²⁶ From this we estimate that the known reptiles of New Guinea are already upwards of sixty in number, whilst it is certain that many more remain to be discovered.

The following table gives a summary of the principal group.

²⁵ *The Birds of New Guinea and the adjacent Papuan Islands.* By John Gould. London, 1875-85

²⁶ See their 'Catalogo dei Rettili e Batraci raccolti da O. Beccari, L. M. d'Albertis ed A. A. Bruijn nella Nuova Guinea propriamente detta.' *Ann. Mus. Civ. di Genova*, vol. 1, p. 323 (1873).

Table of Papuan Reptiles and Batrachians.

a. REPTILES.		
I. Crocodiles	1
II. Tortoises	1
III. Lizards		
1. Monitors	4
2. Skinks	21
3. Geckoes	7
4. Agamids	8
		40
IV. Serpents		
Non-venomous	{ 1. Colubrines	7
	2. Acrochordians	1
	3. Boas	7
Venomous.	4. Elapines	6
		21
		63
		12
	b. BATRACHIANS (Tail-less)	

Crocodiles seem to be fortunately rare on the coasts of New Guinea, and but one species has yet been recorded from the northern shores, though it is highly probable that a second may exist on the southern shores adjacent to Australia. Of Tortoises also, exclusive of the Marine Turtles, only one species seems to have been yet discovered. The Lizards hitherto recognised have been referred to about forty species, and belong mostly to groups likewise prevalent in Australia. Finally, of serpents about twenty-one species are now known to occur in New Guinea, of which six belong to the venomous, and fifteen to the non-venomous group of the order. When we consider the serpents of New Guinea more in detail, we shall be again struck with the resemblances which they present to the herpetology of Australia. Amongst the Boas, for example, we find in New Guinea nearly allied representatives of the Carpet-snake (*Morelia*) of Australia. Again, like Australia, New Guinea is entirely free from the true venomous serpents with perforated poison-fangs, the six venomous snakes hitherto met with within its area being all referable to Elapine genera with grooved poison teeth, which are also prevalent in Australia. It is thus evident that an examination of the reptiles of New Guinea induces conclusions like those derived from a study of its mammals and birds, that the fauna of New Guinea is essentially of the same type as that of Australia.

The Batrachians of New Guinea hitherto recognised are not numerous, consisting only of about twelve species of the tailless division, which contains our well-known toads, frogs, and tree-frogs. One of these may be noticed as constituting a very peculiar Papuan type (*XENOBATRACHUS*); of the remainder, the majority are of marked Australian character, although many of the species are peculiar.

The Fishes of New Guinea are not well known in this country, although our national collection contains, as might have been expected, numerous specimens from the adjoining seas. But the late Dr. Bleeker, a distinguished ichthyologist of Holland, has published many memoirs on Papuan ichthyology in various Dutch periodicals.²⁷ And Mr. William Macleay, of Sydney, who, as already mentioned, carried out a special scientific expedition to Torres Straits and New Guinea in the 'Chevert' in 1875, made on this occasion, and subsequently, through his collectors, a considerable collection of fishes, and has contributed a series of articles on them to the *Proceedings* of the Linnean Society of New South Wales.

The Land-Mollusks of New Guinea were likewise diligently collected during the 'Chevert Expedition,' and the results published by Mr. John Brazier, of Sydney, in the same journal, whilst in Europe Signor Tapparone-Canefri has examined the collection of Land-Shells made by M. Raffray on the northern coast.²⁸ Signor Tapparone-Canefri has also recently issued an elaborate and important memoir on the Land-Mollusks of New Guinea and its adjoining islands,²⁹ which takes up a whole part of the *Annals* of the Museo Civico of Genoa.

But, without descending further into the scale of animal life, I think that what has been above stated is quite sufficient to enable us to arrive at very reliable results concerning the general *facies* of the fauna of New Guinea.

Taking, first of all, the mammals as our guide, we observe that the leading feature of the Papuan Mammal-fauna consists in the almost entire absence of all the more highly organised forms of mammal life, and the prevalence of marsupials. This is likewise the case in Australia.

Again, in New Guinea the very low and abnormal forms of mammal-life called 'Monotremes' occur. This is another clear proof of the intimate connection of New Guinea with Australia.

Passing on to the birds, it will be found that a study of the Papuan elements of this class will lead to exactly the same conclusion. The prevalence of lories, kingfishers, honey-eaters, fruit-pigeons, and megapodes is only paralleled in Australia, which also, like New Guinea, has no woodpeckers. At the same time there is a strong element of individuality in the Papuan Avifauna exhibited in the following three ways. (1) By the large number of species in New Guinea, which, although belonging to Australian genera, are themselves peculiar to Papua. (2) By the existence in New Guinea of such families as the Paradise-birds and Cassowaries, which, although feebly represented in

²⁷ See list of his papers in Mr. E. C. Rye's *Bibliography of New Guinea*, p. 290.

²⁸ M. Raffray visited Havre Dorey and Amberhaki in 1877, having been sent out on a scientific mission by the French Minister of Public Instruction. See his report in *Bull. Soc. Géogr.* p. 385. Paris, 1878.

²⁹ 'Fauna Malacologica della Nuova Guinea e delle isole adiacenti. Parte I: Molluschi estramarini.' *Ann. Mus. Civ. di Genova*, vol. xix.

Australia, are in the main restricted to New Guinea and its islands.

(3) By the presence in New Guinea of a few forms characteristic of the adjacent oriental region, which embraces Southern Asia and the great Sunda Islands.³⁰ These may be looked upon, like *Sus* among mammals, as recent intruders from the north. An examination of other groups of Papuan animals, so far as they are known to us, will only serve to strengthen the conclusions already pointed to, which may be shortly summarised as follows:

1. New Guinea belongs essentially to the Australian region of the world's surface.

2. New Guinea has nevertheless certain types peculiar to itself or feebly represented in Australia.

3. New Guinea has also a slight but appreciable oriental element in its fauna.

It follows that New Guinea and the adjacent islands may be considered as constituting a particular subdivision of the primary Australian Region, characterised by the possession of certain special forms, and a slight mixture of oriental elements, which may be appropriately called the 'Papuan Sub-region.'

³⁰ Such as *Buceros*, *Eupetes*, and *Gracula*.

REVISION OF THE BIBLE.

THE honourable and arduous task undertaken by the Old Testament Revision 'Company' has been long in hand—necessarily so, it may be, partly from the often minute and difficult character of the work, but more perhaps from the number of persons engaged upon it. For although 'in the multitude of counsellors' there is sometimes 'safety,' there is also very often too much of hindrance, through differences of opinion and frequent discussions leading to nothing, or to worse. The work, however, has been completed at last; and in one respect it is more fortunate than its predecessor of the New Testament. It has been received with something more of welcome, or at least with fewer hard words, than were often dealt to the latter. This indeed is a point on which it may as yet be premature to speak positively. It is true that no such vehement onslaught has been hitherto made upon the new text as that which, from different sides, awaited the companion work. But this may be only because the attack is not yet ready to deliver. Even a Dean or a Baronet who may be eager for the fight, however much at home he may be in the Greek Testament, may deem it expedient to take time to prepare his weapons for the less familiar field of Hebrew criticism. This knotty point will no doubt be speedily settled. Meanwhile, and failing objections of a weightier kind than have yet appeared, the ordinary reader may be satisfied that the Revised Version, as now before us, is really deserving of the moderate amount of praise which has thus far been bestowed upon it, although it is by no means all that it might have been.¹

The reader's first impressions as to the general character of the result must, we apprehend, be wholly favourable. Yet, to those who are able to look below the surface, such impressions will hardly fail to be somewhat disturbed by a little continuous examination. This, however, is said with the utmost respect for the Revisers, whose collective wisdom ought certainly to outweigh the judgment of any single individual. Nevertheless, truth *has* been found to lie even

¹ It is proper to mention that the present paper was written before the publication of the article on the subject in a recent *Quarterly Review*. That article, as was to be expected, is severely hostile to the new version: but its peculiar animus is such as goes far to deprive it of value as a critical judgment.

with a minority of one! But, not to presume upon this, every thing advanced in the present paper is offered with all due submission—and it will no doubt be received, by those who may favour it with their notice—for no more than it is worth.

However this may be, it is allowable to point out that a large proportion of the changes contained in the revised pages were simply matters of course, and could not have been missed by any competent hand. In no small degree they have, in substance, been anticipated by previous revisers of whom the world has heard but little. A great merit of the Revision is that it has usually left unspoiled the style and rhythm of the venerable Authorised. There are indeed instances to the contrary, which the reader may find in familiar passages in the Psalms for example, but such cases are not numerous any more than are those in which change may be said to have been made for mere changing's sake. Too many instances, however, occur in which a close adherence to the Hebrew idiom has injured the English, and even left the sense obscure; and places are also met with in which archaic or obsolete words have been retained—words which, in accordance with American suggestions, had better have been allowed quietly to drop into disuse.

On such points as these, much has been written by others, and it is not requisite here to enter into details respecting them. Making due allowance for such instances, it remains substantially true that the revised text as a whole, not only reads well, but also forms for those who read it a more faithful representative of the original than that which has hitherto commonly been in their hands. The faults of the Revised largely consist of faults retained from the Authorised. In regard to these it is no worse than the Authorised, while in innumerable cases it is better, as of course it ought to be.

One who judges thus should not forget to allow something for the difficulties under which the Revisers may be said to have worked. In this remark we refer to the Rules prescribed to them by Convocation as well as to the regard which, avowedly or not, had naturally to be paid to the received theologies of the day. What more precisely is intended by these observations will be seen as we proceed—and, in the first place, may be noticed several of the points to which attention is especially invited by the Revisers in their Preface.

(1) The Hebrew Text adopted as the basis of the Revision is, we are told, the Masoretic; the text, that is, which was in the keeping of the Rabbins of the early Christian centuries, and which had been handed down to them (as the term Masoretic implies) from still earlier ages. This text of the original, carefully preserved and no doubt corrected from time to time, where thought defective, was at length in the sixteenth century committed to the press, and since that time has existed in a tolerably fixed and unvaried form. We may be reasonably certain that, allowing for accidental and unimportant

variations, we have now in our hands the sacred text much as it was in the New Testament times. At any rate, we have no other, so it may be as well to speak kindly of what we possess. An extreme regard for the letter has characterised Hebrew copyists and commentators in all ages. Hence the result, that a remarkable uniformity runs through all existing texts of the Hebrew, both manuscript and printed, attesting the care with which the books have been kept—the Rabbins even painfully counting, as they did, paragraphs and words and even letters. Hence too it is that no critical scholar would now think of correcting the Hebrew at all extensively, so as to bring it into agreement either with the Septuagint or with any other textual authority—such, for example, as the Greek of Venice, or the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The ordinary, received, or Masoretic text, then, as found in the printed editions, was used by the Revisers as the basis of their work. Only, as they inform us, ‘in some few instances of extreme difficulty’ they have adopted a reading on the authority of the ancient versions, recording in the margin this departure from their standard. In other instances, variations possessed of a certain probability have been placed in the margin, and the reader will often find that these are not without interest, though but rarely of any substantial importance.

In thus adhering to a definite form of text already established, the Revisers would find their work much simplified, as compared with the laborious task which the Greek revisers undertook, of forming (virtually) a new text for themselves. In truth no other course was open to the O. T. Company. The materials for the formation of a new Hebrew text hardly exist, at least in any available form; or, again, so far as they exist, they would, if applied, scarcely yield results worth the labour that would be required for utilising them. Any one may see this, who will compare the collection of Hebrew readings formed long ago, with wonderful pains and industry, by Kennicott, or the much more recent small collection by Dr. S. Davidson. Some Hebrew manuscripts of much earlier date than any previously known are stated to have been recently brought to light in Egypt. We are not aware that these have as yet been carefully examined, or whether even these oldest of Hebrew manuscripts are likely to afford new readings of any importance. The recent and important ‘Masorah’ of Dr. Ginsburg ought not to be overlooked in this connection, although the writer has had no opportunity of consulting it.

(2) The Revisers proceed to say how they have borne in mind the duty not to make a new translation, but only to revise one already in existence, which has held the position of a classic in the language for more than two centuries. No doubt it was well to keep this carefully in view; but opinions will differ as to whether the Rule may not have been at times too strictly and even unwarrantably adhered to.

Many renderings of importance in which the Authorised has been allowed to stand, out of deference it may be presumed to this rule, are extremely doubtful, to say the least, and to some of them a marginal note has not been added, as it ought to have been, to apprise the reader as to the uncertainty attending the words. For example, in the word 'son,' in Psalm ii. 12; here, indeed, the margin states that 'some ancient versions render *Lay hold of* (or *Receive*) *instruction*, others *Worship in purity*': but it does not state that the rendering 'son' is altogether doubtful, or more than doubtful. The Hebrew word *bar* in the sense of son is an Aramaic word of late use. It occurs in the Chaldee of Ezra and Daniel, but only in one place in the Hebrew books, namely Proverbs xxxi. 2, where it may be taken as indicative of the comparatively late composition of this part of that book. On the other hand, the word (that is, the consonants *br*) occurs several times in the older Hebrew in the sense of *clear, pure*; as in Psalm xxiv. 4, 'pure of heart.' It may be used in Psalm ii. 12, in the adverbial sense of *purely*, that is, *sincerely*, or *with reverence*. The meaning therefore may be, Kiss, pay the homage expressed by kissing the garment of Jehovah's anointed king, purely, sincerely, with the reverence due. Against the rendering 'the son,' is the conclusive objection that the original has no Article, which, with such a signification, could not have been absent. Hence the rendering 'son' is inadmissible, or at best extremely doubtful, and this ought at any rate to have been noted. But then this Psalm is usually considered a Messianic Psalm, and very probably it is thought by most readers to refer to Christ, and taken to be a very definite and particular prophecy of Him that was to be Son in the later Christian sense. Nothing can be more ingenious, or more fallacious, than these dogmatic interpretations often are; and it must be added, there are too many of them, even in this revised Old Testament.

Another such case, and one which has probably been determined under a similar influence, may be found in Genesis xlix. 10, 'until Shiloh come.' Here either the first or the second margin is far more probable than the words kept in the text. The words should read therefore, 'until he come to Shiloh,' or else, 'until that which is his shall come.' If, however, the rendering given is to stand, and if Shiloh denotes the Messiah, how strange that the word is never used again throughout the Bible; and that there is nowhere in the New Testament, with all its references to the Old, any allusion to this verse as a prophecy of Christ. Moreover, the prediction, if it be one, is absolutely untrue, and was falsified by the whole later course of Jewish history. The sceptre and the ruler's staff *had* passed from Judah generations or centuries before the birth of Jesus of Nazareth; so that from every point of view the rendering which has been allowed to stand was, and is, inadmissible.

A third case of this kind may be found in Proverbs viii. 22, 'The

Lord possessed me.' Here there can hardly be a question that the rendering should be 'created me,' as indeed is recognised in the margin, 'Or, *formed*.' This meaning of the verb is perfectly well established, as in Genesis xiv. 19, and other places. In Proverbs viii. 22, the word is thus rendered in the Septuagint (*ἐκτίσέ με*), as it is in Gen. xiv. 19, and as in more than one ancient oriental text. But then, let it be observed, the Authorised corresponds to the theological idea of which Dr. Liddon has made so much in his second Bampton Lecture, to the effect that the personified Wisdom of Prov. viii. is identical with the Logos of the fourth Gospel;—that the personified Wisdom of Proverbs was therefore a kind of anticipation of that future personage in whom the Logos (in its origin, it should be remembered, a conception not of Christianity, but of Greek philosophy) was to become incarnate;—an anticipation, again, which was unknown and unheard of until some of the ancient Fathers began to speculate about it, long after it could have been of any evidential use as a prophetic anticipation applicable to Christ! This idea, baseless and extravagant as it is, would no doubt find many defenders at the present day; and it may possibly have been the real, though unavowed, reason for the retention of the word 'possessed.' We would not for a moment suggest any intentional deviation from the straight path of exact translation; but clearly a strong bias was likely to arise from such ideas and to sway the mind occupied with them, almost without its own knowledge. While this is true, it is also to be admitted that instances occur in which the meaning 'possessed' is found. It is adopted by the Revised (without much sense and against the parallelism) in Psalm cxxxix. 13, and elsewhere. Still it is not difficult to understand that where a meaning usually deemed heretical comes into a sort of competition with one of the opposite kind, the latter, in the Jerusalem Chamber, will be most likely to be preferred. Accordingly, the Revision retains 'possessed,' while 'formed' is consigned to the margin, and the full meaning *produced, created*, expressed by the Septuagint as well as by the Targum and the Syriac, is altogether ignored. The margin, however, affords at least some hint of the true state of the case, and for this the reader should not be ungrateful. Instances like Gen. xxvii. 3, 'coat of many colours,' are rather different from the foregoing, but equally unjustifiable.

The Rule imposed by Convocation requiring a two-thirds majority for altering the Authorised manifestly tended to preserve old renderings, even against the judgment of very decided majorities of the revising body. A vote of 7 to 4, or 11 to 6, or 15 to 8, would, with such a rule, have no force. The rule was thus, in effect, an ingenious device of conservative obstruction, tending and perhaps designed to give the translators of 1611 a great advantage over the more ample knowledge and less dogmatic spirit of the nineteenth century. From

this source have probably proceeded many faulty renderings of the revised text.

(3) The next subject of importance to which the Preface calls attention is the way in which the word denoting the Sacred Name has been rendered—the Hebrew word, that is to say, which, as found in the Masoretic text, has given origin to the English form *JEHOVAH*. In reference to this important word, the following particulars should be kept in view.

The Jews from very ancient times, probably long before the Christian era, have refrained from uttering the divine name. Nor is that name now pronounced in the synagogue reading of the Hebrew scriptures. The consequence is that the true pronunciation of this word has long been lost, and is probably now irrecoverable. In the printed Bibles the original *JHVH* is pointed, that is to say, vocalised, so as to be pronounced *adonai* (Lord), and in the synagogue reading the same word *adonai* is read instead of it (with some exceptions in which the word *God* is substituted, and on which we need not dwell). What the origin, the pronunciation, or the meaning of the name *Jhvh* may have been, can now only be matter of speculation, and the subject need not here occupy much of our attention. We are told by great authorities that the word should be vocalised as *Jahve* (Yahve), or *Jahveh*, and that it signifies in effect the Giver of Life; more literally, He that causeth to live. A slightly different account would explain it as simply expressive of existence, as though it meant, He that exists, the Self-existent One, or the Eternal, as rendered by the Jewish translator Benisch. This explanation is closely related to yet another, which is perhaps only an old Rabbinical fancy. It detects in the form *Jehovah* an abbreviation for the future and past tenses as well as the present participle of the Hebrew verb of existence. According to this the meaning would again be, The Eternal, He who was, who is and who shall be. This is almost too ingenious; but it is not without support, as in Revelation i. 4, where the strongly Hebraising writer gives in Greek a designation of the Almighty which closely corresponds to this last stated derivation of *Jhvh*. Support for the same view has been found in an inscription on the temple of Isis, quoted by Gesenius from Plutarch, which may be Englished, 'I am that which was and is and shall be.' The most recent discussion of the subject may be seen in the works mentioned below.^a

Leaving these uncertain points, we have next to notice a fact on which there is no doubt or question whatever. The ancient translators of the Septuagint, about 220 B.C., following the sentiment and usage of their people, refrained from translating, as no doubt they refrained from uttering, the sacred name. They had the word *Jhvh* indeed in their Hebrew manuscripts; but, not attempting any trans-

^a *Hebrew Words and Synonyms*, Part I. By Rev. Edward G. King, B D. 1884. Comp. Prof. Driver's Essay on the Tetragrammaton, in *Studia Biblica*. 1885.

lation of it, they too fell back upon the word *adonai*. This, however, they rendered in their Greek version by the Greek *Κύριος* (Lord). Thus *Κύριος* came by a kind of accident to stand in the Septuagint as the representative of the sacred and unutterable *Jhvh*—not as being a translation of it (for it was never translated, any more than it was ever uttered), but simply as its substitute or representative. Hence again from the Septuagint version in which this first occurred, the word Lord (*Dominus*) came into the Latin, and from this again into nearly all modern versions, and more particularly into the Authorised English of 1611. To this must now be added the Revised Version of 1885.

The Revisers observe, 'It has been thought advisable in regard to the word ' *ЈЕHOVAH* ' to follow the usage of the Authorised Version and not to insert it uniformly in place of ' LORD ' or ' GOD,' which, when printed in small capitals, represent the words substituted by Jewish custom for the ineffable Name, according to the vowel points by which it is distinguished.' This statement is certainly surprising and was hardly to be expected from a revising Company of our day—except indeed under the constraining influence of long-descended theological prepossessions. For let the reader further observe and weigh the following considerations: the word *Jhvh*, whatever may have been its lost pronunciation, is a *proper name*. Probably no one who knows anything about it would think of disputing this. It is everywhere used as a proper name, quite as truly so as the words Moses, Abraham, Isaiah, or any other of the numerous personal names of the Old Testament. Now, Christian revisers may be supposed to be free from the excessive reverence of the Jews, ancient or modern, in regard to this sacred word. Why, therefore, should they not express it as what it really is, a proper name? The only reason that can be suggested is this—that we do not know how it was pronounced. But are we therefore at liberty to alter it entirely, to deprive it of its character of a personal name, and in effect banish it from our English Bible? They who would take this course should remember that we do not know how the names Moses, Abraham, Isaiah, and a hundred others were pronounced; any more than we know how the name *Jhvh* was pronounced. Yet no translator or reviser either, whether under the influence of Convocation or not, would think of representing these names by a totally different set of words, words altogether different from their originals both in sound and in etymological sense.

It follows from all this that the true representative of the Tetragrammaton is the name itself, whether the form preferred be *Jahveh*, or the venerable and euphonious *ЈЕHOVAH*. It is at least to be hoped that the barbarous-looking *Yahveh* or *Yahweh* will not become a permanent word of the language. The form *Jehovah* may in reality be not far from the ancient sound of the word, though formed apparently by the mere adaptation of the vocalisation of *adonai*, and

although, in this form, of comparatively modern origin. There is nothing improbable in the supposition that the common form as pointed may preserve something of the ancient sound, handed down traditionally from pre-Christian times to the Masoretic punctuators, and by them transmitted to their successors with the vowels of *adonai*. At any rate the form Jehovah has just the same right to be used as the representative of the unutterable name, as the word Moses or any other name of Hebrew history to be retained as the designation of the person to whom it is given. The exact pronunciation of these personal names is no more known than is that of 'Jehovah,' but yet no one hesitates to employ them as they stand.

In the recent translation of the Hebrew Scriptures by Mr. Samuel Sharpe the form Jehovah is everywhere consistently employed. This is done with excellent effect; for the word is itself one of expressive and interesting form and sound, and is in no way unworthy to stand as the representative of the Name of Names.

The Revisers must therefore be held to have acted arbitrarily in their treatment of this word; and we are left to the conjecture that here again reasons of the theological kind have had more to do with this adherence to the term 'Lord,' than they would themselves care to admit. The following considerations will illustrate this conclusion. The *Kύριος* of the Septuagint, the representative in that version of the untranslated Jhvh, is also perpetually recurring in the Christian scriptures. And is not this, some will ask, most significant? Does it not suggest, adumbrate, foretell, anticipate, even though with singular obscurity, the mysterious fact of the identity of the Person denoted by the word *Kύριος* in the two Testaments?—thus showing prophetically the real nature of Him to whom the Christian Church owes its existence and has given the name of Lord? Against this ingenious theory there is the fatal objection before alluded to, namely, that the idea of the supposed identity was unknown and never thought of until the ingenuity of the Church Fathers had begun to speculate about the Logos, long after the date when the coincidence might have been useful as a proof of anything. Yet the theory is one which is by no means out of favour with English theologians of a certain school. It may be found in the writings even of eminent preachers and scholars like Dr. Liddon and Professor Kennedy of Cambridge. The latter, in his Christmas Day sermon (1882) before the University, expressly makes use of this argument, quite easily assuming that the Lord of the Old Testament must needs be the Lord of the New. Nevertheless, this old fancy of the Fathers, though advanced anew by these eminent scholars, is about as groundless as other ingenious things to be met with in the same ancient writers—their statements for instance about demoniacal possessions and their attendant marvels.

The mode of dealing with this word in the Old Testament will

remind some readers of the somewhat analogous way in which the New Testament Revisers have treated the term *πνεῦμα*, in some places rendering it by 'Spirit,' in others by the word 'Ghost'; this too in bold defiance of their own principle of uniformity of rendering, so very faithfully applied in small and unimportant cases. According to this in itself very proper principle the same Greek word, wherever the sense and context admit, should always be rendered by the same English. But why, then, was not this done in so weighty a case as this of the word *πνεῦμα*?—why, except that to have applied it consistently would have been to leave a great word of the Creeds out of the New Testament?—and that would have been heresy indeed. Accordingly the rendering 'Ghost' must be retained, at whatever sacrifice of consistency, and even though so excellent a word as 'Spirit' with its depth and richness of signification could so easily and so rightly have been substituted for it—this, too, in every case without a single exception.

Before taking leave of this subject it may be well to notice the way in which the Revisers have sometimes dealt with the word *αἰνοναῖ*. Strictly and properly, the form is 'my lord,' or 'my master'; a term of deference and respect used of and to a superior, like *Κύριος* frequently in the New Testament. So it is in the case of Abraham's servant speaking of his master, Gen. xxiv. 12, 27. In some cases, however, the word has been given by the Revision as 'the Lord' (Gen. xviii. 27, 30, 32; Ps. ii. 4; compare Ps. cx. 1, 5), as if it were the word Jehovah, only not in small capitals. The consequence is that, whereas Abraham speaking to Jehovah addresses him in the familiar form of 'my lord' (just as he might have done with any human personage), the Revision makes it appear (or rather follows the Authorised, in leaving it to appear) as if the higher title 'the Lord,' with its religious associations, were employed by Abraham in this familiar conversation with Jehovah. The meaning 'my lord,' is properly adopted by the Revision in Gen. xviii. 3, xix. 19; but here, as if with the purpose of going as far from the exact meaning as possible, a margin has been added, 'Or, O Lord.' Why has this inaccurate margin been added? The Hebrew word does not mean 'O Lord,' but simply 'my lord,' or, at most, 'O my lord,' as in numerous cases throughout the Hebrew Scriptures. Have we merely an oversight in this margin; or is it a result of the same tendency to make the Old Testament correspond as much as possible to ideas of the popular theology of our day?

The proposal has been made by an over-zealous person, and made we believe to the Revisionists, to print all adjectives and pronouns in immediate connection with the Divine name with initial Capitals, in the manner of the Sermons and other Compositions of a certain modern School of Theologians. Happily this attempt to modernise the Old Testament and make it speak the language of a sect has not

thus far succeeded, and probably it was not even entertained by the Revision Company. But some of the facts commented upon in the foregoing pages exhibit too much of the dogmatic spirit which dictated this proposal.

(4) In regard to the difficult word *Sheol*, rendered in the Authorised by 'grave,' 'pit,' or 'hell,' the mode of proceeding appears to be on the whole not injudicious. The word is very probably a proper name, like the Greek Hades, denoting the under-world, or abode of the souls of the dead. 'Under-world' is scarcely admissible as an English word; otherwise, it might have been used as the equivalent of *Sheol*. 'Grave,' and 'pit' are either of them too insignificant to stand as its sole representative. 'Hell,' considering the ideas commonly associated with the term, is decidedly wrong, but the Revisers have left it in one passage, in which the context, as they think, sufficiently suggests and guards the signification intended. But this may be doubted, and with ignorant or unthoughtful readers, such as we have in Sunday Schools as well as in congregations, the popular meaning of the word is pretty sure to be understood. Would it not then have been better, in Isaiah xiv., to have rendered 'The world beneath is moved for thee,' with 'Sheol' in the margin? The Revision would thus have been rid of the objectionable 'hell' altogether; as this word ought also to have been removed from the New Testament, as a term which, in its mediæval and still living acceptation, goes so far beyond the real meaning of the original. The revisers have left 'grave' or 'pit' in the text (they tell us) in historical narratives—but have used the original word itself in the poetical books. This may pass, but it is not easy to see why 'pit' should have been introduced in place of 'hell,' in such a passage as Psalm lv. 15, 'Let them go down alive into the pit,' when *Sheol* would have read equally well, and has in so many other places been substituted. In such cases there is perhaps simply oversight; but everywhere it is well that the original *Sheol* is found noted in the margin, when not used in the text. This gives at least the suggestion of uniformity which is due to the Hebrew; and it enables a reader to detect and correct the inconsistency of the Revision. In many places too the word 'grave' would have been a more poetical and melodious word than the unfamiliar *Sheol*; as in Job xi. 8, 'Deeper than the grave, what canst thou know?'

The Revisers would have preferred the word 'hell,' they tell us, as the usual rendering of 'Sheol,' could the former 'have been taken in its original sense, as used in the Creeds.' This is a strange and surely an inconsiderate statement. Can there be a doubt that the word hell, 'as used in the Creeds,' by those who in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries imposed or re-imposed the Creeds upon the English Church, was intended to be understood in the mediæval sense as 'the place of torment'? The Fathers of English orthodoxy, as it was then established, were devout believers in a hell of the most ur-

questionable kind, one of fire and brimstone, devils and lost souls. Such then, there can be no doubt, was intended to be the 'hell' of the Creeds. From a Sheol of this description, it is at least satisfactory to see that the Revisers so evidently shrink, in common most probably with all thoughtful religious persons of our day.

(5) The reader of the revised New Testament will be prepared to find that the revisers of the Old, while retaining the numbering of the chapters and verses, have arranged their text in paragraphs, and at the same time have abandoned the chapter and page headings. This latter course was unavoidable, in the hands of honest and capable workmen. The headings of the Authorised are too often a confused and strange medley, tending only to put the reader off the true historical interpretation of a passage. This is more especially the case in the prophetic books. The headings are in truth wholly without authority, and nobody can say with any certainty from whose hand they proceeded. But one thing is clear enough, namely, that they correspond to the theological belief of King James's revisers, and the century to which *they* belonged, and if we are not to regard such persons as infallible, there is no reason for adhering to their ideas of the meaning of passages, unless independent inquiry should sanction them, as no doubt, in historical books, it often does. It is a pity that our popular preachers do not sometimes give their people more information than they commonly do give, on more than one of the points just touched.

(6) More questionable is the style of printing adopted by the Revisers, in order to exhibit the parallelism which is characteristic of Hebrew poetry. To some extent, a degree of parallelism is characteristic of Hebrew prose also, for this too has a constant tendency to run into the style designated by that term. Everywhere, however, this form of composition, where it exists, speaks for itself and asserts itself. It was therefore unnecessary, for the sake of exhibiting it to the eye, to print the English version in lines so often broken and unsightly. The text is greatly disfigured by this arrangement, especially in pages or columns of small size, where so often the sentence cannot be put into one line, and where therefore there is a constant overrunning of words, and a breaking up of the lines into unequal parts. What can be more unpleasant in this way than the appearance of many portions of Job, for example?—or the greater part of Psalm xviii. ?—or much of Psalm lxxxix. ? In such cases and as a rule, nothing would have been lost, and much space would have been saved, by printing the lines in the ordinary prose manner, and leaving the parallelism to speak for itself, as it would mostly do. Moreover, there is at times in the English a sort of pretence of parallelism to which the sense does not correspond—that is to say, there is no true parallelism, while yet the words are printed as if there were.

The inexpediency of this mode of printing is tacitly acknowledged by the Revisers when they come to the prophetic books, which although poetical in their language and spirit and abounding in instances of the most beautiful parallelism, as in Isaiah i. 2 *seq.*, are printed as prose. It is to be regretted that the same mode of printing has not been followed throughout.

(7) The Preface further speaks of the relations of the English revisers with the American O. T. Company, which, as in the case of the New Testament, appear to have been of an advantageous and harmonious character. The Americans, it will strike many persons, have shown themselves more free from hampering influences than their English co-workers, and have proposed various changes, the rejection of which many readers will regret. Among these is the suggestion to introduce the word Jehovah, wherever it occurs in the Hebrew text. This proposal, with many others of less consequence, was rejected by the English revisers, no doubt on consideration, but, so far as appears, without reason given. The reader has nevertheless, the advantage of seeing the American suggestions in the Appendix to each volume of the Revised Version.

Passing on from the Preface, a few additional observations may now be made on detached passages of special interest; and these will occupy the remainder of this paper.

The words of Exodus iii. 14 are interesting both in themselves and because of the persistent attempts which have been made to connect them with John viii. 58. 'And God said unto Moses, I am that I am:' the margin properly recognises the fact that the tense here used is really a *future* in form, and that the words may be rendered, 'I will be that I will be.' The Authorised rendering to which the revisers have adhered may have had its origin from the Septuagint, imitated, though not closely, by the Vulgate, and so received into modern versions. The Septuagint reads *ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ὢν*, I am the existing one; or better, I am he who is. This is little more than a loose paraphrase and not by any means a close rendering of the Hebrew; and it was departed from by the ancient translators Aquila and Theodotion, who were both of them Jews, or Jewish converts, and well acquainted with Hebrew. Both of these translators are remarkable for the literal character of their Greek renderings from the Hebrew. They translate the words before us by the future *ἔσομαι ὁ ἔσομαι*, I will be what I will be; and this was followed by Luther, by early English translators, by Dathe, Castalio, Geddes, Wellbeloved, and others. The purport of the words, in either rendering, it is not so easy to perceive. In the one case, it may be eternity of existence, suggesting the connection of the phrase with the name Jehovah;² in the other case, it may be faithfulness to promises, as though the

² The words are perhaps simply equivalent to 'Jehovah' expressed, as it were, in the first person.

Speaker would say, My name shall be, 'I will be faithful to the promises made of old to the fathers and now to you the people of Israel.'

In either case, the want of connection with John viii. 58 is clear enough. Here, a totally different reference, that namely to the Logos idea of the Gospel, is what most probably unlocks the meaning of the passage: or otherwise the 'I am' of John is the same as the 'I am' of Mark xiii. 6, and is found also in other places of the fourth Gospel. The meaning, therefore, may be 'I am *he*,' that is to say, the expected Messiah. We venture to think that the margin, in this case as in others, ought to have stood in the text; but to put it in this place of honour was more perhaps than ought to be asked for.

In Exodus vi. 2, the new text *has* been bold enough to adopt the form JEHOVAH instead of 'the LORD.' From the nature of the context it could not have done otherwise. The same form recurs no less than four times in this chapter (vv. 2, 3, 7, 8); then after this unwonted adherence to the original, the rendering weakly goes back (v. 11) to the old form, 'the LORD.' Such is the inconsistency put upon our Revisers, or a preponderating minority of them, by the tyranny of long-descended usage—just as it must be held to have been in the New Testament in the case of the word 'Ghost,' and in several others of equal importance.

Passing on to the Book of Isaiah, we come to some other examples of the same inability to respond to the requirements of an independent and purely historical revision. Isaiah vii. 14, 'Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel,' is the first case in point. The Revisers have here adhered to the old rendering, in the face of the very plainest and most incontestable Hebrew. This, literally rendered, runs thus:—'Behold the maiden (or young woman) is with child and beareth a son and calleth his name Immanuel.' The article before 'maiden' has been left unacknowledged, except, in the margin. The word rendered 'virgin,' it is well ascertained, is a word of elastic import, and may here denote what the words immediately following suggest, probably a young woman whose state was known to the prophet, and who was therefore, it may be inferred, the prophet's own wife. The word which the Revisers have rendered by 'shall conceive,' is not a *verb* but a verbal adjective, denoting an existing condition, not a future one. It is the identical word which occurs in connection with Hagar, Genesis xvi. 11, where it is correctly given by the Revision, 'Behold, thou art with child.' Why, then, is there such a deviation from the Hebrew in the rendering of the words of Isaiah?—why, except, consciously or unconsciously, to suit a foregone theological theory as to the child of which Isaiah speaks? The margin, it may be said, apprises the reader of the true form of the Hebrew. But then, it should be remembered, the margin will not usually be read from the pulpit. The result therefore to the great public of church

and chapel-goers will be much the same as if the Revision had adopted the bolder course of altogether keeping out of sight the exact full meaning of the prophet's words.

The necessity of close and careful rendering in this case is easily shown. It depends entirely on the translation whether the English reader is to accept the passage in its obvious historical sense, or in the imported, artificial sense of a mysterious and obscure prophecy relating to the distant future, having little connection with Isaiah's own day. The latter is what the text as it now stands will be popularly held to suggest, and would seem to have been intended to suggest; but this is altogether without warrant, if we are to be guided by the prophet's words and their context.

Isaiah is speaking with immediate reference to the events of his day, and to persons there standing before him. He wishes to inspire the king and his attendants with confidence, and he gives them a visible sign by which they may be informed and guided. He refers to a person of whom he has knowledge whose child is shortly to be born. This child shall have a significant name given to it, and in this name is the main strength of the prophecy. The child shall be called 'Immanuel' (God is with us), and thus he shall be a visible sign that Jehovah has not forgotten his people, but will be with them to deliver them. The word rendered 'a virgin' may properly have the meaning 'young woman,' as Gesenius has shown. In this he is followed by Ewald, who however regards the words as Messianic. There is no necessity for so considering them and little probability in so doing, unless we are to suppose that Isaiah expected the birth of the Messiah within a few months of the time at which he was speaking. On the other hand it is observable that this prophet is fond of these significant names. In two cases he gives such names to his children, Shear-jashub and Maher-shalal-hash-baz (vii. 3, viii. 1, 3). In this case of the child Immanuel, we have a third case of the kind; all the three therefore bearing special reference to the political circumstances of the time, and being intended to express the prophet's confidence in the future fortunes of his people, in spite of the adversities which for the moment seem to be overwhelming them. The words of the prophecy respecting Immanuel were, however, in later times, and especially among the Christians, read and applied in the Messianic sense, as is seen by the quotation of the verse in Matthew i. 23, where the writer (in Greek) of the Gospel, more faithful to the original scripture than the English revisers, has not omitted to render the article; although (probably following the Septuagint) he has used future tenses for his verbs. These tense forms, however, are not in the Hebrew; for, as before said, in the one case we have a verbal adjective, denoting a present condition, while in the two other cases we have participial forms which are present, not future, in signification.

Another of these significant names occurs in a remarkable and

usually misapplied verse, Isaiah ix. 6—‘Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.’ The more literal rendering is, —‘His name shall be called Wonder, Counsel-giver, mighty God [or hero], Father of duration, Prince of peace.’ Ought these terms to be regarded as forming one long compound name, like Maher-shalal-hash-baz, only twice as long? or ought they to be translated as separate words, as in the Authorised followed by the Revised? Shear-jashub, Maher-shalal-hash-baz, Immanu-el, are given untranslated, as proper names. It would almost seem that consistency of treatment would have dictated a similar course in regard to this longer form of name. The result would be certainly unique and somewhat fantastic perhaps in appearance; but if it correspond to the facts of the case, appearances are of but small consequence. ‘His name shall be called Peleh-Joetz-El-gibbor-Abi-ad-Shar-shalom’;—allowable, perhaps, and at any rate in harmony with the other significant names in the immediate context and with the usage of Isaiah. But this course would have been a bold one, and perhaps the Revisers have done better to keep the rendering as it was.

One other passage in this book deserves especial notice, for the care with which the Revisers have treated it. We allude to the great prophecy formed by Isaiah lii. 13—liii. 12. One little defect of the Revision may be pointed out. These fifteen verses do not sufficiently appear to stand together as one connected piece, which they unquestionably are. To show this, there ought to have been more of a break in the lines, between verses 12 and 13 of chapter lii.; whereas, as the passage stands, the reader has no intimation given him whether he is to consider verses 13, 14, 15, as belonging to chapter lii. and forming its conclusion, or as belonging to liii. and forming its commencement. The latter is, however, very clearly the case, and it might have been indicated to the reader by the insertion of the word ‘*But,*’ at the beginning of liii. 1.

Next may be observed the historical character given to this passage, probably not intentionally, but only as an incidental consequence of the careful rendering of the tenses. Down to liii. 10, we have the statement of what may be termed the ground of the prophetic anticipations which follow. The tenses are here historical, and are so rendered throughout. The translation is indeed as close as it well can be, perhaps a little too much so, in one or two places, and the effect is consistent and harmonious. The result of the sufferings of the Servant of Jehovah shall be, for his people, prosperity, redemption, expiation of their sins—in accordance with the ancient and widely spread idea that by suffering, even the suffering of others, sin may be atoned for and put away. The ‘Servant’ shall see the fruits of his work, of his past endurance and faithfulness, in the future happi-

ness of Israel, in their deliverance from Babylon and restoration to their own land.

The inquiry as to the person to whom the prophet is thus referring, is not one to be here entered upon at any length. But several sections of this part of the Book (from chapter xl. onwards), in which the Servant of Jehovah is introduced, very plainly indicate that what the prophet has in his mind can be no other than the collective Israel, especially the more faithful portion of the nation, who stood firm in their adherence to the service and worship of Jehovah amidst the misfortunes of the Captivity. In several instances the Servant is expressly named as 'Jacob' and as 'Israel' (xli. 8, 14; xlv. 1; xlv. 4; xlix. 3); and is evidently not one individual but a plurality of individuals: 'But thou Israel my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. . . . Thou art my servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away. . . . Fear not, thou worm Jacob, and ye men of Israel; I will help thee, saith Jehovah' (xli. 8, 9, 14). The import of such expressions is too plain to be missed, and it might seem that only the most devoted allegiance to a foregone conclusion could prevent a man from seeing what the prophet intends to denote under this often recurring phrase. So then, he commences the section, lii. 13—liii. 12, by naming this ideal person in the usual way as the 'Servant,' and goes on to say that, notwithstanding his adversities and sufferings, he shall prosper and see the reward of his faithfulness.

In the wording of the passage, which indeed required but little correction, two or three of the marginal alterations appear to suit the main drift of the whole better than the words actually placed in the text. On these we must not dwell, except only to observe that the word 'deaths' in the margin of liii. 9 corresponds to the plurality of the ideal object in the prophet's thoughts; and that the word 'rich' in the same verse should at least have had a margin. In scriptural usage this word is at times synonymous with proud, oppressive, tyrannical—as indeed the rich men of those times so often were. The word, therefore, may here denote the Babylonian masters and oppressors of Jehovah's Servant. With them, in the midst of them, his grave has been made, far away from his own land. This explanation is favoured or required by the parallel 'wicked.' An alternative rendering would have served to warn readers off the notion of a reference to the sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathea. This, however, with many expositors would be a good reason for omitting such a margin.

But to these small corrections and strictures there might obviously be no end. Such books as Isaiah, Job, and the Psalms present matter and occasion for comment in endless variety. And each critic may easily bring out a different set of suggestions—for indeed Hebrew words are too often vague and elastic as well as obscure enough to allow of very different renderings. And so, from all this it

follows that the ordinary or unlearned reader may be fairly satisfied with the Old Testament Revised as it is now put into his hands; and may receive it as the best that is for the present attainable—at least under the auspices of so numerous and distinguished a ‘company.’

It follows again that it will be the duty of English people who ‘profess and call themselves Christians,’ to make use of this Old Testament! They, at least, who say that they value the Bible as the very ‘Word of God,’ will not surely be satisfied to read from their pulpits, or give to their children, an inferior and often misleading representative of the Divine Word, when a more adequate and correct form of it is at their command. Have they even a right to do this, supposing they have the power? Theological bias and long-established custom have indeed in such a question enormous influence. But with reasonable people, capable of forming an intelligent judgment on these subjects, mere sentiment and use or even the dogmatic systems of churches, ought not to be allowed to override the dictates of common sense, so as to render fruitless the appeal of sound learning, as virtually made in this Revised Version—proceeding as it does from earnest and competent scholars. Indifference and neglect such as this are not to be justified, hardly to be expected. But alas, in the case of the New Testament the vast majority, both of churches and ministers, have hitherto shown that they belong to the class of which the irreconcilable old monk was a distinguished member. Like him in reading his Latin manuscript, they too have largely preferred to cling to their ancient *mumpsimus*, or rather its English equivalent, merely because they have been accustomed to it, and even when the right word is placed before their eyes. Whether, and how far, this will be done in the case of the Old Testament too, time will show; and for the present no very sanguine expectation can be entertained on the point.

NOTE.

In the foregoing remarks on ‘the Servant of Jehovah’ and some kindred topics, it is not intended to imply that the Hebrew prophets, or some of them, did not look forward to a wide diffusion of their religion, ‘the knowledge of Jehovah’ (Isaiah xi. 9) among the nations. There can be no doubt that they did so. But that their anticipation had the definite personal form attributed to it by later Christian interpreters, and commonly assumed in the popular theologies of our time, is more than questionable.

G. VANCE SMITH.

WHAT THE WORKING CLASSES READ.

A GREAT deal is said and written nowadays about the education and enlightenment of the masses. The working man, as compared with his ancestor, is regarded as a prodigy of learning. Nearly every newspaper is conducted with a view, if not to finding favour with 'the people,' at least to avoid giving the people offence. Publications of all kinds—religious, political, philanthropic, social—are started in their interests. Periodicals edited especially to meet the wants of the British working man and his wife are launched in legions upon the bookseller's stall, and cheap editions innumerable take the field almost hourly. To cast one's eye over the pile of papers and serials in the first stationer's one comes to receive the impression that the working classes must be the most omnivorous devourers of mental food ever known. A market which a century since was exclusively controlled by the aristocracy is now open to the democrat or the socialist equally with the most blue-blooded of peers. 'A Workman' gets his letter to the editor printed in the *Times*; and the national newspaper even advocates the cause of the all-prescient proletariat. The monthly reviews print articles from representatives of trade-unions, and the venerable and stately quarterlies undertake to criticise the doings of the democracy only in the most conciliatory, not to say flattering, spirit. Now and again some austere political misanthrope ventures to characterise this pandering to the popular palate as 'venal rubbish,' but it is a protest against a condition of things supported by general acclamation. As with the most reactionary of politicians, so with the most prejudiced of newspaper and magazine editors. The working classes, it is believed, must be 'won over,' or success is impossible. How universal is this impression a very cursory glance at the broadsheets and handy volumes of the present day will demonstrate. Demos, in fact, having acquired full command of Parliamentary power, is now rapidly becoming the spoilt child of the press. What is the motive of the journalist? Is it utilitarian or mercenary? or has he merely fallen a victim to popular superstition?

In some cases, doubtless, it is utilitarian; in many more, purely mercenary; in all an affirmative reply to the last question would explain the phenomenon. When the duty on paper was removed, it

is hardly a figure of speech to say that the literary floodgates were opened, and the land was swamped with publications of every degree of pretension and worth. Great Britain was to be socially, morally, and politically regenerated by means of the printing press. Enterprising publishers started papers appealing to all varieties of taste. The brothers Chambers, with skilful fingers, turned the hose of their genius upon the kingdom; every educated hand seemed anxious to join in the good work, and societies for the dissemination of useful knowledge attained a luxuriant profusion in the new-born crusade against the darkness, the ignorance, the degradation of centuries. A sacred fire possessed the organisers of the people's press, and in the latter half of the nineteenth century the full force of the injunction 'Let there be light' seemed to be borne in upon the soul of wide-awake journalists. In right good earnest they set to work to lift the lowly from the quagmires and cesspools in which their earthly lives were supposed to be plunged, and—is it libellous to add?—to make money. Few philanthropic movements are more hollow in their aims than the philanthropy of the press. Take up almost any paper, unless it be a so-called 'society' journal, or a journal appealing exclusively to the drawing room, and it is difficult to resist the exclamation, 'How disinterested!' Apparently the broadsheet was started and is maintained solely in the cause of the people. If the upper classes are so fortunate as to escape being rated on their ill-gotten affluence and unwarranted social or political eminence, neither are the lower classes any longer the butt for the satire and contempt of the leader-writer. The operations of the pen-and-ink purgatory go briskly forward. Directly any abuse in the ranks of the masses is discovered, an article is secured on it in one of the papers, and an organisation started for its removal. Never was cynicism wrapped in such a garb of solicitude. The explanation is obvious. The daily press is conducted in the interests of the people, because it is believed the people read the daily press. The belief rests on very slender grounds. The working classes concern themselves little about any newspapers save those issued on the Sabbath.

The great daily papers do not fall much into the hands of the masses. Many working men, doubtless, buy the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Daily Chronicle*, but they buy them chiefly for their advertisements. To say, however, that the working men do not read the more influential dailies would not be true. They read them at their clubs, their eating-houses, and the public-house, whilst, in some establishments where several men—tailors for instance—are employed in a separate room, the whole number subscribes towards one or two morning papers and the time lost by one man, who, for an hour or more, will read aloud, the others listening as they work. Working-men's clubs of course take those papers which advocate the political cause to which they are attached. Publicans, as a rule, take the

Times or the *Morning Advertiser*, the *Daily Telegraph*, and the special edition of the *Evening Standard*. Coffee-shops generally patronise the *Standard*, the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Daily Chronicle*, the *Daily News*, and the special *Evening Standard*. All these broadsheets are glanced at during meal times at the coffee-tavern, or at the public-house bar of an evening, but they exercise little effect politically. There are only two daily papers in London which exclusively appeal to and are almost exclusively bought by the man who earns his livelihood by manual toil. These are the *Echo* and the *Evening News*. For years the former held undisputed possession of the ground, and, as was assumed, of the popular taste also. The *Echo*, Radical and revolutionary in its tendency, was believed faithfully to represent the views of the working classes. As a matter of fact, it did nothing of the kind, and except in the case of an infinitesimal minority, had no influence, and was purchased merely for its record of events. The *Evening News* has come rapidly into favour, and has proved itself a formidable rival to the *Echo*. For my own part, I do not know a single working man who buys the *Echo*, but I do know several who buy and read the *Evening News*. A careful examination of the aims of the two papers would now induce one to believe that there must be a very strong Conservative feeling latent in the breasts of the working classes, and that it was only necessary for an enterprising Conservative to start 'an evening halfpenny' to dissipate the illusion that the people were Radical to the backbone. This conclusion is as unsound as that concerning the *Echo*. The *Evening News* is read in preference to the *Echo* because it is the more amusing. That, and that alone, is the secret.

It is, as has been hinted, significant of the particular time devoted to reading by the working classes that the papers which they most largely purchase are issued on the Sabbath. How voracious their reading must be then, all dwellers in the metropolis who, soon after breakfast every Sunday morning, are disturbed by the newsboy's cry, will have formed a shrewd conception. Few working-class homes in England fail to 'take in' some kind of paper on the day of rest. In point of sale, *Lloyd's Weekly London Newspaper* occupies the first place. The total number of copies disposed of weekly is said to be little short of three-quarters of a million. It professes Liberalism, and it is now the most reliable of its class. Among its Liberal contemporaries it is decidedly the most patriotic and loyal. If the papers read by the working classes have any political influence deserving of the name, there need be little fear that the democracy will consent to sever the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland. *Lloyd's* has made a stand against Home Rule as determined as that of any of the Conservative journals, and its lead is followed, however half-heartedly, by most of the other Radical and Liberal weeklies. One

thing is remarkable about *Lloyd's* in comparison with several of the more prominent of its companions. First in the field as a Sunday newspaper, it lacks any sort of relief in the way of light and amusing general sketches. What *Lloyd's* has not in this respect the *Weekly Dispatch* is famous for. Mr. G. R. Sims's papers on the lives of the poor which have appeared from time to time in the *Dispatch* are among the best things secured by the weekly press. The *Dispatch*, from the time when, published at sixpence, it was read in turns by half the population of nearly every village in England, each reader subscribing towards the cost of the whole, has always shown great enterprise. Like *Lloyd's*, it has a supreme horror of anything savouring of aristocratic red-tapeism or privilege, and indulges periodically in tirades against the oppression of the many by the few. Its judgments are, on the whole, characterised by a spirit of fairness, and are not of the intolerant and Republican type of *Reynolds's Newspaper*. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Chamberlain, equally with Lord Salisbury and Lord Randolph Churchill, come under the not very keen lash of this latter journal if they do not act consistently in accordance with its doctrines about capitalists and landlords. Its antipathy to the monarchy is ludicrous in its extravagance. One instance may be given of this which occurred not long ago. A company of foremen tailors held a dinner in St. James's. When the Queen's health was proposed, two of the company hissed and in various ways evinced their Republican sentiments. This the loyal foremen of the sartorial profession resented, and in a very little time the offenders were bundled, in a free fight, headlong out of the room. The comment of *Reynolds's* on this incident was that the two anti-monarchists were evidently the only two sober people in the room! Another paper, similar politically to *Reynolds's*, is the erewhile *Weekly Times*. This journal has recently been incorporated with the *Weekly Echo*, which, though issued by the proprietors of the *Echo* did not prove a success.

The Conservative cause is very poorly supported in the Sabbatically distributed press. The *Sunday Times*, admirably conducted and full of amusing matter as it is, is not purchased to any large extent by working men and women. *England* is so meagre in its news, so intolerant and intolerable in its denunciations of everything Radical, and so bent on publishing little more than those facts which tend to the discredit of the Liberal party, that its failure to reach the masses is not surprising. The *People* must carry off the palm as a Conservative weekly intended for the people. It acts thoroughly up to its title, and is one of the most valuable Conservative organs appealing to the true democracy. The *Referee* cannot properly be called a working-man's paper, though many artisans and shop assistants look forward to its perusal on Sunday morning as regularly as they look forward to their breakfast. Mr. Sims's 'Mustard and Cress' is to

this class of readers quite as entertaining a feature in the paper as are its sporting opinions. The *Penny Illustrated Paper*, under the guidance of the son of the editor of the *Illustrated London News*, has secured a well-merited popularity with every class. It has practically no rival. It sells in its hundreds of thousands weekly, and is impartial in its pictorial delineations of all kinds of matters interesting to the proletariat. Now it is a battle, now a shipwreck; one week there is a batch of Conservative portraits given, another a batch of Liberal. Whatever of interest that takes place during the week and lends itself to treatment in a pen-and-ink sketch is brought before the admiring gaze of the multitude by the *Penny Illustrated*, whilst the world in general is rallied good-humouredly on its faults and foibles by the editor in the person of the Showman. In addition to these papers there are published weekly a legion of religious or semi-religious newspapers—for instance, the *Christian Million*, the *Christian World*, and the *Family Circle*—a bare mention of the names of which would fill a page. The majority of the readers of these are not to be found among the working classes. Further, there exists a host of local journals, published at a halfpenny or a penny, and an equally overwhelming array of organs devoted to particular trades.

An important constituent in the mental food—or rather poison—of the people is the penny novelette. There can be no doubt that this class of fiction has much deteriorated in point of literary merit. The *London Journal* is not what it was years ago. Its stories are frequently the veriest trash, and its illustrations are on a par with its stories. A couple of decades since, when *All the Year Round* and *Chambers's Journal* were the leading spirits of nearly every well-to-do and of many poor homes, the *London Journal* occupied a far more dignified position than it has since taken up. It has lost much of its ancient prestige, and is in many ways inferior to the *Family Herald*. While such stories as 'The House on the Marsh' enliven the pages of the latter, it will soar far ahead of the *London Journal*. We come next to the penny novelettes. Some of these are positively vicious; others are foolish. All may be characterised as cheap and nasty. They are utterly contemptible in literary execution; they thrive on the wicked baronet or nobleman and the faithless but handsome peeress, and find their chief supporters among shop-girls, seamstresses, and domestic servants. It is hardly surprising that there should exist in the impressionable minds of the masses an aversion more or less deep to the upper classes. If one of their own order, man or woman, appears in the pages of these unwholesome prints, it is only as a paragon of virtue, who is probably ruined, or at any rate wronged, by that incarnation of evil, the sensuous aristocrat, standing six feet, with his dark eyes, heavy moustache, pearl-like teeth, and black hair. Throughout the story the keynote struck is highborn scoundrelism. Every social

misdeameanour is called in to assist the progress of the slipshod narrative. Crime and love are the essential ingredients, and the influence exercised over the feminine reader, often unenlightened by any close contact with the classes whom the novelist pretends to portray, crystallises into an irremovable dislike of the upper strata of society. The same dish is served up again and again; and the surprising thing is that the readers do not tire of the ceaseless record of wrong-doing on the part of the wealthy which forms the staple of these nonsensical, if not nauseating, stories.

Half-way between the penny novelette and the *Leisure Hour* or the *Sunday at Home* stands *Household Words*. This journal, published at a penny, no more resembles its parent and namesake than Zola resembles Scott. It is not indeed intended to do so, though many of its readers among the poorer classes, misled by the nomenclature alike of the paper and its editor, frequently believe they are purchasing the magazine founded by the great novelist. Its stories, generally printed anonymously, are of a much higher order than the love-and-murder concoctions of many of its contemporaries, and useful papers on the household and household management are published every week. Neither *All the Year Round* nor *Chambers's Journal* is much read by the masses. Three-halfpence is just one third too high a price to induce the people to purchase a weekly publication.

Of the more religious magazines which find favour in the eyes of the working classes, the two chief are the *Leisure Hour* and the *Sunday at Home*. Both occupy a higher place in the popular estimation than either *Good Words*, the *Sunday Magazine*, or the *Quiver*, and certainly than *Cassell's Family Magazine*. Neither has *Home Chimes*, fighting courageously against adverse fortune, won the hearts of the people. A sign of the times is the popularity of such papers as *Great Thoughts*, *Tit-Bits*, *Rare Bits*, and *Cassell's Saturday Journal*. Any one of these journals might appropriately be called an old curiosity sheet. Brief and good is its motto. *Great Thoughts* culls from master works some of the choicest ideas ever given to the world, and both *Rare Bits* and *Tit-Bits* collect all they can find of interest in any volume they can lay their hands on. Like *Cassell's Saturday Journal*, they offer prizes for literary competitions, and as these competitions are largely entered into by their readers, they may fairly claim to discharge a very important function in educating the people. It may be objected that the reading of the scraps printed in these papers tends to develop a habit of loose reading. The answer is that, whatever habit it engenders, if the working classes did not read these papers they would read hardly anything save the novelette or the weekly newspaper; and, even though gained in a disjointed fashion, it is surely better for them to acquire pieces of historical information thuswise than never to acquire them at all. The two

comic papers most popular with the working classes are founded on the Tit-Bit principle. *Scraps* and *Ally Sloper's Half-Holiday* have nothing to recommend them artistically, but they contain sketches, literary and pictorial, characterised by rollicking fun and broad caricature.

Only the more prominent periodical publications which reach the masses have now been indicated. Sufficient, however, has been said to convey a definite idea of what the working classes read either in the way of newspapers or novelettes. In both departments England will compare favourably with America or France. With one or two exceptions, the popular literature—the literature, that is, which finds its way into the homes of the labourer and the artisan—has not sunk to the low and vicious level of much of that born in New York and Paris. - The papers which the working man of either of these cities is invited to peruse are vulgar, sensuous, and unwholesome. It is to be regretted that several public-houses in London subscribe to these exotic journals for the especial edification of their customers. The English papers as a rule are more silly than vicious. If they are not calculated to raise the moral tone of their readers above that which poverty and overcrowding may have engendered, they at least are not calculated to do any very grave mischief. The worst that can be urged against them is that they *do* help to keep the moral tone of their readers low. Occasionally the editors of penny novelettes are so fortunate as to secure a story from such writers as Miss Florence Marryat and Miss Jean Middlemass. These ladies are probably not aware of the exact nature of the pages which their name will do much to make popular.

The penny novelette has probably much more effect on the women members of the working classes than the newspaper has on the men. As in the former case, so in the latter. In the majority of instances the objects held up to the derision of the people are the aristocracy, the plutocracy, and sometimes even the monarchy itself. Anyone who, being ignorant of the English working man, should take up the chief Sunday papers published for him would probably jump to the conclusion that he was Radical to the backbone. With the exception of the Conservative weeklies, every working-man's paper resorts to the coarsest attacks on the wealthy and high-placed. Capital and birth are the two themes on which the democratic journalist never tires of expatiating. By deriding the governing classes he hopes to arouse the enthusiasm of his public. He is, however, victim to the delusion that the democracy is primarily moved by enmity towards the aristocracy. If the influence of the working-man's paper was as great as many imagine, the whole fabric of British wealth and society would be immediately undermined, destroyed, and reorganised on a socialist, or semi-socialist, basis. In truth that influence is small. Instead of acting up to the teachings

of their papers and effecting a revolution, the English labourer either reads the political articles and fails to act up to them, or does not read them at all. Nothing is more common than to hear a working man extol some particularly bitter onslaught on his social betters. 'Splendid attack on So-and-so,' he will say. 'Quite true; So-and-so has had his way too long;' but apparently it never enters his head to rise in rebellion against the object of his animadversion. His ideas are more abstract than practical. Possibly, too, he recognises that the journalist has written not from conviction of the soundness of the position he supports, but because he believes that it is the position which the working classes will approve and appreciate. It is, moreover, as he knows, much easier to examine a thing and attack its anomalies as a whole than to examine its parts and foundation and discover whether its heart is sound. The efforts of the journalist are thus entirely wasted. Again, for one man who reads the political section of the paper, half-a-dozen study the latest 'mystery' and the police news, while another half-dozen devote their chief attention to the general sketches. The newspapers which appeal to the working classes would do real good if, instead of picking holes in the characters of the high-born and criticising in a spirit of narrow and mistaken economy the national estimates, they were to devote some time to matters which exclusively concern the working population of the country. For instance, it is rare to find a working-man's newspaper pointing out the advantages of the colonies to the people and the best way to emigrate, or the adverse side of Free Trade. The Radical section of these newspapers is bigoted in its democratic sentiments, and supports every anti-capitalist or anti-landlord utterance, however wild, from Messrs. Cobden and Bright down to Messrs. Chamberlain and Morley. Luckily, as I have said, the superficial views usually current in the Sunday broadsheet have not yet succeeded in ingratiating themselves with the masses. It will be an ill day for this country when the literary pedagogue of the Sabbath can induce the democracy to believe in his infallibility.

In the shape of books the working classes read very little. Years ago, had one walked into almost any poor but respectable man's room in the kingdom, one would probably have found two books at least—the Bible and the *Pilgrim's Progress*. Both were held in extreme veneration. Now it is to be feared that very few working men and women read the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and the Bible is far from being what it was—the book of the home. For this the propagation of Sunday newspapers is largely to blame. The weary toiler now spends his Sunday afternoons smoking his pipe and digesting the week's record of criminalities. Formerly, if not addicted to drinking or wasting his hours with boon companions, he became one of the family gathering, whilst his wife or daughter, or perchance he himself, read a chapter from the Book of books. I do not intend to say

that the working classes do not read the Bible now; what I do say and believe is that they do not read it as extensively and regularly as they did a generation or two previously. It is not easy to indicate precisely what other books they read. There can be no question, however, that when they read books they usually read good books. They do not read many, but what they read are of a high order. Cheap editions have brought standard works within their reach, and though the privilege is not largely availed of, it is not altogether neglected. No idea of the reading of the working classes can be arrived at by comparing it with the reading of the upper classes. The latter read everything possible of nearly every author. The former read one or two works in a lifetime, but they usually re-read them several times. Such a method may tend to narrowness; it at least tends to thoroughness, as far as it goes. Lots of working men have studied with great care one or two of Shakespeare's plays; others know one or two of Dickens's works almost by heart. One working man I knew claimed to have read carefully only two books—the Bible and Shakespeare. To say nothing of what it would mean to acquire an adequate perception—and of course he had not done so—of all the glories of these two glorious works, how many people of culture have ever read both, word by word? Another member of the democracy had plunged into the deep waters of *Paradise Lost*, and gone from cover to cover. At the same time there are working men who will devour every book they can buy or can secure from friends, and a curious undigested, if not indigestible, mass they do sometimes get hold of. Hundreds, on the other hand, have never read a line of a book.

The chief difficulty about literature for the working classes is to reach them. If the literature were lying on their table they would often read, but they seldom sally forth into the highways and byways of the literary world to discover what they shall purchase. Beyond doubt they have become possessors of thousands of cheap volumes, but the working men and women of England do not number thousands, but millions, and it is matter for regret that, with the many means of disseminating among them the masterpieces of the English language, more energy is not exerted in bringing home to them the inherent attractions of Shakespeare, Scott, Marryat, Dickens, Lytton, Eliot. The working classes read the Sunday newspaper as largely as they do because it is left at their door. What religious organisations have done in the distribution of tracts which the working classes do not read, surely some other organisation might do for the distribution of works of a wholesome character and of abiding interest which they would read. Without underrating their beneficial action, it may safely be said that free libraries have not done all that was expected of them in the way of bringing the literary gems of the world within the reach of the son of toil. The

elementary education now received by every child at least gives him a power of reading not always possessed by his fathers, but such power is not necessarily employed. He might read more if books were brought to his home. Between the free library and his home, morally and materially, stands the public-house.

Taking cognisance of the working classes as a whole, there is one thing which I believe to be indisputable—viz. that the instruction imparted through the Board School has not superinduced any large amount of reading, except in a shape contemptible and worthless. Neither the newspaper nor the novelette contains any element calculated to carry peace and contentment to the working man's door. There is nothing in it to elevate, to ennoble, to inspire with a desire for truth and right-living. And if, as men and women, the masses have a particular liking for such reading, the disposition is not surprising when we consider what they read as children. The periodical literature of the poor is in every respect inferior to the periodical literature of the well-to-do; the Sunday newspaper is not comparable for a moment in its knowledge of politics with the daily newspaper, and is apparently equally ignorant of the ways of men generally. The working classes, in point of fact, are written down to. This is the mistake frequently made by educated men who take up subjects and deal with them for the uneducated. It will, of course, be urged that the Sunday newspaper is a business concern, and that the journalist produces what he finds is read. The excuse is unworthy and unwarranted. The working classes have made no demand for the ephemeral matter placed before them on Sunday mornings, and it is well to bear in mind that one can scarcely look to the working classes to raise the tone of their press. Rather ought we to look to the press to ply the weapons in its hands with all the energy and talent possible, with a view to awakening the working classes to higher ideals and the virtues of self-reliance and self-restraint, and not to court popularity by unmeasured and unjustifiable criticism of people who have made their position by conscientious industry, or of things which, if not of Utopian perfection, are yet not so black as interested agitators paint them. Whatever influence the working-class press may have exercised in the past, one thing is certain—as the masses open their eyes more and more to facts, that influence will probably expand. It is, then, the bounden duty of the press which finds its chief patrons among the labourers, the artisans, and the mechanics of England to beware of leading them astray, morally, politically, or socially.

EDWARD G. SALMON.

FRANCE AND THE NEW HEBRIDES.

ANNEXATION in the Pacific is fast becoming a momentous problem, the solution of which bristles with difficulties and imperils the *entente cordiale* at present existing between Great Britain and foreign Powers. The subject is not only playing a prominent part in the great diplomatic drama of European politics, but is tending to shake the confidence that for more than half a century has existed between the Australian Colonies and the mother country.

Important as the question is to the prestige of Great Britain and the future welfare of Australasia, it is looked at by the Imperial authorities and by the Colonial communities from somewhat different standpoints.

This is not unnatural, for while the annexing or giving up of islands in the Pacific may involve the Imperial Government in awkward questions of foreign policy, to our Colonies the matter is one of domestic importance, affecting not only the trade of their country, but the future safety of their shores.

France already possesses very considerable influence in the Pacific. In the great maritime highway between Panama and Auckland, commonly called the Eastern Pacific, the French possessions comprise the Marquesas, the Tahitian Archipelago, and the Leeward Islands.

(1) The Marquesas, a group of eleven islands, were ceded to France by a treaty with Admiral Dupetit-Thouars in May 1842. Here for some time a military garrison was kept up, but the French Government finding such an establishment more expensive than necessary, finally abandoned it on the 1st of January, 1859.

The Tahitian Archipelago may be subdivided thus :

(a) Tahiti Moorea, Tetiaroa, Meetia, Tubai, Raivavae, the Gambier islets, and Rapa, an important island, not so much from a commercial point of view as on account of its harbour, which has been described—possibly by an enthusiast—as ‘one of the finest natural harbours in the world.’

(b) The Low Archipelago, also known as the Paumotu group, a vast collection of coral islands extending over sixteen degrees of longitude, numbering seventy-eight islands, and covering an area of 6,600 square kilomètres, chiefly valuable for their mother-of-pearl trade.

Admiral Thouars seized Tahiti in August 1842, and during the following year this island was, at the request of its queen and principal chiefs, placed under a French protectorate. On the 29th of May, 1880, King Pomaré the Fifth handed over the administration of Tahiti and its dependencies to M. Chesse, commissioner of the Republic. The cession was duly ratified by the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, and on the 30th of September, 1880, the President of the French Republic declared:

(a) The island of Tahiti and the archipelagoes depending upon it to be French colonies.

(b) French nationality to be conferred in full upon all the former subjects of the king of Tahiti.

Tahiti is now the centre of government of the French¹ establishments in the Eastern Pacific.

(3) The Leeward Islands. Soon after the establishment of the French protectorate over Tahiti in 1843, a dispute arose between Great Britain and France relative to the islands of Huahine, Raiatea, and Borabora, three large islands in the vicinity of the Society group, commonly called the Leeward Islands. The matter was definitely settled between Lord Palmerston and Comte de Jarnac by the Treaty of 1847, in which the two Governments reciprocally engaged:

1. Formally to acknowledge the independence of the islands Huahine, Raiatea, Borabora (to the leeward of Tahiti), and of the small islands adjacent to and dependent upon those islands.

2. Never to take possession of the said islands, nor of any one or more of them, either absolutely or under the title of a protectorate, or in any other form whatever.

3. Never to acknowledge that a chief or prince reigning at Tahiti can at the same time reign in any one or more of the other islands above mentioned, nor, on the other hand, that a chief or prince reigning in any one or more of those other islands can reign at the same time in Tahiti, the reciprocal independence of the islands above-mentioned and of the island of Tahiti and its dependencies being established as a principle.

In 1882, however, in direct contravention of articles 1 and 2 of this declaration, the French flag was hoisted at Raiatea, and a provisional protectorate assumed over that island by the French authorities of Tahiti. True, this proceeding was disavowed by the French Government, but Sir Charles Dilke, in answer to a question put to him in the House of Commons on this point, admitted that the French authorities had seized the opportunity to open negotiations for the abrogation of the Treaty of 1847 in consideration of adequate concessions on our part in connection with other pending questions. How far the much-vexed question of the Newfoundland fisheries was allowed to enter into the settlement of this matter I am not in a position to determine. One thing is certain, that the French flag is

¹ The population of the French establishments in the Eastern Pacific is over 25,000.

still flying at Raiatea, and these three important islands, declared independent in 1847, are now regarded as French possessions.

In the Western Pacific, the trade route of the future, between Vancouver Island and Sydney, is intercepted, 720 miles north-east of Queensland, by French New Caledonia, 200 miles long and 30 broad, possessing the two secure harbours of Port Balade and Port St. Vincent, and by the adjacent group of the Loyalty Islands, which were annexed by France in 1864. Not content with the influence they already possess in these waters, France now seeks to annex the New Hebrides, an important group of islands west of the Fijis, distant only 900 miles from New Zealand and 1,200 from Australia, and lying in the great commercial highway of our vessels, and those of New Zealand, on the American, Japanese, and Chinese routes.²

Mr. Stout, the Premier of New Zealand, in a letter to the Agent-General of that colony, dated the 27th of February, 1886, graphically interprets the designs of France :

It has been apparent to me for some time that the cost of New Caledonia to France must have been great, and no doubt the French Government now see that there is little hope of reducing the expenditure. New Caledonia can produce little, her mines have failed, and her soil is not so fertile as to enable her to rely on vegetable products. The convicts who have served their time are unable to maintain themselves in the colony. They have either to leave, seeking a home in Australasia or Fiji, or else they commit some fresh crime, and are again kept at the expense of the State. Colonisation in any proper sense of the term is impossible. The French officials, no doubt, have seen that what is required to make New Caledonia approach a self-supporting position is some outlet for settlement of the convicts and emigrants. This wish can only be obtained by the annexation of the New Hebrides. These islands are rich in soil, and will maintain a considerable population. They are near New Caledonia, and the French have several settlements amongst them. It is only natural, therefore, that France should try and obtain possession of the New Hebrides.

So little is known in this country even by the political exponents of our Pacific policy respecting these islands that, before discussing the subject of their annexation either by France or England, it will be as well to acquaint my readers with some particulars concerning their position and people. The New Hebrides lie between 13° 16' and 20° 15' south latitude, and 166° 40' and 170° 20' east longitude, and are included in the new division of the Western Pacific.³ The group consists of over thirty inhabited islands of volcanic origin, which extend 400 miles NNW. and SSE., and have an estimated population of 150,000.

Espiritu Santo, the most northern island, has the largest area, sixty-six miles long and twenty-two broad. Quiros, a Spanish explorer, first discovered its existence in 1606. Subsequently Bougainville

² The trade between the Australian Colonies and the Western Pacific Islands between 1871 and 1880 amounted to the value of 6,486,936*l*.

³ I allude to the new definition of the Western Pacific given in the Declaration signed between Great Britain and Germany, the 6th of April, 1886.

visited it, and some of the surrounding islands in 1768, but the complete discovery of the group was reserved for our own great navigator Cook, in 1774.

Aneiteum, situated at the extreme south, is about forty miles in circumference, and has a native population over two thousand, all of whom are Christians. Every person above five years old can read, more or less, and attends school. Crime is rare, life and property are secure. Cotton grows well; hurricanes are frequent and severe; but the chief distinction of Aneiteum consists in its harbour, which is spacious and sheltered from all points except the west. The entrance is wide and free from obstruction, and safe anchorage for vessels of any size is obtainable.

Tanna, sixteen miles from Aneiteum, about twenty-five miles long and twelve broad, is considered the richest and most beautiful. The population is between ten and twenty thousand. Its unique attraction is a volcano, which has been in a constant state of activity since 1774. Port Resolution, situated at the extreme north-east of the island, is a fair harbour. North of Tanna lies the less fertile but equally mountainous island of Erromanga, triangular in shape, with a sea-board of nearly seventy-five miles. It was here the great missionary John Williams was murdered.

Vaté,⁴ or Sandwich Island, thirty-five miles long and about fifteen broad, is situated fifty-four miles north of Erromanga; the climate is rather damp. The great features of this island are its magnificent bays and harbours. The finest harbour is Havannah, formed by the mainland of Vaté and two other islands. South of Vaté is the large island of Api, fertile, wooded, and thickly populated.

Mallicollo, the second largest island of the group, situated between Api and Espiritu Santo, is covered with cocconut trees, and has a good landing-place on its western side, with deep water close to the beach. St. Esprit island is a very convenient place for watering, as boats can easily pull into the river Jordan, which flows into the bay of St. Philip. The ordinary trade-winds blow beautifully fresh and cool over the land, and cause the temperature to be about four degrees lower than the other islands. The remaining islands of any importance are Pentecost, possessing two good watering-places towards the south-west end of the island; Lepers Island, with a magnificent mountain rising to the height of 4,000 feet; Aurora and Ambrym, the latter a perfect gem.

The natives of the New Hebrides are dark in colour and of moderate stature; their weapons are clubs, spears, bows, arrows, and tomahawks. The dry season lasts, however, from May to October, both months inclusive, and the wet season from November to April; occasionally much rain falls in the dry season, generally accompanied by a change of wind from eastward. The normal

⁴ Sometimes called Efaté.

direction of the trade-winds is from ESE., but the stronger winds, which very often succeed calms, are from SE., and may be expected when the wind veers round to E. or NE.

Under the Charter of 1840 the group originally formed part of New Zealand, and in 1845 it was so indicated in the Commission which appointed Sir George Grey governor of that colony; this fact I look upon as being most material to the present issue. In 1863 the boundaries of New Zealand were altered and declared to be 162° east longitude, and 175° west longitude, and 33° and 53° south latitude, a fact which Sir George Grey somewhat aptly remarks, and I agree with him, does not affect the status of the islands as being a possession of the Crown, which they may still remain, although they have ceased to be a part of the colony of New Zealand. Sir Arthur Gordon evidently understood his authority as High Commissioner extended over them, for he appointed Captain Cyprian Bridge, R.N., to be a deputy commissioner there, and it was in that character that Captain Bridge went to the islands. Anyhow, it is now a matter of history that for fifteen years the independence of these islands was respected by France and not interfered with by Great Britain. However, in 1877 events happened which but too plainly showed to those on the spot that it was the desire, if not the intention, of France to annex the New Hebrides. The colonies, not unnaturally preferring the presence of a friendly rather than a possibly hostile power in their midst, began to petition the Queen to annex the islands, and towards the close of the year 1877 public opinion in Australia ran so high on the subject, and the tone of the colonial press so alarmed the French Government, that their Ambassador sent the following letter to Lord Derby, then Lord Beaconsfield's Foreign Minister :—

The Marquis d'Harcourt to the Earl of Derby.

Ambassade de France · le 18 janvier 1878.

M. le Comte,—Il s'est établi entre l'île de la Nouvelle-Calédonie et le groupe des Nouvelles-Hébrides des rapports d'ordre commercial qui se sont rapidement développés, en raison de leur voisinage, et qui présentent pour la prospérité de notre établissement colonial une importance considérable.

Mon Gouvernement, qui attache beaucoup de prix à ce que ces relations continuent sur le même pied, se préoccupe dans une certaine mesure d'un mouvement d'opinion qui se serait produit en Australie dans ce dernier temps.

Les journaux de ce pays auraient dénié l'intention qu'ils attribuent à la France de réunir les Nouvelles-Hébrides à ses possessions, et demanderaient qu'afin de prévenir cette éventualité, l'archipel dont il s'agit fût placé sous la souveraineté de la couronne d'Angleterre.

Sans attacher à ce mouvement de l'opinion une très-grande importance, mon Gouvernement tient toutefois à déclarer que pour ce qui le concerne il n'a pas le projet de porter atteinte à l'indépendance des Nouvelles-Hébrides, et il serait heureux de savoir que de son côté le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté est également disposé à la respecter.

Veillez, &c.,
D'HARCOURT.

S.E. le Comte de Derby, &c.

In answer to this, Lord Derby (with the concurrence of the Colonial Office) gave to the French Government the famous assurance of the 1st of February, 1878, 'that Her Majesty's Government have no intention of proposing any measures to Parliament with a view of changing the condition of independence which the New Hebrides now enjoy,' an understanding Sir Michael Hicks-Beach lost no time in signifying to the Australian Colonies.

Thus was brought about the Anglo-French Agreement of 1878, which has been, and still is, interpreted by the Imperial authorities as preventing any interference either by Great Britain or Australia in the condition of the New Hebrides.

On the 20th of April, 1883, it was officially announced by the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that neither France nor Britain intended to take possession of the New Hebrides—an engagement which was renewed by Comte d'Aunay, the French Chargé d'Affaires, on the part of France, by the 'Note Verbale' of the 9th of July, 1883, and publicly referred to the following night by Lord Granville in the House of Lords; yet, in spite of M. Ch. Lacour's expression of cordiality, and his expressed anxiety to receive a written

** Note Verbale du 9 juillet 1883.*

Vers la fin du mois dernier, le Représentant de la France à Londres a entretenu le Principal Secrétaire d'État de la Reine de la démarche faite récemment par les colonies australiennes en vue de provoquer la réunion à la Couronne de divers groupes d'îles du Pacifique, et notamment des Nouvelles-Hébrides.

En ce qui concerne les Nouvelles-Hébrides, la question avait été, dès 1878, posée dans les mêmes termes; elle avait alors fourni l'occasion d'un échange de notes, dans lesquelles chacun des deux gouvernements avait déclaré qu'en ce qui le concernait, il n'avait pas l'intention de porter atteinte à l'indépendance de l'archipel.

Il n'est survenu depuis lors aucun incident qui parût de nature à modifier cet accord de vues. Le fait même que Lord Lyons a cru devoir, au mois de mars dernier, remettre sous les yeux du Ministre des Affaires étrangères à Paris le texte des notes susmentionnées attestait qu'à ce moment encore le gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique y attachait la même valeur et persistait dans les mêmes dispositions.

Cependant, dans le récent entretien, dont la démarche des colonies australiennes a fait le sujet, le Principal Secrétaire d'État s'est borné à dire que le gouvernement anglais n'avait encore pris aucune décision relativement à la réponse qui leur serait faite. Les autres membres du gouvernement qui ont eu depuis à traiter de la question au Parlement, se sont même montrés plus réservés et n'ont fait aucune mention des déclarations de 1878. Dès cette époque, le gouvernement français avait fait connaître le prix qu'il attachait, en raison des rapports établis entre ses établissements de la Nouvelle-Calédonie et les Nouvelles-Hébrides, à ce qu'aucun changement ne fût apporté à la situation politique de ce dernier groupe d'îles. Loin de diminuer l'importance de ces rapports, ceux-ci n'ont, depuis lors, cessé de s'accroître. Ils présentent aujourd'hui pour notre colonie un intérêt de premier ordre.

Le gouvernement de la République a, par suite, le devoir de s'assurer si les déclarations de 1878 ont pour le gouvernement de la Reine, comme pour lui, conservé toute leur valeur, et d'insister, s'il y a lieu, pour le maintien de l'état actuel des choses.

Le Cabinet de Londres ne sera pas surpris qu'en présence du mouvement d'opinion auquel la démarche des colonies australiennes a donné lieu, et des manifestations qui pourraient en résulter inopinément de part ou d'autre, le gouvernement français tienne à être fixé, à bref délai, sur la manière dont la question est envisagée par le gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique.

confirmation⁶ of Lord Granville's answer to the Note Verbale, current events but too plainly indicate that France is playing the same game with the 1878 understanding as she did with the Treaty of 1847. Just as the settlement of certain pending questions were to act as a set-off against the surrender of Raiatea and the surrounding islands, so the bribe of no more transportation of French criminals to the Pacific is offered as compensation to the Australian Colonies for their share in the loss of the New Hebrides. True, the island of Rapa is to be thrown in if the bargain is struck; but the possession of a comparatively unknown port in the midst of French territory in the Eastern Pacific hardly compensates us for the loss of a magnificent group of islands, possessing fine harbours, in the immediate vicinity of our valuable colonies in the Western Pacific.

The remarks of the present Premier of New Zealand on this arrangement are significant:

The proposal made to the English Secretary of Foreign Affairs (says Mr. Stout) of sending no more convicts to the Pacific if these islands are obtained by France has no doubt been thought by the French authorities to be one that will be pleasing to the colonies.

I do not deny that it is a great concession, for, no doubt, having New Caledonia as the French dépôt for *recidivistes* is much worse than having New Caledonia and New Hebrides as French colonies for moral people. I am only expressing my own views; still I am of opinion that in New Zealand, and, I believe, in the Australian Colonies, there will be no assent made to the proposition of the French Ambassador.

Mr. Osborne Morgan, speaking officially on this subject the other night in the House of Commons, said that the Government attached the greatest importance to the opinion of the Australian Colonies. A well-meant statement, no doubt, but one which will be received in Australasia with some amount of credulity, seeing the weight colonial opinion had in the recent settlement of the New Guinea difficulty between Great Britain and Germany. Let us hope that the shilly-shallying policy then displayed by the Home authorities will not again be repeated in the question of the New Hebrides, and that Mr. Service, then Premier of Victoria, may not have occasion to repeat what he said to me in Melbourne, that the colonial policy of Lord Derby had done 'a lasting injury to the Australian Colonies.'

A propos of the telegram of June 16, announcing the hoisting of the French flag at the New Hebrides, I would here call attention to the remarks of M. Gabriel Charmes when discussing in the *Journal des Débats* the contingent possibility of the colonial policy of France bringing her into collision with England. I give the translation, laid before the Victorian Parliament:—

⁶ 'Les explications fournies au Parlement anglais nous donnent la confiance que la réponse du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique à notre dernière communication ne tardera pas à constater, définitivement, l'accord qui paraît subsister dans les intentions des deux pays, relativement à l'Archipel des Nouvelles-Hébrides.' (Paris, le 16 Juillet 1883 M Ch Lacour to Lord Lyons)

The English papers threaten us with the possible hostility of England. They must pardon us for doubting it. The enmity of England we should of course be sorry to incur. *But we know our neighbours well enough to see the wide difference there exists between their words and their deeds.*

Now what is the opinion of the colonies on the subject. New Zealand has been credited with approving the scheme suggested by the Government, and it was so stated by Mr. Osborne Morgan in the House of Commons only a few weeks since. That such, however, is not the case the following letter plainly shows:—

The Premier of New Zealand to the Premier of Victoria.

Premier's Office, Wellington March 5, 1886

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that on receipt of your secret and confidential telegram on the 20th of February, and as my colleagues were not then available for consultation, I addressed a letter to our Agent-General, in it giving my views on the subject of the New Hebrides, the part of the letter dealing with which I now enclose for your information. Since then the Cabinet has fully endorsed my action, and it only remains, therefore, for me to convey to you the assurances of this Government of their willingness to co-operate with you and the other Australian Governments in the endeavour to prevent so undesirable a result as the acquisition of New Hebrides by France.—I have, &c.

(Signed) ROBERT STOUT.

The Hon the Premier, Melbourne, Victoria.

The reasons that will induce the colonies to refuse their assent to the present proposal are thus summarised by Mr. Stout in his letter to the Agent-General for New Zealand, dated the 27th of February, 1886:—

1. The New Hebrides have been practically looked upon as a British possession.
2. They have been the seat of the Presbyterian Mission in the Pacific, and any advance they have made in civilisation has been due to that Church.
3. It is well known that whilst the French Government at home allows absolute freedom in religious matters—indeed is thought to be opposed to the Catholic Church—yet abroad, and in the Pacific especially, occupation by France is thought to mean the granting of privileges to the Roman Catholic Church that are not granted to any other religious body.
4. There is also a strong feeling in the colonies that they should protest against any further occupation by foreign Powers of the Pacific Islands.
5. The islanders themselves are strongly opposed to French occupation
6. The labour question will complicate the issue, for it is apparent to me the getting of labourers in the islands for plantations in Fiji and elsewhere is attended with great and increasing difficulties.

Victoria, now as before, takes the lead in opposing any scheme by which these islands may become a French possession.

When it was reported in Melbourne that French annexation was imminent, Mr. Service prophetically pointed out that, unless prompt and united action was taken by the colonies, the matter would soon be *un fait accompli*. After communicating his fear to the other colonies, they unanimously agreed by their various ministers that it might prove a fault, to be ever deplored, but never to be

remedied, if Australia, through supineness, were to allow the New Hebrides, in the important strategic position which they occupy towards her, to fall without an effort into the hands of a foreign Power. These views were telegraphed to Lord Derby, who appeared impressed with the gravity of the question, and requested that the views of the colonies might be embodied in a joint paper to be submitted to the Cabinet. This was accordingly done, and on the 20th of July, 1883, the Agents-General submitted an able and exhaustive memorandum on the subject, which, however, was not signed by Sir Arthur Blyth, the Agent-General for South Australia, as his government had instructed him that they did not coincide with the views of the other colonies with regard either to annexation or the establishment of a protectorate over the New Hebrides.

On the 24th of February, 1886, Mr. Murray Smith sent the following telegraphic intimation of the French proposals to the Premier of Victoria:—

[In secret cypher Secret and Confidential] London, 24th February, 1886

Had an interview with the Secretary of State for the Colonies. All the Agents accompanied by Canadian Commissioner. Received express assurances Her Majesty's Government are determined to strictly adhere to pledge that nothing shall be done to change position of New Hebrides without previously consulting colonial Governments, but he requests us to inform Governments confidentially that the French Ambassador has offered Secretary of State Foreign Affairs France will cease transportation altogether in the Pacific if she is allowed have New Hebrides --whereon he has replied nothing shall be done without consulting the colonies, which was recognised by the Ambassador. Secretary of State for the Colonies then said that these proposals might be more acceptable if Rapa were given to England, and now Granville invites Governments to consider the proposals of French Ambassador, and to communicate result as soon as convenient, consistent with the importance of subject. Rights British subjects, missionaries, guaranteed. Communicate to other Governments.

R. MURRAY SMITH.

Various telegrams have passed between Victoria and London in reply. When, however, it became evident that the question was to be compromised, Mr. Gillies, the Victorian Premier, telegraphed his ultimatum to Mr. Murray Smith, who hesitated at first to lay it literally before Lord Granville.

To the Agent-General, London. Melbourne, March 24, 1886

To-day's *Age* states English politicians favour cession New Hebrides France, condition no transportation, and that Agents-General have no hope successfully opposing this proposal, and are privately convinced France will win. Can this impression prevail? Colonies cannot protest more than they have done. Surely their interests and wishes must be more to England than French aggrandisement. The feeling in colonies is that if Germany or France had Australia peopled by their own, neither would tolerate foreign Power seizing any of islands, New Hebrides least of all, under the circumstances. What would be the use speaking of Imperial federation in face of an act which would proclaim stronger than any language contemptuous indifference for our wishes and future prospects?

Should English Ministers give away, or allow to be taken, New Hebrides to-day, Australasia will assuredly take them back when able.

D. GILLIES.

Queensland agrees with Victoria, and the views of this colony are contained in the following telegram, which was settled in conference between Mr. Griffith, Premier of Queensland, and Mr. Gillies on the 13th of March last, and afterwards submitted to the other federated colonies :

'Colonies in Federal Council, except Fiji, which cannot be communicated with, have insuperable objections any alterations in *status* New Hebrides in direction sovereignty of France. They adhere to the resolution Sydney convention and address of Federal Council 5th February. In their opinion very strong reason to believe that if France cannot get an increase of territory she will have very soon to wholly relinquish to deport prisoners Pacific. Should she not, legislative powers Australian colonies must be exercised to protect their own interests by exclusion. Under the circumstances no advantage will be derived from accepting proposals, but only very considerable injury.'^a

D. GILLIES

South Australia may be opposed to annexing or protecting the New Hebrides, but Mr. Downer, the Premier, has plainly indicated that the desire of his government is to act in co-operation with Victoria in the present matter, and upon Mr. Gillies communicating the proposed telegram to the Agent-General, the South Australian Prime Minister replied :—

Adelaide, March 16

I agree to whole of telegram

J. W. DOWNER

New South Wales apparently approves of the compromise and refuses to interfere. The temptation to get rid of the awkward *récidiviste* question has proved too much for the colony, and Sir Patrick Jennings, the Premier, is already making inquiries through his Agent-General as to 'within what period the occupation of colonies in the Pacific as penal settlements of France will cease.' Sir Henry Parkes and his friends, however, take an opposite view, and so the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales may be said to be divided upon this important point.

When the whole matter of annexation of the neighbouring islands in the Western Pacific was discussed at the Intercolonial Convention, held at Sydney in 1883, by representatives from the governments of all the British Colonies of Australasia, it was unanimously resolved :—

That, although the understanding of 1878 between Great Britain and France recognising the independence of the New Hebrides appears to preclude the Convention from making any recommendation inconsistent with that understanding, the Convention urges upon Her Majesty's Government that it is extremely desirable that such understanding should give place to some more definite engagement which shall secure those islands from falling under any foreign dominion. At the same time the Convention trusts Her Majesty's Government will avail itself of any opportunity that may arise for negotiating with the Government of France with the object of obtaining the control of these islands and the interests of Australasia.

^a See, in connection with this, evidence of Barrière, Governor of New Caledonia p. 17, Parliamentary paper O 4584.

And the delegates then and there engaged to recommend measures for defraying the cost incurred in giving effect to the resolution, having regard of course to the importance of Imperial and Australasian interests.

It will, therefore, be seen that if the present Government of New South Wales is ready to coincide with Great Britain in giving up the New Hebrides to France, the late Sir Alexander Stuart, Mr. George Dibbs, and Mr. Bede Dally, who represented that colony at the Convention of 1883, though opposed to annexation, entertained strong views against the islands falling into the hands of a foreign Power.

Tasmania and Western Australia agree more or less with Victoria.

The missionaries too are not favourable to French annexation, and their opinion should carry weight, seeing the present civilised condition of the New Hebrides is chiefly due to their heroic conduct and self-denying efforts.

Dr. Steel of Sydney says :—

the population of natives in the New Hebrides is rapidly declining, and these islands will certainly be annexed by some Power, as they are well fitted to grow all kinds of tropical spices and other fruits. They were discovered for the most part by British navigators, traded with by British vessels, regularly visited by Her Majesty's ships of war, and justice frequently administered by Her Majesty's naval officers, and finally evangelised by the labours and munificence of British subjects.

Mr. Paton, senior missionary of the New Hebrides Mission, thus expresses himself :—

The sympathy of the New Hebrides natives are all with Great Britain, hence they long for British protection ; while they fear and hate the French, who appear eager to annex the group, because they have seen the way the French have treated the native races of New Caledonia, the Loyalty Islands, and other South Sea Islands.

All the men, and all the money (over 140,000*l.*) used in civilising and Christianising the New Hebrides, have been British. Now fourteen missionaries, and the 'Dayspring' mission ship, and about 150 native evangelists and teachers, are employed in the above work on this group, in which over 6,000*l.* yearly of British and British colonial money is expended, and certainly it would be unwise to let any other Power now to take possession and reap the fruits of all this British outlay. All the imports of the New Hebrides are from Sydney and Melbourne and British colonies, and all its exports are also to British colonies.

The thirteen islands of this group, on which life and property are now comparatively safe, the 8,000 professed Christians on the group, and all the churches formed among them, are, by God's blessing, the fruits of the labours of British missionaries, who, at great toil, expense, and loss of life, have translated, got printed, and taught the natives to read the Bible, in part, or in whole, in nine different languages of this group, while 70,000 at least are longing and ready for the Gospel. On this group twenty-one members of the mission family died, or were murdered by the savages in beginning God's work among them, not including good Bishop Paterson, of the Melanesian mission, and we fear all this good work would be lost if the New Hebrides fell into other than British hands.

Mr. Macdonald gives the following account of the Presbyterian Mission in the New Hebrides :—

It has now fourteen European missionaries, together with about 150 native Christian teachers, who may be regarded as the hope of their race both as to Chris-

tianity and civilisation. The mission is carried on at an annual expense of about 6,000*l.* of British home and colonial money. The natives to a man are as much in favour of British as they are opposed to French annexation. There is not commercially a richer or more fertile group than the New Hebrides in the Pacific.

Several memorials and petitions have been addressed from time to time to the Queen, praying for a protectorate or annexation of the New Hebrides.

In 1862 the chiefs of Tanna sent a petition to Sir John Young, governor of New South Wales, for a protectorate.

In 1868 one was presented by the New Hebrides Mission through Lord Belmore, and the same year another was presented by the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland to Lord Stanley.

In 1872 one was sent to Lord Kimberley by the same religious body.

In 1874 Victoria petitioned, and also the natives of Vaté, through Mr. Carey, of H.M.S. 'Conflict.'

In 1877 the Presbyterian Church of Victoria and New South Wales, the Free Church of Scotland, and the New Hebrides Mission, all petitioned Great Britain for annexation.

And, in 1882, all the Presbyterian Church of Australasia, assembled in Conference at Sydney, entreated for the annexation of the group.

In face of this information, I venture to think the postponement of the settlement of this much-vexed question in order to convert the colonies to the Imperial view is fraught with much danger both to their interests and our own, and if some more immediate action is not now taken, we shall find ourselves checkmated by France.

While the 1878 understanding nominally remains in force, annexation by either France or England of the New Hebrides is impossible without disturbing the *entente cordiale* at present existing between the two nations.

Some alteration in the present condition of these affairs must, in the interests of Great Britain and Australasia, take place.

Having regard to the important work done in these islands by our own missionaries, and the expressed opinion of our Australian Colonies, any compromise that would place the New Hebrides under the control of France cannot be considered. The interests of British subjects in Australasia require that there should exist in the New Hebrides some form of government which can insure protection of life and property, and otherwise facilitate commercial intercourse, which it is but too evident that the Western Pacific Order in Council of 1877 fails to effect.

What I suggest is, that a Government, representing native, colonial, French, and British interests, should be formed, and diplomatically recognised by the interested Powers as authoritative.

C. KINLOCH COOK.

RECREATIVE EVENING SCHOOLS.

UNDER this title a work has lately been begun in London, which has as yet attracted little attention.

Before the public knew anything about it, a representative body of working men, the London Trades Council, had proposed it to the School Board of London, and the Board, almost without variation, adopted the proposals of the Council. Recreative evening schools had been tried in Nottingham, where Dr. Paton, the originator of the scheme, had influence enough to induce the local board to make the experiment, and they had been proved a success.

The scheme was not therefore a castle in the air—it was practical and workable, and adopted at once on this guarantee by the London Board. The thing was settled in principle before the general public had even heard of it. For my own part, when I first saw the circular of the London Trades Council appealing to us all to come and take their young people in hand, and by the means suggested help to complete their imperfect education and gather them in from the streets, I felt overwhelmed. It was too delightful to be readily believed. All our poor little efforts here and there by clubs and institutes had small and partial results; they left such vast masses outside becoming more and more beyond control, and exercising a great force of attraction on those inside our little folds, that one struggled on against a disposition to despair. It was worse than our work being small, that it could not be thorough in the midst of such a world. The very sense of humour in the people was vitiated; that which pleased and amused the youths set the nerves of the cultured on edge; vulgarity could go no further. Through such a deflection of taste it seemed hopeless to bring it back. People who thought to do it by a ballad concert or some nice penny readings here and there, no doubt had a reward in themselves; but they might as well try to sweeten the pestiferous concourse of the drains of London at Barking Reach by dropping into it a few rose-leaves. When, therefore, the leaders of the working men, who are apt, some of us fancy, to confine themselves too exclusively to dreams of a millennium politically achieved, and not to try enough what may be done for the people by the people without any Parliament-made laws, suddenly began thus to arouse themselves

and to look at home, the world seemed to grow brighter. One had been longing and praying that parents would appear to care a little more what became of their big boys and big girls, and keep a tighter hand upon them and take an interest in bringing them up decently and giving them better education; but at the same time there had been no denying how much excuse was to be made under the existing conditions of London life. But suddenly, after years of working without help or even much apparent sympathy from parents, there arose this voice from the people themselves, demanding what we had longed for, and the antiphon of the London School Board.

The way was opened at once to a great and united movement, in which all men of good-will might and must join to bring back these lost tribes of uneducated children. For the fact confronts us that much of the thirteen millions spent annually on elementary education is barren of results of real value, owing to education coming to a dead stop for almost all children at the age of twelve or thirteen. At that age a child has just mastered the mechanical acquirement of the arts of reading, writing, and arithmetic; it has been entrusted with the keys of knowledge, but does not enter in; it has arrived at the starting-point of education, and there it stops—that is to say, education ends where it ought to begin. Thus, at a tremendous expenditure, over which we are always growling, we give the national progeny an education which we allow to be wasted and turned to no account. The enormity of the waste may be gathered from the fact that nearly half a million of children leave school every year and only about five per cent., it is calculated, pursue their education in any way from the point where it is dropped; and of the two and a half millions who are between the age for leaving school and eighteen, but twenty-seven thousand attend evening schools in the course of the year—many out of this small number only for a short time. Of course we may be met by ignorant optimists with the comfortable assumption that there is much home education and self-education going on; but those who know will say that this is a vain confidence.

Since education became compulsory and the enforcement of school attendance a matter of police; since the State stepped in between the parent and the child, and made the period of school attendance a sort of penal servitude, it is rarely that study is voluntarily continued or resumed when that period is terminated. An intense reaction sets in. The policeman's hand off its collar, the child naturally runs away; the parent considers the duty of educating fulfilled. Then the labours of life begin; and ten hours in a factory tax the child's physical powers to the utmost. There is no appetite for books when the crowd of fagged boys escapes from the long daily bondage, or the girls, cramped up at their work so many hours, get out into the streets.

Nor in London, where 84,000 leave school every year, have many of them homes in which, if they were ever so well-disposed, they

could sit down comfortably to study. It is not the exception for parents to be out with the door-keys in their pockets; and these poor children in vast numbers roam the streets, and, instead of continuing and improving their education, are quickly turning aside from all the good they have learned, and losing the grace of their schooldays. For the last four years evening classes have been opening in the Board Schools as they did long before in others; but what can be expected?—only failure. This is illustrated by the total evening school attendance already stated. We might as well expect a released convict to return of his own accord to prison as for those weary children to go back to school. For the immense majority, education absolutely ceases when they leave school, and the slight impression is soon obliterated. Just at the time when they would acquire a taste for study—when it would cease to be a mechanical drudgery, when they would understand the value of instruction, the whole process ceases, and all that has gone before and for each child cost the country and its parents so much money, is rendered to a great degree, if not entirely, valueless.

True there is a literature specially provided for the vast amount of raw material annually flung out of our schools ready for manufacture. It is to enable the two million and a half of boys and girls in transition to be laid hold upon by this horrible scoundrel-making machinery that we have taught them to read. This kind of literature, of which I see a good deal, represents the world through a distorting medium of false sentiment, infamous hero-worship, vicious love; a world devoted to burglaries, highway robberies, murders, and other crimes of every depth of dye. Instead of teaching anything of sterling worth, this literature depraves and warps the ideas of youths, and makes them long for highly spiced criminal excitements. Surely this is a bad use for the treasure of the country to be applied to, providing a market for such garbage. Regarded simply from the lowest ratepayer's point of view, it is a frightful and intolerable waste of revenue.

Many of these children, doing children's work, when they grow up will be without trades. Instead of developing in them—in this middle term when they are practically working for others, not for themselves—aptitudes which would conduct them to well-being, if not to fortune, and create new elements of productive force, and of future prosperity to the country, we allow them to relapse into almost total ignorance. We do not bring them on far enough to take advantage of technical education, even if it were offered them free. With the immense advances of knowledge, there are processes in every industry for which much intelligence is needed to make a thorough workman. In all the subdivisions of trade a general insight is not acquired save by those who are educated enough to obtain it for themselves. Without it the individual is helpless and at the mercy of others; he knows only his own minute part of a puzzle which he cannot put

together. Nor can he, without a knowledge of principles, improve on old methods.

So the farther invention and discovery go ahead, the farther the ignorant workman is left behind, and reduced to a state of impotency. His ignorance becomes intenser ignorance as light and knowledge increase. Some change of process which affects his minute subdivision throws him out of work and reduces him to pauperism. The industrial mechanism acquires an extreme delicacy when this is the case; it is disorganised and reduced to helplessness by the slightest change as it could not have been in primitive times, when each mechanic was master of a trade—not merely of a small portion of it. He could formerly, as he cannot now, adapt himself to altered circumstances.

The material loss is great, but the political and moral loss immeasurable. These are the future electors who will exercise so much influence on the world's destiny. The constituents of an imperial race, they ought to be educated with a view to the power they will wield. Every Englishman ought to know something about the dependencies of England, as one of the heirs of such a splendid inheritance; he should understand English interests, something about her commerce, her competitors, the productions and trade of other lands. He ought to know his country's historical as well as her geographical position. He cannot, with safety to the empire, be allowed to be so ignorant as to be unfit for his political trust, like loose ballast in a vessel, liable, in any agitation that may arise, to roll from side to side and so to destroy national stability.

For the individual those years are decisive between thirteen and eighteen. They form the character; they regulate the habits of a lifetime; they stamp the features. Nevermore can those years be overtaken. Each year half a million cross the rubicon of life and leave behind the power to change. We speak and write about 'the residuum' and 'scum'—mixed in metaphor and ideas—throwing the blame on 'this last' whose educational opportunities have been but as one hour to the twelve of his betters; and we forget it is to our own shame that, in a day of great enlightenment, intenser shadow falls upon the masses. The Education Act of 1870, which was looked upon as the Abolition of Ignorance, has failed to achieve its object; it has left darkness grosser by the revolt of those educated under compulsion. The education it has enforced is worthless; it is like a fair woman without discretion—as a pearl in a swine's snout—this mere capacity to read which leaves its possessor brutal and uncultured. How is this shortcoming to be remedied? We have gone as far as we dare in the direction of cramming the greatest amount of teaching possible into the shortest span of a child's life. The question of overpressure is one about which doctors and educational pundits differ; but I can testify that I have seen children driven dull by overwork. At this moment, as I write, a woman has called with her

little girl, who has got 'St. Viper's Dance' from working and worrying before the examinations; it is a fact that children's sleep is disturbed by the nightmare pressure which makes them cry out in their dreams; and I have stated elsewhere that one of my teachers was sent for lately to calm the agony of mind of a little girl, on her death-bed, at being absent from the impending school inspection, that she might, as her mother said, die in peace. Considering the miserable results we do get up to the age of thirteen, the listless progress, in spite of driving, that children of a languid temperament, from under-feeding and other sanitary causes, make, it is hard to see how we can diminish aught of the tale that is exacted; but the responsibility would be perilous of crowding more than is already imposed upon it on that narrow ledge of childhood. We cannot ask less, and we dare not ask more.

There are strong objections to other expedients—to making school attendance compulsory to a more advanced age, or evening-school attendance compulsory, as in Switzerland and in certain of the German States. The former would be hard on the parents, the latter harder on the children. There is a demand for cheap labour; and at the present moment, when the number of men unemployed is so formidable, the wages of their children are the only support of multitudes. It may be true, if they were driven to school there would be more work for men; but, on the other hand, it is by children's labour that a good deal of work is kept in the country which would otherwise go abroad. The working man is—perhaps fortunately—inconsistent in this, that while he will not himself work below a certain standard he considers fair for a man's labour, he will allow his boys to do the same work for a much less wage.

But however this may be—whether in the long run it would, or would not, be better for the working man if his children were kept at school to fourteen or fifteen, instead of being sent prematurely to labour, and, though bringing in a few shillings, cheapening the whole labour market—there can be no doubt that there are many poor women dependent on their boys' earnings. Even as it is, magistrates are loth to convict in such cases.

Among the working lads with whom I associate, no few are the chief support of their mothers: and the lives of self-denial led by many of these poor fellows—unattractive, perhaps, in exterior, rough in manners, often far from choice in language—must, where sterling and unconscious merit is weighed, be deemed noble. The effect of taking away such innumerable props from humble life would be to considerably increase the pauperism of the country and aggravate the distresses of the poorer classes. Certainly it is no time to do this.

But to compel school attendance after all those weary hours imposed on the young toiler, for whom Nature has intended youth as the playtime of life—mental drudgery coming upon the top of bodily

drudgery—would be to inflict an intolerable wrong—to make these lads more discontented and defiant than they are, and to affect most injuriously the physique of the rising generation—bad enough already. Besides, it would be found very hard in this country to enforce school attendance upon working boys. But the possibility of doing so, it is hardly worth discussing, for the electorate would never allow such a tyrannical Act to pass. Compulsory education, even of school children, is unpopular enough, and the country would not stand compulsion being applied beyond the existing limits.

Out of this dilemma the success of the new movement will release us. Its method is to make the evening school a place of welcome, of pleasure and recreation, mixed with solid usefulness and educational work. I hope that the Board will, as it is seen how the experiment works, allow more recreation to be interwoven by the voluntary teachers into the code subjects taught by its own paid teachers; and that the latter will enter into the spirit of the method and infuse into their own teaching more life and reality, and make it bear more on the concerns of the boys' and girls' daily life. This will be all the more needful as, from having, this first session of the experiment, only those who are students for pure study's sake, we begin to gather in those who are less eager for knowledge and more bent on recreation.

The work begun during this winter is no test; but it has prevented schools from dying out as they generally do at the end of the session, and in some instances added to them. But our sound has not yet gone out; our specific has not been tried on the roving street boys and street girls whom we want to attract in; and it is on the ultimate power of the system to draw in these outsiders that its claims will rest.

It is for the prodigals of education that we want the windows of our house to be full of light and suggestion of entertainment. We want the stream borne outward of song, and the music of the drill, and the running of many feet in the maze, and the clinking of dumbbells, and the inspiring word of command, and the shadow of graceful movements, to bring in those young wasters of their youth. Then we shall show them our pictures vivid with colour, and bring them round Greater Britain, and make them travelled, and teach them of science and art, and carry their minds far back into the realms of history and show them many wonders. And their minds will glow like the pictures and begin to teem with new thoughts and ideas; and they will slowly understand why it was they were dragged to school as little children, spite of tears and often with poor little empty stomachs. The drawing class will impart a new delight, and in the other art classes, carving wood and modelling—that strange making power of man—the likeness of the Highest will begin to develop, and the *Geist* to come into eyes till now dull and defiant. Thus our new leaven will work until the whole mass is leavened; and those weird crowds of haggard boys and wild, unkempt girls have disappeared from the

highway; for the servant abroad has gathered and compelled them to come in by the best compulsion, the irresistible attraction within, to the house of wisdom.

It may possibly be assumed that there is something antagonistic in this movement to work of a similar kind actually going on in church schools and clubs. So far from that being the case, the new association will gladly help, where help is needed, to fill with a fuller life the work being carried on through those channels. But the main reason why so much is undone is that the Board Schools, which form a large part of the educational system, have had no organ such as church schools have for assimilating children of a larger growth.

They have no clergy to shepherd the children and follow them out into life, to retain their affections and collect them to social gatherings, and by the combination of the simple pleasures of their lives with religious duties to bind them together. They have no guilds, no homes in the country. There has been nothing hitherto but the bare, hard machinery of education, without the faintest hold of love or interest beyond code work. And yet these schools stand where schools were needed most, and where, as child life is thickest, so boy and girl life is thickest also, and they are the only fostering wings that ever the pupils passing through them know. Those hundreds of thousands have never consequently been affiliated to any religious body, but, having passed through and had their wretched portion of education divided to them, they get no more care and are lost in the sea of human life. But there stand those splendid palaces of education through which they have gone, forming a vast network over the whole of the world-like city, and provided, for those past scholars, under the new evening-school code, with a staff of paid teachers, always on the spot to maintain discipline; with all their apparatus; with playgrounds—oases in the mighty deserts of London.

All that is needed is to bring them the organised life and friendship which religious workers supply in the denominational schools. The local secretary and the body of voluntary helpers, with the evening-school managers, will form the soul of the new body, which will grow from term to term, and attract to itself more and more of the lost children of the schools. Religious work, far from being hindered by taking these young people out of the streets, will be made by degrees possible among them. Decency, order, good taste, are not anti-religious, but the best handmaids of religion. Those boys and girls who have received the shade of thought and refinement, and had the roughness and studied brutality of the streets removed, will be touched by the Old Story as they could not have been in the former days. Music will find its way into their souls, and the beauty of religious art and pageantry will exercise its glamour. There will be the imagination to climb above vulgar things, eyes to see, and ears to hear.

The idea, then, is not only to make the evening school bright with

song, with gymnastic exercise set to music like the soldier's march, with vivid pictures awakening the dull imagination, bounded hitherto by the bricks and mortar and dustbins in courts and alleys, to scenes of travel and history, and natural phenomena, and the wonders of nature and science; not only to set young fingers carving and drawing and modelling, and fill empty heads, but also to fill empty hearts; to give friends to those boys and girls; to give them right hands of fellowship; to go with them to the cricket-field, to the swimming-bath, on country rambles. To pilot a party of London boys through the forest is a new experience; the world becomes fresh to old eyes from theirs. Wonder inexpressible as a pair of jays dart out before us, chattering down the long avenues; or the wood-pigeons persuade, or the cuckoos are recognised as the original of the cuckoo-clock. The commonest things are gathered as if they were enchanted, until the freight they intended to bring home grows beyond bounds, and the discovery of Nature's prodigality at last makes them throw all away save some little branch or flower, as an evidence that fairy-land exists. Then we can have botanical and entomological excursions, and open their minds and imaginations by these country dips. Gradually the life of the evening school will become corporate; it will not dissolve at the end of each session; by the grace of the Board we shall keep all that we have gained, and wind refining influences round our young people, and implant a purer taste, which will begin to reflect itself on public amusements. 'The Great' and 'the Jolly,' and all the other unspeakable vulgarisms at whom men cacinated, will be hissed off, and real humour will return to its deserted abode; and real singing, and beautiful dancing, and true sentiment, and business good and true to art and nature of all kinds, will again be appreciated. Time will develop our plans. Those lordly schools will still be our centres; their paid and regular staff, the great dependence and permanent strength of the work, will enter into it with all their hearts when they come to understand it fully, and see its ends and aims; our voluntary work will be a graft on the strong stem, to make it fruitful; but all the fruit will not be on this little grafted bough; the whole tree will be glorious with fruit and blossom.

Then we shall begin to extend our work still further; to make provision that once in the year the country sun shall bronze pale faces; to draft our girls and boys away to hospitable country houses or cottages where the Squire will make them the welcome guests of the villagers for a happy week or two—halcyon days in their toiling, noisy, ugly lives—days that will illuminate and sweeten the year by pleasant recollections and joyful hope. Then, linked with our school life-centres—and who can tell but that the Board, backed up by public opinion, may take this up?—we shall establish higher and technical schools, not barred with golden bars against the poor, but open without payment to needy talent. So, having found out in our first grade

evening schools the natural resources of the country, we shall pass them on and develop them; and apprentices whom their masters teach grudgingly and of necessity, trying to spin out teaching to the last, lest they should know too much and possibly break away, and so prevent them from ever becoming thorough workmen, we shall, in these universal technical schools, teach the highest and fullest and best, without regard to their selfish masters' scruples and fears.

From the mass, submitted to the test of simple art classes, talent will be separated and handed on to a more advanced training. Every boy may have friends, opportunities, possibilities opened to him, horizons of hope. He will by his teachers be linked to a world of greater culture than his own, and also have his eyes and heart opened to the fact that he is not overlooked, not uncared-for, in this vast crowd of human beings. Plans will thus widen out, and, through unsatisfactory results and many impediments, we must look forward and see the day of great things through the day of small beginnings. It will need continuous well-directed energy and order to work out a system, and there must be no carpet-knights in posts of trust and responsibility. Away through the evening the children of light must speed, with unflinching punctuality and the sense of a great trust. Nothing must make them fail or weary to realise the great ends which will be gained by the faithful discharge of small duties, and the vastness of the scheme, in which they are links, will stimulate them and quicken their pulses. There are many looking on who are profound unbelievers in voluntary work and workers, and prophesy, 'They won't stick to it.' But I believe that when we get the right men—as we shall in course of time—and get rid of the wrong ones—weed out our mistakes—there is something so distinct, so hopeful, and so approaching to a new faith and the light and heat of enthusiasm its passage generates in this movement, that there is no room for fear of our voluntary workers failing. I do not depend on the 'upper classes' alone—this is a working-men's movement. Young workmen I have found throw themselves into it heartily; they are willing to go long distances; and I think to see teachers of their own class among them has a great influence on the taught. Here there is no suspicion of condescension, no instruction from a superior's point of view; but one of themselves, entirely on their own level, who comes in a brotherly way to make them happier or better. This is the feeling we must all aim at imparting to those we teach; and we must try in this work, as much as possible, to get rid of the disadvantages of birth, 'gentility,' difference of sphere, to drop on our side all ideas about difference of station. We shall not really derogate thereby from any respect to which we are duly entitled, but it will be given freely and even lovingly.

THE DISSOLUTION AND THE COUNTRY.

IN the debate rising out of the defeat of Mr. Disraeli's Government on the Irish Church resolutions in 1868, Mr. Gladstone stated what were the conditions which in his view justified a Minister in making an appeal to the country by way of dissolution against an adverse Parliamentary vote. There must, he said, be in the first place an adequate issue of public policy. There must, in the second, be a reasonable probability that the decision of the country will reverse that of the House of Commons. Both these conditions certainly exist now. Mr. Gladstone, in his latest manifesto, stated that the issue before the nation is the gravest which has been submitted to it during the past half-century. He might probably have said with truth that it is the gravest which has been submitted to the country since the Act of Union with Ireland was passed. There is no ground for doubting that not only Her Majesty's Ministers, but the parties and groups of parties allied against them, hold, the one with alarm, the others with hope, that there is a fair chance of the country refusing to countenance the vote against Home Rule for Ireland. Both sides are eager, but both sides feel that the result is supremely uncertain. Mr. Gladstone mentioned another condition which had been alleged to justify dissolution of Parliament, but of which he denied the force. A Ministry may not dissolve simply for the purpose of obtaining from the country a vote for its own continuance in office. Usually this disallowed consideration is inseparable from the others. Whatever may be the definite issue before them, the constituencies will ordinarily vote less upon that than upon the general character of the Administration which makes appeal to them. Certainly this will be so in the elections which are now impending. The country, if it returns a Ministerial majority to the new Parliament, will vote more for Mr. Gladstone than for Home Rule. It will vote for Home Rule because it is proposed by Mr. Gladstone, and not for Mr. Gladstone because he proposes Home Rule. If his attitude on the subject had been the reverse of what it is, if the provisions and machinery of his Bills had been wholly dissimilar from what they were, there is no reason to doubt that the members of Parliament who went with him into the lobby on the 8th of June would still have accompanied him thither, and that, with the exception perhaps of Mr. John Morley, his Cabinet would

have adhered to him with glutinous tenacity. If Mr. Gladstone had proposed Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, Mr. Chamberlain's scheme would now command the assent of the majority of the Liberal party. If, in the exercise of his own freedom of judgment, Mr. Chamberlain had propounded a counter-scheme identical with that which Mr. Gladstone has put forward, he would be scouted and denounced as a traitor, animated by motives of jealousy and personal rivalry.

Mr. Gladstone is not himself responsible for this state of feeling among large classes of his fellow-subjects, possibly among a majority of the people of these islands. But it imposes an immense responsibility on him. The statesman who is sure that any scheme which he may devise will be accepted by half, or nearly, or more than, half of the nation simply because he has devised it, is bound to be very careful in his proposals—to think once, to think twice, to think thrice before he lays them before the world, and to think three times more before he refuses to modify them. The dictum of the old saint and sage, bidding his readers to consider the things said and not the person saying them, is a counsel of perfection to which the weakness of human nature can seldom be equal. But the more the hearers consider the person who speaks or writes, the more the person speaking or writing is bound to consider the things spoken or written. The jealous scrutiny, the minute and sceptical examination which they decline to exercise on him, he must exercise on himself. Mr. Gladstone has written much on the influence of authority in matters of opinion: it cannot be excluded from them. People will believe because the evidence has convinced somebody else. They assent to the conclusions of a man of thought or action without understanding his premisses or his processes. The wielders of an authority such as Mr. Gladstone exercises in England are invested with a power and a responsibility compared with which those of a despotic sovereign or a dictator are slight. Mr. Gladstone submits his scheme to the judgment of the country; and a large part of the country is prepared to submit its judgment to Mr. Gladstone's scheme.

Mr. Gladstone could not have gained such a position as this without being as well entitled to it as any human being could possibly be. But then no human being is entitled to such a position, or can occupy it with safety to himself or to those who submit themselves to his guidance. It is dangerous to his own reputation, and diminishes the services which he might render his country. The excessive confidence of large masses of his countrymen arouses in others a distrust as exaggerated and more blind. One of the denunciations of which he has lately been made the object is the familiar one of fomenting social discord, of inflaming the poor and ignorant against the rich and cultivated, of setting up uninformed sentiment against reasoned conviction. The accusation is unjust.

The antagonists of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme—for which I am not pleading, which, as I have endeavoured to point out in the pages of this Review, approaches the subject from a point of view and deals with it by methods essentially faulty—are not content to argue against it or to suggest amendments in it. They boast that the rank, the riches, the leisure, and the culture of England are hostile to it. When Mr. Gladstone says, 'I sorrowfully admit this,' the reply is, 'You are setting class against class. You are endeavouring to incite ignorance and poverty against station, title, and wealth, to drown social influence in numbers, to subject the instructed judgment of the professions to the crude sentiment of the labouring classes.' It is impossible to imagine anything more mischievous than this discrimination, whether for exaltation or disparagement, of certain classes in the nation against the great body of the nation itself. The classes do not exist apart from the nation; the nation is the aggregate of classes. The blame of this dangerous way of speaking and writing must rest in the main with those who set the example of it, and only in a secondary way, though still really, with those who retort it. There is fallacy in the argument on both sides—if that can be called argument which is rather an appeal by question-begging phrases to intellectual or moral Pharisaism. The words 'education' and 'culture' are much abused in this connection. Leisure and wealth and rank undoubtedly present opportunities of education and culture. But opportunity without stimulus is often barren. The number of persons belonging to the privileged and wealthy classes who achieve personal distinction is relatively few. The man who, born to affluence and social consideration, is content to work as if he had these things to gain, whom the love of fame or other worthy motive prompts to 'scorn delights and live laborious days,' is a very exceptional being, as is shown by the exceptional praise which he receives whenever he makes his appearance. The great body of what is called educated opinion is simply fashionable opinion. People who wish to be considered socially what they ought to be flock in herds after the society statesman and the pet political hero of the day, as they run after the pet actor, the pet painter, the pet lecturer, even the pet monstrosity, the last dwarf, or the latest two-headed nightingale of the season. This imitative and servile movement of fashion is dignified by the name of the tendency of educated opinion. Even when the education and 'culture' are real, they should be appropriate to the subject-matter on which their authority is cited. The successful soldier of fortune, the court poet, the Albemarle Street lecturer who makes science, not popular, but fashionable, may be profound politicians, but the arts in which they are eminent do not give any presumption even of political capacity. There is a great run just now on the writings of Burke, which have become a sort of Holy Scriptures of politics, and of which, as of the Bible, it may be said :

‘This is the book where each his doctrine seeks, and this the book where each his doctrine finds.’ ‘It cannot escape observation,’ says Bunke, ‘that where men are too much confined to professional and faculty habits, and, as it were, inveterate in the concurrent employment of that narrow circle, they are rather disabled than qualified for whatever depends on the knowledge of mankind, on experience in mixed affairs, or a comprehensive connected view of the various complicated external and internal interests which go to the formation of that multifarious thing called a State.’ We may set this passage against the often-quoted sentence of Jesus the son of Sirach: ‘How can he get wisdom that holdeth the plough, and glorieth in the goad, that driveth oxen and is occupied in their labours, and whose talk is of bullocks?’ To be in close and vital contact for existence’ sake with the essential realities of life is often a more copious source of that moral and practical wisdom which is the basis of politics than the exclusive pursuit of special arts or sciences, or than a dilettante trifling with them. It is, however, pertinent to remark that the author of Ecclesiasticus was not speaking of Parliamentary government, Home Rule, or the agricultural labourer’s vote. As a matter of fact, the tribunal has been constituted by the consent of Liberals and Conservatives alike. To endeavour to discredit its moral competence is idle, and is very bad tactics besides. An advocate who should denounce the jury he addresses as unintelligent and ignorant, would stand a small chance of getting a verdict. To begin by setting the Court against you is a blunder into which an old forensic hand would not fall.

That the labouring classes are the best judges of the question which will be at issue in the coming election is not so much a true, or a false, as an idle proposition. They are more under the influence of feeling and less under the influence of fashion than persons in easier social circumstances. But sometimes feeling may be wrong, and occasionally fashion may be right. They have a strong instinct of justice and fair play when their own real or supposed interests are not too directly involved; but that instinct, it may be hoped, and that qualification of it, it is to be feared, are common to Englishmen of all ranks. A wise statesmanship will appeal to the conscience and judgment of the country as a whole, endeavouring to enlighten the one and to stimulate the other, and will avoid disparaging the selfish prepossessions of the classes to the people, or the ignorance of the people to the classes. The commencement of this crimination and recrimination has been with the partisans of rank, wealth, and leisure as the guides of political conduct. History warns us. The distinction drawn between the *optimates* and the *populares* in Rome, in the days before the republican constitution perished, under the demagogic ‘one-man rule’ of Julius Cæsar, corresponded very closely with that which imprudent persons are drawing now between the

cultivated and the ignorant. The optimates consisted, we are told by one of their partisans, of the senate, the better and larger part of the equestrian order, and such of the plebeians as were unaffected by pernicious counsels—the upper and upper-middle classes, that is to say, with a sprinkling of the conservative working men. As contrasted with the populares, they were made up of the men and classes ‘qui neque nocentes sunt, nec natura improbi, nec furiosi, nec malis domesticis impediti.’ The distinctions which were drawn in Imperial Rome between the honestiores and the humiliores, between the ‘fat people’ and the ‘lean people’ in some of the Italian republics of the Middle Ages, between the aristocrats and the populace under the first French Revolution, and in later revolutions between the labourers and capitalists, suggest caution to persons inclined to insist on similar distinctions for purposes of political warfare in England. This method of controversy will raise directly far more serious questions than any which it may be employed indirectly to settle.

As the election proceeds, the language of intellectual and social scorn now used towards the great body of the electors will be abated. It will be well if it be not exchanged for coarse and fulsome flattery. Horace Walpole mentions that Lord Talbot, addressing the House of Lords on some matter connected with the King, was misled into calling the peers ‘your majesties’ instead of ‘your lordships.’ He withdrew the phrase as an oversight, but said he should have used it by design if addressing the people. The people, the legal people as the French phrase has it, are sovereign in fact, and not merely in rhetoric; the ultimate appeal is to them; the Crown, the two Houses of Parliament, the Ministry, the rival parties in the State, submit to their decision as final. It is vitally important that the issue which they have to decide should be correctly apprehended. Apart from that, the most righteous feeling will help but little to the solution. Mr. Gladstone presents it in the question, ‘Will you govern Ireland by coercion, or will you let her manage her own affairs?’ If the controversy were simply between himself and Lord Salisbury, this might be enough. Lord Salisbury now denies—and of course everyone will accept his disclaimer—that when he spoke of twenty years of resolute government, he meant twenty years of coercion. Unfortunately he spoke of coercion in the sentence in which, according to his later account, he was not thinking of it. He mentioned the repeal at the end of the twenty years of the coercive laws of which he had not dreamed, and the introduction then of the local liberties which he was ready to grant now. Moreover, Lord Salisbury had made a commencement of his resolute policy while he was yet Prime Minister, in the framing of a Bill for the suppression of the National League. It is satisfactory to know now that he did not mean what he seemed to say. When, however, a man talks of twenty years of resolute policy, he almost deprives himself of title to rank among

statesmen. If Lord Salisbury were infallible, a policy chosen once for all might be usefully persisted in; Lord Salisbury being fallible, he is just as likely at the very beginning to be wrong as he is to be right, and the resolute policy would in this case be blind obstinacy. The faculty of adapting methods of government to constantly changing circumstances, of varying the means because the end is the same, is the mark of capable statesmanship; while persistence in the maxims and rules of government once for all adopted is a stupid pedantry. The issue, however, is not simply between the policy of coercion and the policy of allowing Ireland to manage her own affairs. If a majority is given to Mr. Gladstone at the elections, it will, in spite of vague disclaimers, be understood as sanctioning the particular scheme which he has already devised for enabling Ireland to manage her own affairs. That scheme, as I endeavoured to point out in this Review, tends not only to the complete Parliamentary independence of Ireland, but to its ultimate severance from the Crown of England. Mr. Gladstone properly claims for all parties and sections of parties in Great Britain, that they are Unionists in intention. The word Unionists, however, has its own defined meaning in Anglo-Irish politics. It means supporters of the Act of Union, those whom Mr. Gladstone calls paper Unionists. He contrasts with them the promoters of real union of heart and affection. Does this necessarily mean more than such a bond of cordial regard as now exists between the United Kingdom and the United States, and between the severed kingdoms of Holland and Belgium? Such a union is obviously compatible with complete political separation. It is a phrase of sentiment and not of politics.

The people of England and Scotland are animated by two convictions and determinations in this matter. The first and most vital of them is that the Imperial Parliament shall remain the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, that the three countries shall be represented in it fairly in proportion to their numbers, and that representation shall be continuous for all of them. The mere turning, from time to time, of the representatives of Ireland, or some of them, into a Parliament in its ordinary condition consisting exclusively of the members for England and Scotland, would simply confuse public business and would probably make its transaction impossible. The Imperial politics, domestic and foreign, in which Irish members are to bear their part, cannot be shoved off into particular weeks and months, of which formal notice shall be given. The essence of Parliamentary vigilance and control is that they shall be always attentive and active. From day to day, and from hour to hour, almost, events occur which suggest questions and which call for Ministerial explanations. Members who are not continuously following the course of events and discussions, and taking part in the Parliamentary business which rises incidentally out of them, cannot

be tumbled into the House of Commons at stated periods with any good effect: they will have lost the thread of the transactions. While, however, this arrangement would make the participation of Irish members in Imperial business nugatory, it would enable them to interfere with purely English and Scotch affairs, by improperly protracting Imperial discussions, so as to thrust other business aside. They would be able, upon some Imperial question, to defeat with the aid of Conservative or Liberal allies, as the case might be, a ministry bent on English or Scotch legislation which they did not approve. They might thus displace through intrusive Irish votes a British Government possessing the confidence of the majority of British members, because its legislation on some purely British subject was distasteful, let us say, to English Conservatives and Irish Catholics residing in England. By Mr. Gladstone's Bill, as it stands, excluding Irish members from St. Stephen's, the Parliamentary union between Great Britain and Ireland is abolished. The occasional admission of Irish members on stated occasions would, I repeat, destroy its efficiency both as the Imperial Parliament and as the insular Parliament of Great Britain. The only way in which Home Rule can be reconciled with the maintenance of the Parliamentary union between Great Britain and Ireland is by the fair and continuous representation of Ireland in the United Parliament, and the banishment of purely English, Welsh, and Scotch business to legislative bodies dealing with it, and with it alone. In this way a place may be found for Home Rule under the shelter of the United Parliament. If this arrangement is not yet practicable, we must wait until it becomes so, and be content in the meantime to remain as we are. But if Mr. Gladstone chose to adopt it, it would become practicable. By placing Ireland, on all matters which affect the internal unity as well as the external safety of the United Kingdom, on all matters except those reserved as specially Irish, under the authority of the Imperial Parliament and Executive, the Land Purchase Bill would become superfluous and the Ulster difficulty would disappear. The Irish Protestants of the North would not be transferred to a rule distasteful to them; they would still be represented directly in the United Parliament, and be under its direct protection. At the same time they would be brought, on purely Irish business, into direct relations with their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects of the south and west. They would be forced to find a means of living on peaceful and friendly terms with them. It is the great evil of the system which has hitherto prevailed that it has made the Protestants of Ulster consider themselves the fellow-countrymen rather of the English and Scotch across the sea than of the men with whom geographically and territorially they are associated, and with whom indeed they are inextricably intermingled. The light phrase about the two Irelands conveys an historic reproach. The tendency of Home Rule, duly

guarded by the authority of the Imperial Parliament and Executive, which need no more conflict with the Irish Legislature and Executive than the organisation of the Federal Government at Washington does with the State Governments of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, would be to merge the English garrison into the surrounding people. If Mr. Gladstone sees his way to the modification of his scheme in the sense indicated, he would probably bring back to his ranks three-fourths of the Liberal dissentients whom he calls seceders. He would avert the painful conflict and the not less painful alliances now impending, and would restore the union of the Liberal party, otherwise shattered as a potent instrument of usefulness for many years. All that is legitimate in Home Rule is compatible with the maintenance of the Parliamentary Union. The Parliamentary Union would be stronger for the common purposes of the United Kingdom if Home Rule were granted to its several parts. The divided sections of the Liberal party are looking at different sides of the shield. The aims of each are consistent with the aims of the other, and indeed are mutually dependent for their effective realisation. There cannot be a real, as opposed to a mere paper, union without Home Rule; there cannot be orderly Home Rule except under the safeguard of the Parliamentary Union. It is for Mr. Gladstone now to make overtures to the followers who have reluctantly quitted his standard. If, the opportunity presenting itself, he fails to make use of it—and the opportunity is present to him whenever he may choose to seize it—the responsibility will rest mainly with him of increasing the chances of Lord Salisbury's resolute policy, and of disabling by its divisions the Liberal party, which alone can effectually resist that policy.

It is possible that in the interval between these pages quitting the hands of the writer and reaching those of the public, unequivocal declarations may clear the controversy of its ambiguities. At present, all that can be said is that Mr. Gladstone's language does not close the door to the chances of a settlement. He is a great deal less peremptory than Mr. John Morley, or Lord Rosebery, or Mr. Childers. Mr. Gladstone is content to say that the two Bills which he introduced are dead, and that there is not a clause or a detail in them which those who support the principle that Ireland in matters purely Irish shall govern herself may not dispute. Mr. John Morley, speaking at Newcastle on Monday, the 21st of June, said practically that the Home Rule Bill is not dead, but only sleeping; that it will revive not merely in principle, but in the main consequences, the main methods, and the main applications of that principle. He emphatically repudiated the idea of making Home Rule subordinate to the full and continuous representation of Ireland in the United Kingdom. Mr. Childers has spoken to the same purport. Ireland is to have the *entrée* of the Imperial Parliament when Imperial and revenue topics are under discussion, an arrangement

more impracticable, and more mischievous if it were practicable, than statesmanship of the Abbé Siéyès order has ever devised. Lord Rosebery, while asserting that this country will vote not for or against the Government measure, but on the simple proposition that a separate Irish legislature is desirable, yet says that 'wherever, in whatsoever place, before whatsoever assembly, the project for the government of Ireland may be proposed, our scheme—the scheme of Mr. Gladstone—will loom up as much of a landmark as the great pyramid itself.' That is to say, that Mr. Gladstone's scheme will loom up in the new House of Commons when it meets. In other words, it would seem that Mr. Gladstone's Bills are dead for the purposes of the general election, but are not dead for legislative purposes if the new Parliament shows a Ministerial majority. The real question, however, is not what Mr. John Morley, Lord Rosebery, or Mr. Childers says, but what Mr. Gladstone means, and their language may have very little relation to his intentions. The passages which we have quoted may be unauthorised glosses on the sacred text. Mr. Gladstone is his own interpreter, and it is to be hoped he will make it plain. He does not, like Mr. Morley, venture to ask the country to approve the Home Rule principle in the consequences, methods, and applications which were given to it in the Bill which the House of Commons rejected. He disowns the Bill because he knows the country, like the late Parliament, is not prepared to accept it. But if Mr. Gladstone made a faulty application last spring of a principle sound in itself, who can feel sure that he will make a wiser application of it next autumn? In fact the principle of Home Rule is sound or unsound as it is applied; and before the confidence of the country can properly be given to any Minister, as advocating a principle, the use which he is going to make of that principle should be explicitly stated.

It will not be enough for Mr. Gladstone, in conjunction with Mr. Parnell, to have a majority in the next House of Commons. He refused to propose Home Rule until Ireland had declared with what he considered practical unanimity for it, until five-sixths of its Parliamentary representatives were pledged in its favour. But the rule which holds good on one side of the Channel, holds good on the other too; and if Ireland ought to be practically unanimous, so ought Great Britain. To repeal the Parliamentary Union—for this is what Mr. Gladstone's defunct Bill practically proposed to do—against the will of a majority of the English and Scotch representatives, or even against the will of a large minority of them, would be monstrous. It would be against Mr. Gladstone's own principle. It would, moreover, be impossible. The questions of a second Chamber, and the fitness of the House of Lords to discharge the functions of a second Chamber, are open. But so long as the House of Lords exists, it would be bound, by every acknowledged principle, and by a usage almost adopted into the constitution, not to give effect to a measure of the character suggested and in the circumstances supposed. Mr. Gladstone cannot

obtain a majority morally adequate for his purposes—he may not be able to obtain a majority at all—unless by assenting to the principle of maintaining the full and continuous representation of Ireland in the United Parliament he heals the breach between himself and the dissentient Liberals. If the Home Rule Liberals become Unionists, the Unionist Liberals may become Home Rulers; and another union—the union between the different sections of the Liberal party—may be restored. Nor is this all. Looking less at Lord Salisbury's recent declarations than at his earlier action and language, there is some reason to hope that he might be brought into this combination. If the concordant action of Mr. Parnell's followers and of the Conservative party up to the general election, including Lord Salisbury's Newport and Guildhall speeches, was not concerted, it was pursued in obedience to a mysteriously pre-established harmony. Lord Carnarvon's appointment to the viceroyalty of Ireland was as significant of a disposition on the part of Lord Salisbury to come to an understanding with Mr. Parnell as Mr. John Morley's appointment to the Chief Secretaryship was of Mr. Gladstone's. Lord Salisbury has not yet denied that he was cognisant beforehand and approved of Lord Carnarvon's interview with Mr. Parnell—that he was told afterwards what passed between them; and if this be so, he will not allege that the interview was of a purely speculative kind and did not mean business. The Cabinet, it is said—and this is the main point of the denial—never considered the subject. But cabinets are kept a good deal in the dark by prime ministers nowadays. Mr. Chamberlain has his grounds of complaint on this head. They are ignorant of the knowledge till they approve the deed. If the Conservative and Parnellite parties had been in a sufficient majority of the whole House, probably the Cabinet would have heard of the matter. The result possibly would have been seen in a scheme of Home Rule better than that which Mr. Gladstone has proposed, because maintaining the continuous representation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament. This is, however, speculation on the might have been, though it comes closely to the would have been. One thing is certain, that if the practical unanimity of Ireland is the condition on which alone Home Rule can properly be proposed, the practical unanimity of Great Britain is the condition on which alone Home Rule can legitimately be accepted. If Mr. Gladstone is to carry a measure giving Ireland control over affairs exclusively Irish, he must reunite the Liberal party under his leadership. If Mr. John Morley speaks for the Government, this hope must be abandoned.

FRANK H. HILL.

The Editor of THE NINETEENTH CENTURY cannot undertake to return unaccepted MSS.

THE,
NINETEENTH
CENTURY.

No. CXVII.—NOVEMBER 1886.

THE COMING WINTER IN IRELAND.

THE bill introduced by Mr. Parnell to give temporary relief to the Irish tenants was defeated in—for the time of year—a very full house on the 22nd of September last. It was defeated by a majority of 95 in a house of 503 members. The defeat of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill in the House of Lords, in the month of August 1880, closed one chapter, and opened another, in the history of Ireland, and it is quite possible that the defeat of Mr. Parnell's bill may yet be pointed to as an event of equal gravity, and equally far-reaching in its consequences on the future of Ireland.

What was Mr. Parnell's bill, and why was it introduced? It was a bill designed to give temporary relief to tenant farmers in Ireland pending the inquiry which has been undertaken by the present Government. I shall presently state what the bill proposed to do; but I must here try to answer two questions which have been very frequently put:—First, why was such a bill considered by Mr. Parnell to be necessary in September last? And, secondly, why was not it or some similar bill introduced during the spring session? I shall answer the latter question first. No bill for the temporary relief of Irish tenants was introduced during the spring session, chiefly because the Irish National party had strong hopes that the measures proposed by Mr. Gladstone for the better government of Ireland would be passed into law. And when pressed, as we frequently were, by our constituents to take some steps to stop evictions, our answer always was that it would be folly to embarrass a Government which was engaged in an attempt to settle the Irish question in a generous and final fashion; and that if, as we

hoped, the Government should succeed in their attempt, this and other difficulties could very soon be dealt with by our own people at home. We knew that with the Liberal Government in office no bill interfering with the landlord's power to evict would be allowed through the House of Lords, and that to introduce such a bill at that time would be simply to place in the hands of the enemies of the Government, and our enemies, a weapon to do them injury. But this was not our only reason for considering it not wise to bring forward this question last spring. 'Coming events cast their shadows before;' and whether it was due to the rumours of the coming of Home Rule, or to the influence of Lord Carnarvon, the fact is undeniable that in the winter quarter of 1885 there was a most astonishing falling off in the number of evictions in Ireland. The number of families evicted in the quarter ending the 31st of December 1885 was only 369, of whom 208 were readmitted as caretakers or tenants; as against 642 in the quarter ending the 31st of December 1884, 646 in the quarter ending the 31st of December 1883, and 709 in the quarter ending the 31st of December 1882. And this state of things continued in some measure into the spring quarter of 1886, though here there was an alarming increase—the number evicted in the quarter ending the 31st of March 1886 being 698. But when we came back to Ireland after the election had been decided in the month of July last, what was the state of things with which we were brought face to face?

The people had during the past year been restrained from active agitation by a very considerable exercise of influence on our part; by the hope that their national demands were about to be granted, and the long chapter of their oppressions be closed for ever; and by the tremendous influence of the speeches delivered by Mr. Gladstone during the spring—speeches which were read even in the poorest cabins from one end of Ireland to the other, and which with a people like the Irish had an immense effect in making them patient and content to endure a great deal rather than embarrass such a friend. All these things, which had made it easy for us to restrain agitation in the country up to July last, had ceased to have effect, and at the same time we found that, encouraged by the defeat of Mr. Gladstone's Government, and by the result of the elections, the landlords were making up for lost time, and were carrying on the old game of eviction at an appalling rate. In the quarter ending the 31st of June 1886, there were evicted in Ireland 1,309 families; and from the 31st of June up to the 20th of September, 1,037 families were evicted. Such being the state of affairs in Ireland, and there being now no immediate prospect of a settlement of the National question, we had no choice but to take the earliest opportunity of forcing on the attention of the House of Commons the desperate condition of the Irish tenants, and the great troubles we foresaw if the landlords were

supported in their then course, and nothing done to afford protection to the tenants.

But now it may be asked, Why was the bill introduced in the middle of September, and not at the beginning of the autumn session? When the session opened, we did not know what the policy of the Government in respect to Ireland was to be. During the debate on the Address we drew attention to the serious condition of Ireland, and the absolute necessity for some measure to put a check on harsh evictions, and it will be remembered that it was only in the course of that debate that the Government proposals were disclosed. On the 3rd of September the Chancellor of the Exchequer moved to take all the time of the house for financial business, and I, at Mr. Parnell's request, moved the following amendment :—

That, in the opinion of this House, the state of Ireland is such as to require the proposal of remedial measures by the Government before the time of the House is appropriated entirely to the business of supply

And it was in the course of the debate upon this amendment that Mr. Parnell showed that the proposals of the Government could by no possibility meet the present difficulties in Ireland, and stated that he himself was ready to introduce a bill which, in his opinion, would ensure peace and quiet in Ireland whilst the Government Commissions were carrying out their inquiries. In making this offer Mr. Parnell was doing what he had been frequently invited to do by all sections of the English press on other occasions. But I must say that the result of the experiment has not been encouraging.

Now what was it that this bill proposed to do? It was a very short and simple bill, consisting as it did of only three clauses, and except as regards the second clause it was of a purely temporary character. The first and third clauses were intended to protect judicial tenants, whose rent had been fixed before the 1st of January 1885, from eviction in cases where their landlords had refused to give them a reasonable reduction. But no tenant could claim protection under this Act unless, first, he paid 50 per cent. of all rent and arrears due by him; and, secondly, the court was satisfied that he was unable to pay the balance without deprivation of the means of subsistence and of working his farm. If these conditions were fulfilled the tenant got simply a stay of any proceedings for eviction or recovery of the balance of rent due *until* the Land Court had decided what abatement his landlord ought to give him. And this court which was to decide as to the abatement would have been the very court which had fixed the judicial rent, and would therefore be in a position to decide immediately whether there really was a case for an abatement this year on a rent fixed by themselves three or four years ago. That was all that the bill proposed to do for judicial tenants, and a most modest proposal it was.

Under these clauses about 153,000 judicial tenants would have come.

The second clause in the bill proposed to admit the Irish leaseholders to the benefits of the Land Act, from which in 1881 they were most unfairly excluded in spite of the repeated protests of the National party. The leaseholders number about 60,000, they include the very cream of the Irish farmers, are largely men of some capital, and as a rule are very highly rented; and having been denied all relief under the Act of 1881, they have in many instances during these disastrous years been sinking deeper and deeper into poverty with the most deplorable results as regards the cultivation of their farms and the general prosperity of the country. The justice of their claim to be admitted to the Land Courts has long ago been admitted on all sides, and as on this point Irish members of Parliament, Orange, Unionist, and Nationalist, were absolutely unanimous, Mr. Parnell thought it right to lose no more time in putting an end to an admitted grievance. One thing is certain: that this refusal, without any reason given, to do justice to the Irish leaseholders will tend to aggravate seriously the agitation in Ireland during the coming winter.

Such was Mr. Parnell's bill, and in preparing it he had to keep two things in view:—First, that the bill should be one which would not be repudiated by the people of Ireland represented by the National party. Secondly, that it should be one which would enable us to state honestly to the House that if it were accepted we could look forward with confidence to peace in Ireland during the coming winter. Keeping these two points in view, we did our best to make the bill a moderate one, and in the course of the debate our very moderation was charged against us as a crime. The bill, in fact, amounted to nothing more than an attempt to compel all Irish landlords to act as every reasonable and humane landlord in Ireland will act of his own free will. By rejecting it the House of Commons has placed the peace of Ireland entirely at the mercy of the Irish landlords—I should say, indeed, at the mercy of a section of the Irish landlords. And past experience fully justifies us in believing that this is a most uncertain and dangerous tenure.

The course of the debate on this bill was most characteristic and instructive. Mr. Parnell introduced the measure in a speech of studied moderation—a speech which I believe would carry conviction to the mind of any unprejudiced man who heard it. And on the first night of the debate the only other Irish member who spoke in support of the bill was Mr. Pinkerton, a Protestant farmer from Antrim, a man who had lived all his life at farming, and whose speech was entirely occupied with practical details of the subject. On the second night of the debate no opportunity had been offered to any member of the Irish party to address the House, although

several were prepared and anxious to do so; and when Mr. Dillon, who had been asked to speak on behalf of the Irish party, informed the Government whips that he was anxious to address the House at half-past nine, he learnt from them that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach intended to speak at ten o'clock himself. I have dwelt on these particulars because the character of the Chief Secretary's speech makes them of great importance. For any one who has studied the debate, it is impossible to deny that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's speech was the first, coming from any one of importance, which contained a note of hatred, contention, and strife. He began by refusing to give credit to the promoters of the bill for the intentions which had been stated on their behalf by Mr. Parnell. There was not a word in his speech of regret at being compelled to refuse this concession. He treated the leader of the Irish party and his bill with an unconcealed contempt which very ill became a man who is responsible for peace and good government in Ireland. His arguments—so far as there were any arguments in his speech—were directed to show that no case had been made out for any abatement of judicial rents, and the whole tone of his speech was one of insult and of menace, for which no word uttered by any member of the Irish party in the course of the debate could be quoted in justification. It was a speech calculated to blood on the Irish landlords to deeds of oppression during the coming winter, and to fix more firmly than ever in the mind of the Irish tenant the old conviction that his sufferings and persecutions are matters of contemptuous indifference to the English Government.

We really desired to have peace and quiet in Ireland this winter. And we desired it—if for no other reason—because now for the first time in living memory the English public seems willing and anxious to listen to a fair statement of the Irish National cause. And it was plainly our interest that nothing should occur in Ireland which would make it impossible for us to get a fair hearing in England.

After careful consultation we decided to do what we had been over and over again invited to do on similar occasions in the past—we decided to bring forward a measure which we considered would meet the difficulties of the case and secure peace in Ireland during the coming year. We made that measure as moderate as we dared to do in face of the condition of things in Ireland; in point of fact we incurred a good deal of blame in Ireland for presenting so moderate a bill. And how were we met by the press of London, and by the Conservatives and the Unionists in the House of Commons? On all sides we were denounced as dishonest agitators. 'We did not really want the bill to pass'; 'it was brought in merely to keep up agitation' etc. etc.—the same old story that we listened to in 1880 on the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. And in the debate when we considered that we had made an *unanswerable* case for the justice

of the demand of the Irish farmers for the abatement of judicial rents fixed before last autumn, how was our case met? Not by any arguments worthy of the name, but by contemptuous incredulity, and jeers at statements of the losses and sufferings of tenant farmers in Ireland, and by idiotic assertions that the wealth of the Irish small farmers was steadily increasing; that the distress was due to drinking too much whisky, etc. And finally, by a repetition on the part of the Irish Secretary of those threats to which we were so well accustomed to listen in 1880 and 1881.

Some of the arguments used in the course of the debate were of such a character that I cannot avoid placing them side by side in order to exhibit all the more clearly the gross inconsistency of our opponents:—

1. It was said that no case had been made out for reduction of judicial rents.
2. That the landlords could be trusted to act generously and give reductions.
3. That the bill if passed would give the tenants no material relief.
4. That it would amount to a No-rent manifesto.

So much for the debate on Mr. Parnell's bill. I will pass from it now, and will only say further that it was not of a character to encourage the Irish people to look to the London Parliament for justice.

The Government having, as we think, most unfortunately decided to reject Mr. Parnell's proposal and to promise to Irish landlords the full support of the Irish executive in enforcing their legal rights, what is to be the result in Ireland? The answer to that question depends entirely on the Irish landlords themselves. Some of the largest landowners in Ireland have already offered to their tenants large abatements on the judicial rents. If the rest were to follow their example there would be no trouble in Ireland during the coming winter. If there had been any strong reason to hope that all, or nearly all, the landlords in this country would act reasonably and humanely, Mr. Parnell's bill would have been quite unnecessary; but that bill was brought in by men who know the Irish landlords better than Sir Michael Hicks-Beach knows them, and better than most Englishmen do, and I am sorry to say that we have the very strongest reason to expect that a large section of the landlords will pursue a course this winter consistent with their past history.

It would be plainly impossible for me, within the necessary limits of this article, to go into details as to the action of individual landlords. Those who desire to pursue this subject further I must refer to the speeches delivered in the debate on Mr. Parnell's bill, and to

the publications of the Irish Press Agency. There cannot, however, be the least doubt that any Englishman who does devote a little of his time to this study will speedily become convinced of two things:—First, that under the law as it stands it is still possible in a great many cases for Irish landlords to do the most cruel injustice to their tenants; and, secondly, that the history of the dealings of Irish landlords with their tenants down to this very hour fully justifies us in refusing to place any trust in their forbearance, or in their sympathy for the people whom we represent. As I have said, the winter in Ireland depends on the action of the landlords. If they follow the example set by a few within the last three weeks, we shall have peace. If, on the other hand, they do as they did in the autumn of 1880; and if they follow the example of men whose names I could mention; and if the language which is repeated to us as having been used by a number of agents and landlords is sought to be acted upon, it would take a very wise man indeed to predict what this winter will bring forth. Two things are certain—first, that the National organisation is immensely stronger than it was in 1880; and, secondly, the difficulties of the farmers are greater even than they were in that year. And such being the case, any one who wishes to realise what is before the Irish Government if they are called upon by the landlords to support them in a policy of extortion and eviction, had better read the history of the autumn of 1880 and the spring of 1881, and he will then be able to form an opinion for himself.

If then a struggle for existence is forced on the Irish tenants this winter, it seems to me that a very great responsibility will lie on the Liberal party in England. For it will be in their hands to decide whether the great work of reconciliation between the two people, so happily begun by Mr. Gladstone last spring, is to be rudely interrupted.

As it is, we of the Irish National party do feel under a considerable obligation of gratitude to the Liberal party for the way in which they stood by us during the spring, at the elections in July, and on Mr. Parnell's bill. And I personally have a deeper feeling of gratitude to many individual members of that party for words of encouragement and sympathy spoken in private. But if we are to have another land war in Ireland, the new faith of the Liberal party may be put to a severe strain. Many bitter things will be said, and in spite of all that we can do deeds may be done in Ireland which will shock them deeply. But if when they are in trouble about what is going on in Ireland, they will only remember that all through the spring and down to September last we did everything in our power to effect a compromise—if they will turn to the debate on Mr. Parnell's bill, and then read the past history of this Irish land question, they will not wonder at the intense bitterness of feeling

which exists on this question in the minds of the Irish people. And they will be able to understand much which in the past was utterly inexplicable to them. If they will be strong in their faith, and sufficiently wide in their sympathies to enter into the bitterness of an oppressed people, all will come right very soon. And Mr. Gladstone will live to see then two peoples who have hated each other for seven hundred years agreeing to live side by side as friends—equally free, though under the one Crown.

JOHN DILLON.

FRANCE, CHINA, AND THE VATICAN.

I.

THE latest intelligence from China and Rome seems to leave no doubt that France has found means of preventing any action on the part of the Vatican, and so far to have gained a free hand to deal in her own interest with China, unembarrassed by the independent action of a third Power. The Pope, compelled to choose between sending a Nuncio to Peking, as desired by the Chinese, and a rupture with France under a menace of war on the Church, the withdrawal of the subvention of 50,000,000 francs, and the termination of the Concordat, could have little option. But the end is not yet. China may be less open to intimidation than heretofore, and assert her undoubted right to refuse the recognition of an assumed protectorate over Roman missions, irrespective of the nationality of their members, and its extension to the native converts throughout the Empire. French interference between the Chinese authorities and the subjects of the Emperor of China has never had any treaty warrant or justification by the law of nations. China has the remedy therefore in her own hands, to a certain extent, by simply refusing to admit the pretension. Of course, in doing so, the Chinese Government must be prepared to resist any action, either diplomatic or belligerent, to coerce them—even by a renewal of M. Jules Ferry's system of 'intelligent destruction' on their coast; and in the Treaty Ports where the French have free access under a treaty of peace—proceedings from which the Chinese have only recently been relieved. But, as the latter have shown that even a great destruction of property and sacrifice of life could not induce submission to demands which they deemed too humiliating and unjustifiable, it may not be wise to trust too much to such means of coercion. France may well consider whether the cost of such measures in the late operations was adequately compensated by any advantage gained. The French inflicted a great amount of injury no doubt upon the Chinese Government and the people in property and commerce, and a great sacrifice of lives also; but they had to pay their own expenses after all, which were too heavy to hold out much inducement to recommence a similar inglorious and unsuccessful struggle.

In any case it is to be remembered that other nations besides the French have interests in China, and are liable to serious damage

by the renewal of hostile action. Interests in trade, compared with which the total amount of French trade in China is wholly insignificant—and, so far as such interests are concerned, this fact gives the French the advantage, if not the satisfaction of knowing that it is their rivals, and the British more especially, who are the chief sufferers; and, under the law of nations, without any claim to compensation. Every sovereign and independent state, being the guardian of its own honour and interests, is entitled, by the *jus gentium* accepted among Western nations, to take such measures as it may deem expedient to obtain redress for injuries received, subject only to the limitations imposed by international treaties in the common interest.

In view of these circumstances, and the unsettled contention between China and France, which is fraught with so much evil, not only to one or other of the contending parties, but to all the Treaty Powers in various degrees, according to the magnitude of the stake of neutral Powers in the China seas, it may be well to ascertain accurately what is the relative proportion of the commercial interests engaged in the intercourse of Western nations with China. The Reports and Returns of the trade of the Treaty Ports, issued annually by the Inspector-General of the Imperial Maritime Customs, furnish in the most authentic and complete form all the necessary data.

In estimating the proportionate share of France, however, in such a comparative view, it would not be fair to take the Custom House returns for 1885 as a test, since French carrying trade was by the hostile operations of the French fleet reduced in that year to a mere simulacrum. But, if we take the return of all trade of foreign countries with China at the Treaty Ports for the year 1882, the following statistics will give a fair comparative statement during a period immediately preceding the commencement of French operations:—

	HK. Taels.
The total net value of foreign trade was	145,052,074
The exports amounted to	1,789,015
And the total gross value therefore was	146,841,089
Of which the British dominions contributed	111,090,769
Leaving for other foreign countries	<u>35,750,320</u>

Thus accounted for in detail—

	HK. Taels.
Next to Great Britain,	
The United States of America con-	
tributed	11,698,858
The Continent of Europe	11,236,276
Japan	6,209,099
Russia	4,962,597
Cochin China	552,474
Siam	464,950
The Philippine Islands	268,340
Turkey in Asia, Egypt, and Aden	54,911
As above	<u>35,750,320</u>

Deducting the percentages for the Chinese flag, and then taking the average of the percentages for foreign flags (as given at p. 27) under the four headings of (1) Tonnage Employed; (2) Total Foreign and Coast Trade; (3) Duties on Cargo; and (4) Tonnage Dues, the comparison between foreign flags in the carrying trade from and to foreign countries and between the ports of China is as follows:—

British	80.46 per cent.
German	8.34 "
French	3.33 "
Japanese	2.08 "
American	1.80 "
Russian	1.82 "
Danish92 "
Swedish and Norwegian61 "
Spanish46 "
Dutch38 "
Non-Treaty Powers25 "
Italian05 "
	<hr/> 100.00

It is thus evident that the stakes held by the other Treaty Powers and France are so hugely disproportionate, that the former, who were as neutrals merely spectators, had much to lose and nothing to gain; while these conditions were exactly reversed, and France, so far as trade and material interests connected therewith were concerned, had a bare 3½ per cent. *en jeu*.

If such preponderating interests of a material kind do not entitle neutral States to any consideration for the heavy or incurable injury they may suffer from the acts of a quasi-belligerent, it may at least justify a searching inquiry on the part of the sufferers into the causes of quarrel, and the pleas either party may advance for liberty to inflict any amount of loss or damage not only on each other as principals, but on one or more neutral Powers.

The ostensible cause of a state of continued enmity and irreconcilable antagonism is, no doubt, Religion, and its propagation under the Roman Catholic Church, coupled with the claim of France to exercise a protectorate over all missions of that persuasion in China—persisted in notwithstanding ever-recurrent disturbances and massacres of missionaries and their converts, by outbreaks of popular hostility throughout the Empire.

It is evidently all-important, if this common danger is to be averted, to ascertain the actual *fons et origo* of such widespread and continuous hostile feeling, and not only one persistent in its manifestation, but as a rule, with few exceptions, directed against the Romish missions in the first instance, under the French protectorate. Is it religious fanaticism and intolerance in the Chinese population? or is there a political and social motive underlying the whole movement? It is essential that the true answer to

these questions should be given, because the same causes, if not removed, will in all likelihood produce similar effects in the future. And what these effects have been during the last forty years, since the gates of China were forced open by the Treaty of Nanking in 1842 at the conclusion of a war with Great Britain, when foreigners of all nations were for the first time free to trade and reside at five ports, we have now seen. Riots, popular violence, massacres, and pillage, in which the Roman Catholic missions and their converts have in most cases been the objects of attack and the first victims. Disturbances so serious that they have constituted a real danger to the maintenance of peace, and in 1856-60 did actually lead to a war most disastrous and humiliating to the Chinese Government. And the French cause, of quarrel (not the British) was the execution in the interior of M. Chapdelaine, a French missionary bishop. With such dire consequences we cannot be surprised if the rulers of China and the people look upon all missionaries, and those more especially of the Roman Church under French protection, with profound distrust and hatred, as the *teterrima causa* of all their troubles with foreign Powers and a permanent source of danger and further disasters, threatening their national independence and security. With this ever-present menace and source of anxiety preoccupying the minds of the responsible members of the Government, the Prince of Kung's parting words to me when I was leaving Peking no doubt expressed the thought which was uppermost and most constantly present in his mind: 'If only you could relieve us of missionaries and opium, all might be well!'¹

For though the Prince coupled the missionary and the opium questions together, as the two we had most frequently discussed, there could be no doubt to which of these he attached the greatest importance. The missionary trouble was constant and urgent. At any moment some terrible massacre (as that of Tientsin which occurred a very few months later) might bring a question of peace or war upon them, as it had already done once. The opium was more a question of finance and social morality, on which, as an academic question, there was always much to be said by censors and literati, who were often themselves consumers of the drug. Not so the missionary question, which still remains, now as then, without any visible hope of a satisfactory solution—unless, indeed, a change in the policy of the French Government should take place, with a corresponding modification in the proceedings of the French missionaries themselves, as we shall presently see.

¹ The opium question, I may say here, received a solution some years later, which even then I had foreshadowed, by the action of the Chinese themselves, in the more extensive cultivation of the poppy in their own territories; and the effect is now shown by the reduced importation of foreign opium; China becoming the largest poppy-growing country in the world, probably.

II.

The outbreak of popular violence which took place at Tientsin in June 1870 was characterised by so much barbarity and atrocity that it called the attention of all the Treaty Powers forcibly to the precarious tenure of their relations with China, and the supreme importance of the missionary question. The attack was on the French settlement, separated from the British by the whole breadth of the city of Tientsin, and on opposite sides of the river. This, in fact, accounts for the fact that the destruction of buildings and the massacre of the inmates was in a great degree limited to the one Settlement. The mob, organised beforehand, with leaders exciting them to destroy and kill, had been presaged some days before by many threatening notices; and the French orphanage, cathedral, and consulate were the first destroyed.

After forcing an entrance to the orphanage, they proceeded to murder all the Sisters in charge (nine), with every kind of brutality, and to fire the premises, throwing their victims, dying or dead, into the flames; and the cathedral and consulate shared the same fate. The French consul, his chancellor and interpreter, were all killed, and several members of the French community. Three Russians—a merchant, his wife, and clerk—were mistaken for French and butchered in the streets, and their bodies stripped and thrown into the river. And, no force being sent to check them in their work of pillage and murder, they proceeded subsequently to destroy three Protestant establishments situated in the city. All this to take place in open day at a Treaty Port the nearest to Peking (not ninety miles distant, and with a large arsenal not a mile off, where many Europeans were employed), gave to the event a most sinister aspect.

Much correspondence followed; money indemnities were paid; of the superior officials, the prefect, intendant, and magistrate were sentenced to penal servitude; and thirteen of the rioters executed at the demand of the French Government. Still the question remained more urgent than ever—What could be done to prevent similar fearful outbreaks? Redress for the past was of little value if it brought no security for the future; and it was very evident this was unaccomplished.

And now, while this article is in the press, recent intelligence has been received of a wholesale massacre of missionaries and their converts in Cochin China, in which it is reported seven hundred of the latter were killed and thirty villages burned. And by the same telegram the news came of a similar outbreak at Ch'ungking, in Szechuen, a province in China, beginning with an attack on the French cathedral and residence of the Vicar Apostolic, and extending, as usual, to all other foreign establishments, and threatening death to all foreigners. The British and French consular officers, among

others, barely escaped with their lives, as fortunately did the missionaries this time.³

These last proofs of unabated hostility and unchecked violence in the populations where missionaries have a base of operations and erect buildings, whether hospitals, churches, or mission-houses, were scarcely needed to demonstrate how many elements of danger continue to exist, and the obligation of the Treaty Powers and the Chinese Government alike to devise some better means of dealing with the missionary question, and of establishing a less unsatisfactory and precarious footing for them and for all foreigners in the country.

And the first step towards this object requires more knowledge of the people and the classes who influence them,—their habits of thought, their national prejudices and superstitions, and though last not least, the estimates they have formed of the motives of foreigners for coming among them, and their claims to respect or consideration, which are rated very low by all classes, literate and illiterate, as there is abundant proof.

It will, then, be found that not one, but many causes combine to move the people to hostile action towards missionaries as a class, and the 'French missions' (so called by them) more especially. A general distrust and dislike of foreigners, as such, the common result of differences of race and creed in all countries, is always present; but in this religion has little part. The Chinese educated class only look upon the superiority claimed for Christianity over Confucism with supreme contempt. Spiritual questions have no interest for them; and the *odium theologicum* has no part in their dislike or their scepticism. Buddhism, the only religion very widely accepted, though of foreign origin as much as Christianity, sits very lightly on the majority of the Chinese population.

The late Abbé Huc, one of the most talented of the missionaries 'de la Congrégation de Saint-Lazare,' after long years devoted to missionary work in Mongolia and China, bore strong testimony to this effect. He tells us in his work entitled *The Chinese Empire*:—

The religious sentiment has vanished from the national mind, the rival doctrines have lost all authority; and their partisans, grown sceptical and impious, have fallen into the abyss of indifference, in which they have given each other the kiss of peace. Religious discussions have entirely ceased, and the whole Chinese nation has proclaimed this famous formula, with which everybody is satisfied—*San-Kiao-y-Kiao*—that is, 'The three Religions are one.' Thus, all the Chinese are at the same time partisans of Confucius, Laotze, and Buddha—or rather they are nothing at all.

³ The 'eccentric originality of the Protestant missionaries' in their building was telegraphed to Rome as the cause of the riot, but the real provocation and immediate object of attack was the Roman Catholic cathedral, roofed with the yellow tiles strictly reserved for Imperial use—an offence to the military students, collected in large numbers for their examination, and the populace. In Annam and Tonquin, exclusively in French hands, of course there are no Protestant missionaries to be found.

It was a saying of Dr. Arnold's, that 'universal tolerance was often very much akin to universal indifference'; and certainly their formula of politeness, in which they are apt to close all discussion, after a panegyric on their neighbour's religion, as the Abbé tells us, is an edifying commentary on the text, 'Religions are many, reason is one, we are all brothers'—which goes far to confirm the correctness of his conclusion.

But they do believe in tutelal deities, in the duty of ancestral worship—in these and many other things that we deem superstitions, such as the *Fung Shui*, in occult powers and geomantic influences, and witchcraft. And perhaps we should remember, as Sir Thomas Wade remarks, that 'after we ourselves had had the Bible a century and a half, we still continued to condemn witches on charges at once as horrible and ridiculous' as those laid to the charge of the Sisters of Charity and to Christians generally.³ And the Jews even at this day in Christian countries are murdered and pillaged by evil disposed and fanatic mobs, just as the missionaries and their converts are in China on similar charges, and with quite as little help or sympathy from the constituted authorities, civil or military. The Chinese of all classes believe in the existence of such influences, and the calamities they may bring upon individuals or communities if offence is offered them. And partly from fear of this, and partly from anger and dislike of the foreigner, the populace burn their churches, pillage their houses, and murder their occupants.

Practical statesmen will not treat these national feelings and superstitions as M. Jules Ferry was disposed to treat the opposition he encountered, as '*une quantité négligeable*,' which later on he found, was both a constant and a very formidable power, backed by a spirit of national resistance. It is not wise, and it cannot be safe, to regard this feeling of hostility to missionary proceedings on the part of the Chinese with contempt as something that may be met by force, or left to expend its violence in vain efforts to resist religious propagandism and foreign influence.

It is in no sectarian spirit, or disposition to invoke any anti-Gallic feeling, that attention is so pointedly called to all these tragic and fearful missionary riots, so generally directed against the missions under special French protection; but because I regard certain of the proceedings both of the missionaries and their protectors as the chief causes of disturbance. Nor is this charge of modern date, or of Protestant origin. *Kang-hi* was the liberal patron of Roman missionaries of all nationalities—French, German, Dutch, and Italian. They were well received, and many were employed by him in important scientific work for the State. And in his reign large and flourishing

* The kidnapping of children and natives, to take out their eyes and other organs to use as medicines or for ceremonial rites and sacrifices; and also of girls to bewitch the native victims.

Christian communities grew up in various parts of the Empire. But before the end of his long reign, we are told, he ceased to regard them with the same favour. Disturbed by the disputes between the Dominicans and the Jesuits about ancestral worship, and the resistance of converts under the missionary influence, he issued an edict in 1718 limiting the freedom previously enjoyed, and restricting the number of missionaries to those only who had his special permission. And later, on the representation of his officers that the tendency of the new religion was to undermine his authority, further steps were taken. And at this time, Father Ripa tells us, the personal conduct of the missionaries had much to do with this unfavourable change. He observes, that

If our missionaries would conduct themselves with less ostentation, and accommodate their manners to persons of all ranks and conditions, the number of converts would be enormously increased. Their garments (he goes on to say) are of the richest materials, they go nowhere on foot, but always in sedans, on horseback, or in boats, and with numerous attendants following them.

We might have expected that such warnings would have averted a precisely similar mistake in like circumstances. At the present day the missionaries have hardly followed the counsel of their Master; for they have neither been wise as serpents nor harmless as doves, however devout and well-intentioned they may be. Over-zeal and bad judgment are often quite as injurious to a good cause as a lack of virtue or any other defect. And how grievous an offence it has been to the authorities and the people to see foreign teachers of a new religion assuming the insignia and distinctive marks of office and Imperial authority, the foreign Powers have had ample evidence in numerous complaints and grave remonstrances, as will presently be seen. But the extent to which this assumption has gone can hardly be realised without reading the following description from the pen of a French bishop, writing from a missionary station in the interior, far from any Treaty Port or consular authority either to control such vagaries or to protect him and his coadjutors from the consequences. The letter was published in the *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, dated from the Mission of Kouy-Tchaou-Ching, and addressed to the Directors of the Society by Mgr. Faurie, the vicar apostolic at that place. After describing himself as exercising 'the powers of life and death, of imprisoning and setting free,' and how he moves from place to place in making a tour through his diocese, with the ceremonies in use by the mandarins, attended by a retinue that might follow a high authority, he describes his approach to a town in the following terms:—

Besides the red parasols consisting of three tiers of shades, the cavalcades and the cannonades, there was added before my palanquin an escort of three little children dressed in red and green, and carrying crowns composed of precious

stones. Here, again, I signalled my arrival by setting free several prisoners who were confined for offences against our religion.

After this he informs us that 'having arrived at Gan Chouey-foo, all the chief insignia of authority were placed at the door of the house, besides cannon announcing the nightly guard,' and 'each time that I left my house or returned three rounds of cannon announced the fact.' In the interior of the residence ceremony was not banished, for he adds, 'I always eat alone. The principal chiefs in full dress stand round the table to serve me, while musicians attend at the door and commence their harmony.' And so it goes on, with an account which reads more like the text of a burlesque play than anything else. It is easy to understand how exasperatingly offensive this must have been to the high authorities, whose state and official attributes were thus usurped and travestied, but it is needless to speculate on what the Chinese Government and its provincial authorities think of such procedures, and what they feel on the subject. No Treaty Power is ignorant, for a remarkable document was received by all the foreign representatives at Peking, some time after the massacre at Tientsin, addressed by the Prince of Kung and his colleagues at the Tsung-li-Yamén (in charge of foreign affairs), and on this subject there is the following paragraph:—

In trade there is no cause of serious quarrel between native and foreigner. But connected with the missionary question there is a vast amount of mischief on the increase, the fact being that, while propagandism starts with the announcement that its object is the exhortation of people to virtue, Romanism as propagated in China has the effect of setting the people against it; and, inasmuch as this is the result of the unsuitableness of the *modus operandi* now in vogue, it is essential that there be devised, without loss of time, such remedial measures as will bring things to a satisfactory condition. The missionary question affects the whole question of peaceful relations with foreign Powers—the whole question of their trade.⁴

After this preliminary exordium, so earnestly stated, the writers proceed to describe in detail what are the abuses which they conceive are the chief cause of trouble in regard to missionaries:—

As the Minister addressed cannot but be well aware, ill-feeling begins between them (the missionaries) and the people. In earlier times they say it was not so; but since the exchanged ratifications in 1860 the converts have in general not been of a moral class, and the religion has in consequence become unpopular; and the unpopularity is increased by the conduct of the converts, who, relying on the influence of the missionaries, oppress and take advantage of the common people (the non-Christians), and yet more by the conduct of the missionaries themselves, who, when collisions between Christians and the people occur, and the authorities are engaged in dealing with them, take part with the Christians, and uphold them in their opposition to the authorities. This indiscriminating en-

⁴ Memorandum of the Tsung-li-Yamén upon the missionary question, circulated October 9, 1871, among the Foreign Representatives at Peking. *Parliamentary Papers, China*, No. 1, 1872, pp. 4-14.

listment of proselytes has gone so far that rebels and criminals of China, and such-like, take refuge in the profession of Christianity, and covered by this position create disorder. This has deeply dissatisfied the people, and their dissatisfaction being felt grows into animosity, and their animosity into deadly hostility. The populations of different localities are not aware that Protestantism and Romanism are distinct. They include both under the latter denomination, or under the one denomination of foreigners, and thus any serious collision that occurs equally compromises all foreigners in China. In the provinces doubt and misgiving are certain to be largely generated. Under such circumstances, how is it possible but there should be irritation, and that this should show itself in serious outbreaks? Be it that the troubles connected with propagandism come of the resentment of the people, roused at last to wrath, it is not the less a fact that the Christians have given them cause of exasperation.

The Ministers then go on to state that the hostility of the people is

particularly roused by the conduct of the Romanist missionaries themselves, who go beyond all bounds in assuming an attitude of arrogant importance and of overbearing resistance to the authorities, and in every province interfering at the offices of the local authorities in lawsuits in which native Christians are concerned [citing in proof many individual instances].

This interference with the jurisdiction of the Chinese authorities is plainly shown to be one of the most serious grounds of protest, and in connexion with it the assumption of official titles—seals or other insignia of rank and authority in use in China. One case among others is cited of a missionary in Shantung assuming the title of ‘Sinn-fu’ (Governor of a Province.) ‘This,’ it is observed, ‘is not only encroachment upon the authority of the local officials, but usurpation of the authority of the Chinese Government,’ and it is asked, ‘How is it possible that all these improprieties should not arouse general indignation?’

III.

We cannot now feel any doubt that the missionary question is the main cause of disturbance in our relations with China, and of danger to the Chinese Government itself no less than to all foreigners resident in the country, missionaries and laymen alike, and whatever their nationality—a danger all the more serious that, as the Prince himself has truly stated, ‘the missionary question affects the whole question of pacific relations with foreign Powers and the whole question of their trade.’ Whether it be desired or not, a community of danger, if not of interests, does exist, and must be taken into account in considering by what means the persistent and ever-increasing hostility of the Chinese of all classes can best be met, and an ever-present danger averted; and M. de Lavalette, the French ambassador in London, when the intelligence arrived of the attack on the French settlement at Tientsin, based his first com-

munication to her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on the recognition of a *solidarité* of interests, as well as of dangers, in the following terms:—

Bien que les victimes de ces attentats soient presque exclusivement des Français, on ne saurait contester que des faits pareils révèlent l'existence de dangers qui menacent indistinctement tous les étrangers résidant en Chine.

Whence he draws the conclusion, so true in fact, but so little regarded in practice—

C'est en considérant leurs intérêts comme solidaires dans ces contrées de l'extrême Orient que les Puissances européennes peuvent arriver à assurer à leurs nationaux les garanties et les sécurités stipulées dans les traités.

From this principle, so promptly and frankly invoked by the French ambassador in the disaster that had befallen the French settlement, the question naturally suggests itself, how far, in this missionary question more particularly, and dominating all others, the relations of the French Government with China and their independent action under special conventions can be reconciled with a common interest and a common policy for their advancement.

This evidently occurred to Lord Granville, for, writing to Lord Lyons in Paris in reference to the expressed desire of the French Government for united action, he pointed out, while agreeing in the community of interests, a certain difficulty in 'the different nature of the treaty provisions as affecting the position of Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries in China, and that in consequence 'there were difficulties in the way of a collective note to the Chinese Government on the subject.' And this is the first obstacle to unity of action in all that concerns the Treaty Powers and a common policy, as a means of defence against the danger that threatens all. Where the acts of one may, or must of necessity, bring equal danger on all, divergencies in policy or action are incompatible with united effort, and therefore fatal to the very principle of such *solidarité* as the French Minister invokes. While sharing unavoidably in a *solidarité* as regards the danger it entails, it cannot be invoked to secure safety in practice. To show this more clearly, we have to inquire what are the divergencies in the treaty provisions of France and England bearing upon the missionary question. The treaty of Great Britain made in 1842 had no stipulations about missionaries as such. They had a right of residence in common with other British subjects at the open ports. France made her first treaty in 1846, negotiated by M. Lagrené, without any special provision beyond a stipulation for the toleration of Christianity and liberty to teach. But M. Lagrené induced Keying, the Chinese plenipotentiary, to memorialise the Emperor, and obtained a decree in reply to the effect that 'the religion of the Lord of Heaven, differing widely from that of the heterodox sects, and

the toleration thereof, has been already allowed.' In another paragraph it goes on:—

Let all the ancient houses throughout the provinces which were built in the reign of Káng-hí (1661–1772), and have been preserved to the present time, and which on personal examination by the proper authorities are clearly found to be their *bonâ fids* possessions, be restored to the professors of their religion in their respective places, excepting only those churches which have been converted into temples and dwelling-houses for the people.

Without the right of circulation in the interior, however, which was only acquired by foreign officials, missionaries, or merchants under the treaties of 1858, the restitution clause of 1846 proved of little value. But in 1858, after a second war, ending in Chinese defeat, the four Powers all obtained certain privileges for the missionaries of their respective nationalities, and the French in Article VI. of their Convention a clause confirming the above right to exact restitution.

To realise the feeling of the people on learning that they were to be called upon by foreign missionaries to give up property which for a couple of centuries had passed into Chinese hands, and been inherited from generation to generation under the laws of the land, we must try to imagine what would follow in our own country in similar circumstances.

We must suppose a French army could succeed in entering London and there dictating the conditions of peace, and among others one that all the Church property confiscated after the Reformation by Henry VIII. should forthwith be restored to the Roman Catholic Church by the present holders, however acquired, and without compensation, and that the French Government could be appealed to in order to enforce the rigorous execution of the stipulation. What would be the result? Would it be peace and harmony or revolt and a general insurrection?

As regards the obnoxious and invidious position of the French Government, and its action in support of these missionary claims, some judgment may be formed by the refusal recently to allow the French cathedral built in the precincts of the palace and overlooking the Imperial domain to be removed by mutual agreement between the vicar apostolic of Peking and the Chinese Government, at the cost of the latter, to a more eligible site. And yet past experience might show, apart from the equity and fitness of such a measure, that, in its present offensive position, a gathering of students leading the populace might at any moment reduce it to ashes without any power in the French Legation to prevent it, if happily the missionaries and legations together might escape from an infuriated mob, not prone to discrimination and no respecter of persons.

Precisely in the same spirit of contempt for the susceptibilities

of a great people among whom they have to live, and of the Imperial authorities, has been the act of roofing with yellow tiles, reserved to the Emperor's sole use, a church built at Chung King, the scene and the occasion of the last outrage on the Roman Catholic mission, and the rest of the community as a sequence. And how should it be otherwise with such arrogant and wanton provocations?

How different has been the policy adopted by the Protestant Powers in missionary matters could easily be demonstrated if space would permit. And as regards the British Government more especially, the instructions sent to their representatives have invariably, from the beginning, enjoined on all their missionary subjects 'to abstain with a steady purpose from exciting suspicions, to conduct their operations with the utmost prudence, and to insist upon their proselytes not looking upon their conversion to Christianity as releasing them from their general duties as subjects of China.'⁵

As regards our treaties it is known that Lord Elgin, the negotiator of the Treaty of 1850 and the subsequent Convention of 1860, had serious doubts as to the expediency of inserting an article upon the subject of the Christian religion at all. And Sir Thomas Wade, who was acting as official interpreter at the time, has stated his belief that it was Lord Elgin's opinion that, while the enforcement of treaty stipulations affecting the propagation of Christianity was offensive to our own feelings and outraging to the feelings of any other nation which might be compelled to accept such conditions, the cause of Christianity itself could be advanced by nothing so little as political support. And from the same authority we learn that two years later, after the Convention of Peking, a Romish father, long resident in the country, in conversation admitted of his own accord that the personal position of Romish priests in China was anything but ameliorated by the support they now received from the French Government. The comparatively amicable relations previously existing between the missionaries had been disturbed. The mandarins and men of the lettered class who had been formerly friendly stood aloof.⁶

In reference to the clause of the French Convention of 1860 stipulating for the restitution of Church property, we are left in no doubt as to the feeling with which it is regarded by the Chinese Government and people. In the memorandum of Prince Kung, already cited, the following paragraph conveys this very plainly. Thus:—

⁵ See *Parliamentary Papers, China*, No. 3, 1871, relating to the departure of Europeans at Nankin, June 21, 1870.

⁶ *China*, No. 5. Correspondence respecting the revision of the Treaties of Tientsin.

In the interest of peace it will not do for the missionaries to be demanding restitution of any chapel they may choose to indicate. During the last few years the restitution of chapels in every province has been insisted upon without any regard for the feeling of the masses, the missionaries obstinately persisting in their claims. They have also pointed out fine handsome houses (belonging to, or occupied by, the gentry or others) as buildings once used as churches, and these they have compelled the people to give up. Places even the surrender of which was a question of dignity improper (probably Yaméns are meant), with meeting-houses, clubs, temples—all such places being held in high respect by the gentry and people of the whole neighbourhood—they have forced from them for the benefit of the Church in lieu of other lands or buildings. Buildings which were once used as chapels have been in some cases sold years ago by Christians; and, having been sold and resold by one of the people to another, have passed through the hands of several proprietors. There is also a large number of buildings which have been newly repaired at very considerable expense, of which the missionaries have insisted on the restitution, refusing at the same time to pay anything for them. On the other hand, there are some houses which have become dilapidated, and the missionaries put in a claim for the necessary repair. Their conduct excites the indignation of the people whenever they come in contact with each other, and it becomes impossible for them to live quietly together.

The only wonder would be if they could live quietly together; for such proceedings in any other country would lead to insurrections, if not to a revolution, by a general uprising of the people against the Government that attempted to enforce such a concession to a foreign Power, and at its bidding.

IV.

In this evil state of affairs the imperative necessity for measures that may afford some reasonable hope of improvement, if not a permanent and effective remedy for the common interest, must be manifest. In what direction we are to look for a remedy, the knowledge of the true causes of the hostility of a whole population, exceeding in numbers and in the area it occupies the whole of Europe, should suffice to indicate.

The chief cause of the existing hostility and all the mischief it works in its manifestations in increasing frequency and intensity, it can hardly be doubted, lies in missionary propagandism; and not so much in the attempt to introduce a new religion as in the procedure adopted by the Roman Catholic missions, and the *ingérence* of the French Government in the exercise of an assumed protectorate which has no warrant in treaties.

In this policy, and its effects on the temper and national feeling of the people, so constantly outraged by the missionaries on the one hand, and by the intervention of the French authorities in the support of their pretensions on the other, lies the common danger, because in this isolated action, in which none of the other Treaty Powers are disposed to join or approve, the *solidarité* of interests ceases, and is only exchanged for a community of danger. That is all that remains, if not in principle, in actual practice. And if this be so, it is no less

plain that without a modification of such policy on the part of one there is no practical remedy. We hear a good deal of French susceptibilities, and the respect that should be shown to them. But is it to be assumed that other nations have no susceptibilities for which they are entitled to an equal regard from France? The Chinese are certainly not without theirs, though it has been too much the habit to treat them with contempt. To what other nation in the world would such an affront be offered as to build a cathedral for an alien religion in the precincts of the palace of the reigning sovereign, and against his protest?

Nor is there any provision by treaty to justify a claim on the part of missionaries or foreign Powers for the exemption of proselytes from the obligations of their natural allegiance and from the jurisdiction of their constituted authorities. Yet such things are done, not avowedly, but very certainly not the less to the humiliation of all in authority, and with scandal to the whole population.

We are told it is in the interest of religion; but if this were the single object of the protecting Power, or if it was the real object of French policy in China, it would still be a question whether it could be advanced by such means. Can other Powers forget—it is certain the Chinese cannot and will not—that the actual presence of the French in Annam and Tonquin, and in such close proximity, can be traced to missionary initiative as far back as the reigns of Louis XIV. and Louis XVI., who each, at the incitement of missionary bishops, sent military and naval expeditions and took possession of ports and territory in Saigon, Siam, and elsewhere; while in these later aggressions and annexations to enforce indemnities, &c., missionary *ingérence* has never been wanting. For the Chinese to believe that religion, and not a political object, directs French policy, must be very difficult.

The course followed by the Republican Government in France, in the persecutions and injuries inflicted upon the Catholic Church within their own country, bears strong evidence of the absence of any profound regard for its interests or that of the religion it professes. So at least many of the French themselves think, and the four Algerian bishops, in a remonstrance they lately addressed to the Senate and Chamber, bear similar evidence, when they urge that ‘the persecution of Catholicism at home becomes an argument against the French protectorate of Catholic missions abroad.’ M. Paul Bert, fresh from his expulsion of the clergy from their schools and churches, with other injurious dealings, would hardly have been chosen, if they had been consulted, by the Romish missions in Cochinchina as the protector of their interests and the Catholic religion.

The protectorate under these circumstances is illusory in a double sense. It does not protect the missions from outrages; on the

contrary, it is the chief cause of hostility; and it does not advance religion and the work of the missionaries, but constitutes the greatest obstacle.

The Pope has no armies or fleets wherewith to threaten war or attack, but for that reason would be all the more likely to make his intervention acceptable where Christian communities were concerned; and a French war dance at the Tsung-li-Yamên is not calculated to predispose the Chinese Government to encourage missionary settlements in their midst.

We may remember that M. de Freycinet, in a public speech lately delivered at Toulouse, told his constituents that the foreign policy of his Government was to maintain its relations with all the foreign Powers on a footing of mutual consideration; and an appeal to this principle, and for its application in China, should not be disregarded to the detriment of all the chief Powers of the Western world, old and new. They have the strongest claim on any French Government not to conduct its relations with China so as inevitably to create a state of popular feeling incompatible with the maintenance of peaceable intercourse, fatal to the security of life and property in the country, and threatening ruin to the commerce and material interests of all other nationalities.

RUTHERFORD ALCOCK.

EXHIBITIONS.

THAT the Great 1851 Exhibition should not have realised all the expectations of its projectors is no great matter for wonder. Few schemes do realise the expectations of their projectors. Of the sixteen thousand inventions for which during the last calendar year their authors sought the protection of a patent, how many will justify the hopes of their inventors? Certainly not ten per cent.—probably not five. Fortunately, however, inventors, projectors, saviours of mankind, and all their enthusiastic *gens*, are blind to the lessons of experience. They never learn the hard truth that their invention—their project—is at most one of the wheels of the machine which is to renovate society—not the machine itself—and that they have done a good day's work if they have shaped their cogs so deftly that the wheel will run smoothly when it is fitted to its place, or that they are luckier than their fellows if they have found a place for it at all. Those who invented exhibitions were unduly sanguine as to the outcome of their project; but, if they had not been, probably they would never have invented exhibitions at all, and the world would have suffered a very decided loss. Enthusiasm is a terrible nuisance, and enthusiasts are terrible bores, but we should lose a great deal if the cult were extinguished.

The first World's Fair did not inaugurate a reign of peace. The modern successors of Trygæus found that the goddess was not to be bribed by commercial advantage more easily now than in the days of Aristophanes. Still, it did its work well for all that. If, like Acts of Parliament and many other human devices, its energy was principally effective in directions not wholly foreseen by its promoters, yet it was effective. If it did not cause the swords and spears to be wrought into plough-shares and reaping-hooks, it led to the former being drawn by steam instead of by horses, and substituted reaping-machines for the latter. Its political influence, its direct effect on the comity of nations, was inconsiderable; but its influence on industrial progress, especially on the industrial progress of England, cannot easily be over-estimated. It gave rise to new industries of a wholly new character—notably to the entire group of artistic industries. Of the great industrial firms now at the head of British trade no small proportion trace, if not their origin,

certainly their first rise to a leading position to the Exhibition of 1851. But for it we should have had to wait another decade for the beneficent reform of the Patent Law, which was actually effected within a twelvemonth of its close, a reform which reduced the cost of a patent from 250*l.* to 25*l.*, and swept away the cumbersome and ridiculous formalities which were almost as great hindrances as the cost in the way of an inventor anxious to obtain due legal protection for his ideas. This Act of 1852 worked admirably for thirty years, and might, with a few of the modifications naturally suggested by experience, have worked well for another thirty, had not our legislators found it easier two years ago to pass a merely popular measure than to consider carefully the points really wanting reform. But for the Exhibition and its educational effect, Parliament would certainly never have passed the 1852 Act in its actual shape, and, if this had been its one solitary result, the labour and money spent on the Exhibition would have been repaid over and over again.

Coming as it did at a time when the world was full of the new discoveries of science; when the railway had just got its web of lines fairly spread over the country; when the telegraph was commencing to stretch across the sea as well as over the land; when chemistry was meditating the conversion of enormous masses of foul waste into products of use and beauty, and photography was ceasing to be a mere scientific curiosity—the Exhibition taught men how enormous were the powers for their use and benefit which nature and the knowledge of nature placed at their disposal. *Segnius irritant animos*; the philosophers had preached to men for years in vain; but when they opened a big shop and spread out specimens of their wares for all to see, the people came, saw, wondered, and went away wiser; readier, at all events in some degree, to accept the benefits of science instead of scoffing at them; inclined, at least to some extent, to treat the searcher after knowledge with admiration instead of wholly with contempt.

Thus the public were educated to purchase, and the manufacturer was taught to produce. Those manufacturers who were quick enough to see this found their advantage in new and extended markets, so that they soon left behind those of their rivals who were content with the more ancient methods. To English manufacturers the collection of foreign examples was at the time an almost unmixed benefit. The English stores of coal and iron, then practically unrivalled, rendered our people careless of competition in the manufacture on which all other manufactures are based—that of iron. In the principal textile industry—the spinning and weaving of cotton—England was first, and there was no second. But in all grades depending on any branch of the fine arts she had everything to learn, and, *vacua*, could chant as loudly as she pleased in the presence of the foreign copyist, baffled by the absence of material for

imitation. Our makers learnt much from the foreigners. If the foreigners got any lessons in return, they were of a sort that could not be put in practice at once. Later on we found that not one side only could profit by knowing how the other worked; at the time the benefit was all our own.

The inauguration of an age of commercialism may or may not have been an unmixed blessing; anyhow, the exhibition inaugurated such an age. We learnt from it the value of 'applied' art and 'applied' science; and since its time we have always estimated any new advance in art, any fresh discovery in science, not as an addition to the sum of human knowledge, but as a means of making human life in some fashion better or happier than it was. The new method is not wholly bad any more than it is wholly good. We should now regard Galileo not as a visionary fanatic, but as a potential benefactor of his kind; instead of locking him up we should honour him and get up a company to sell his telescopes. Now this state of affairs is distinctly more comfortable for Galileo, and it is better, too, for ourselves.

The first notable results of the Exhibition were its commercial results. It brought in a lot of business to the shop. This was plain to other nations. There was, of course, no reason why these advantages should be left to England alone. France—who, if there is any credit in the matter, may justly claim the credit of having invented industrial exhibitions¹—soon followed with the *Exposition Universelle* of 1855; but the considerable financial deficit did little to encourage other countries. We ourselves may be said to have had a share in the loss, for the expenditure of the British Commission was so lavish that it is believed to have caused a determination at the Treasury never again to allow large sums, and very seldom to allow any sums at all, to be spent in upholding British credit in foreign exhibitions. At the close of the ten-year period from 1851 we had our second exhibition. Surrounding circumstances, however, were unfavourable, and the promoters were only saved from a deficit by the liberality of the contractors, Messrs. Kelk & Lucas, who made over to the Commissioners a very large sum of money in order to prevent a call upon the guarantors. Great international exhibitions were also held at Vienna in 1873, at Philadelphia in 1876, and in Paris in 1878. Sydney (1879), Melbourne (1880), and Calcutta (1883) have also held international exhibitions, but not on quite so large a scale.

¹ The first National Exhibition appears to have been held in Paris in 1798. It was succeeded by many others, in France and elsewhere. In France the Society of Arts commenced to hold small exhibitions of British arts and manufactures in 1816, and from these started the idea of the 1851 Exhibition. The French had discussed and discarded the idea of making their national exhibitions international, but when the question was submitted for decision to the Prince Consort he at once decided that the 'industries of all nations' should be included.

When the second period of ten years from 1851 was approaching its close, the question of holding a third great exhibition in London came up for consideration. The proposal, however, was soon decided to be impracticable. The narrow escape from financial failure in 1862 rendered the successful raising of a guarantee fund problematical. It was doubtful how far manufacturers, tired of spending money on foreign exhibitions, and with their thirst for medals assuaged, if not entirely satiated, would support a large scheme. Under these circumstances Mr. Cole, ever fruitful of resource and ready with suggestion, came forward with a proposal for a series of annual exhibitions to extend over a period of ten years. Each exhibition was to deal with certain industries or arts, and a scheme was drafted, allotting to each one its share of the work. The Commissioners of 1851 guaranteed 100,000*l.*; the remaining buildings from the 1862 exhibition² were assigned for the purposes of the scheme; and in 1871 the first of the series was opened with much pomp and ceremony. It was not wholly unsuccessful. At all events it paid its way. Its successors were less fortunate; each was a heavier loss than the one before it; and in 1874 the series was brought to an end, after the fourth had been held.

It has often been asked, now that a series of special exhibitions has been so successfully carried out, how it was that a similar experiment in 1871 was so dismal a failure. The reasons are simple enough. The building was unsuitable. It was practically one enormous passage, running round a central square garden. Visitors were sick of its interminable length before they had got half round it; it was by no means well adapted for the exhibition of goods; there was no main building or central hall; and as for any general *coup d'œil*, it was out of the question. Then the Exhibition authorities and the Horticultural Society got to loggerheads, and in the later exhibitions the gardens were absolutely closed to the visitors to the Exhibition. Finally, the administration was not all that could have been desired. Nothing so soon strangles an exhibition as red tape, and the place was managed as if it were a Government department. There was a good deal of military routine and an utter absence of that suave geniality which we have got of late years to associate with the management of exhibitions. Mr. Cole, one of the ablest and most powerful men of his generation, a wonderful organiser, and (with some deficiencies) a most capable administrator, was not popular, and seemed never to know what the public would like; perhaps he never greatly cared. He generally had his way, bending to his will all with whom he had to deal; but he got his way, bearing down opposition in a fashion which by no

² Certain of these buildings were of a permanent character. They include the arcades of the Horticultural Gardens, and generally the buildings surrounding the Gardens on the east, west, and south sides, now used for the most part for housing certain of the South Kensington Museum collections.

means endeared him to those whose opinions he overrode. Everybody who has an honest liking for a strong man must admire and respect Henry Cole. He always knew what he wanted, and he generally got it. Nothing stopped him. He carried out his views with the most absolute disregard for the abuse and contumely which was poured upon him by his enemies. No criticism, no ridicule, made him swerve for an instant from the line he chose to take. He would collect and show to his friends the most bitter caricatures of himself and his associates, and was pleased, when a savage onslaught was made on him by a newspaper, at the attention thereby drawn to his proposals. He was absolutely fearless, a terror to his superiors, but respected, and for the most part liked, by his subordinates. But he was not a good man to reconcile conflicting interests, or to pacify discontented exhibitors. Here, probably, was the principal reason why the excellent series of exhibitions which he proposed did not prosper under his management.

The failure of this scheme was thought to have put a stop to exhibitions in this country, at all events for a long time. In other countries they were held with success, and English manufacturers found it worth their while to contribute. Here they were by many people said to be dead. Their multiplication is not popular with manufacturers. The man who has made his reputation is quite content to let matters rest, and until there has grown up a sufficient number of rivals who would like to make their reputations too, his natural objection to exhibitions meets with no opponents. The enormous and unwieldy size of a universal exhibition was an objection, the force of which was felt more and more with each succeeding show. It was evident that if exhibitions were to be held at all they must be limited in scope, and, despite the failure of the 1871 series, Mr. Cole's ideas were far from being dead. How successful a special exhibition might be was indeed shown by the Manchester Fine Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857, an experiment which has since remained unrivalled, though an attempt has been made to imitate it in the not very successful collection at Folkestone this year.

Putting this aside, we may reckon the Loan Collection of scientific apparatus shown in 1876 at South Kensington as the first special exhibition of importance. As nothing of the sort is perfect, opportunities for criticism were not wanting. The expenditure was somewhat lavish; the arrangement and cataloguing left something to be desired. Unfortunately it happened that some of the more active promoters were the objects of bitter personal hostility to the members of another class of scientific men, and, as some of these latter had great influence in the press, the exhibition came in for a good deal of abuse really intended for its organisers. The class to which it appealed, the class of scientific students, was a small one, and no

attempt was made to attract the general public. A few years later, in the early days of the telephone and the electric light, it would have been as popular among sightseers as it was valued among scientific men. As it was the public did not care for it, and the students of science were not numerous enough to support it.

That the Loan Collection was a little before its time was proved by the success of the special Electrical Exhibitions in Paris (1881), Vienna (1883), and Philadelphia (1884). These were of a strictly scientific character, but they dealt with a subject which was popular for the moment, and so they attracted that attention from the general public without which no enterprise of the sort can possibly prosper.

Another example of an exhibition dealing with a special subject was the Smoke Abatement Exhibition of 1882. This was practically a private speculation, and is understood to have cost its public-spirited promoters a good deal of money. It certainly did much in educating the public as to the best and most economical methods of using fuel, and a very distinct improvement in our grates and ranges may be traced to it.

The origin of the magnificent series of exhibitions now just brought to a close at South Kensington is interesting, and affords a good illustration of the difficulty of forecasting the issue of such enterprises. The holding of several successful fishery exhibitions in Germany and France induced some gentlemen to start a similar exhibition at Norwich. The success of this attempt suggested a repetition of the exhibition on a larger scale in London. At first the thing hung fire for a bit, as such schemes will, but it was taken up by the Duke of Edinburgh and the Prince of Wales, influential support was found for it, and the proposal became popular. A start was made; the enterprise grew bigger and bigger until it got to be a little too big for amateur hands. The assistance of Sir Philip Cunliffe-Owen was called in, and his long experience of such affairs soon enabled the Fisheries Exhibition to be organised on a scale far beyond the original intentions of its promoters. He was ably supported by those who had started the idea, and some of them not only gave their time and their labour, but took upon themselves the heavy pecuniary risks involved in an enterprise of such magnitude. The Prince of Wales, besides lending his influence, gave the benefit of his advice and his special knowledge of exhibitions. Popular tastes were consulted to an extent never before attempted at any exhibition, and provision made for the amusement, as well as the instruction, of visitors. The best part of the Horticultural Gardens was given up for promenaders, bands were provided, and of an evening the garden was illuminated. Success was complete. London had got what it had long wanted—an outdoor lounge at once pleasant and respectable; Vauxhall or Cremorne without the doubtful

characteristics of either. Everything went well, and the result was a considerable financial surplus.

So successful an experiment could not fail to be repeated. The Prince of Wales was now thoroughly interested, and, after due consideration, he announced a series of three exhibitions to be held under his direction. Carried out on the lines of the Fisheries, the Health, Inventions, and Colonial and Indian Exhibitions have been each in its own way an advance upon its predecessor. The Health made a surplus, after paying its expenses. The Inventions—more costly in arrangement and maintenance—after using up the balance from the Health, left certain liabilities to be discharged by the Colonies. Together, the three will doubtless turn out to have paid their way.³ That those who are responsible for the management should feel anxious for the financial solvency of their organisation is but natural; but, considering what these three exhibitions have done for Londoners—to say nothing of others than Londoners—the opinion may fairly be expressed that it does not matter a pin whether they result in a moderate deficit or a large surplus. In any other country the balance would be paid by the Government as a matter of course. Here we administer by purely private enterprise a concern the revenue of which is 100,000*l.* per annum. That is about what an exhibition costs. Carefully managed, there may be a surplus of 5,000*l.*—five per cent. Treat the public a little more liberally, give them a little more for their money, and the surplus is gone. The proper object of the managers of an exhibition should be—and the object of the managers of these exhibitions has been—not to make a profit, but to dispense all their income without getting into debt; to sail as near the wind as possible. This ought to be understood; and if the guarantors should be called upon to pay up—say five to ten per cent. of the guarantee—they ought not, and they probably would not, grumble at the notion. For this series of exhibitions has been a real gain to London. It has provided a cheap, harmless, and pleasant source of recreation to many thousands.⁴ It has formed a

³ The surplus of the Fisheries (amounting to 15,000*l.*) was devoted to the establishment of a Home for Fishermen's Orphans. The finances of the other three exhibitions were so far treated in common that the profits of any of them were arranged to be available against the losses of any other. The ill-natured statements occasionally made as to misappropriations of funds are pure invention, though it may perhaps be a matter for regret that the publication of the accounts of each exhibition has been delayed till the conclusion of the series. There is no reason to suppose that such separate publication would have caused any confusion or inconvenience, and it would have prevented a good deal of rather spiteful criticism.

⁴ The total number of visitors to the whole of the series may be taken as fifteen and a half millions. It is not possible to judge how many individuals this means. The same person paying ten visits counts of course as ten. It was calculated at one of the exhibitions that each season-ticket holder went on an average twenty-five times. A very large proportion can only have paid a single visit. Supposing that on an average everybody who went to any of the exhibitions at all went twice to each, we should get a total of nearly two million individuals who had been amused and instructed.

source of valuable instruction at all events to a portion of the vast crowds who have visited South Kensington since 1883. It has promoted trade to a considerable extent, and by the last of the four exhibitions it has done not a little towards strengthening the feelings of good-fellowship and kindness existing between the mother-country and her colonies.

Naturally there is something to be said on the other side. The tradesmen of London appear to have a genuine cause of complaint in the introduction into their midst of an enormous bazaar, full of shops whose tenants have their rents and taxes paid for them, and who consequently can afford to sell at a cheaper rate. The providers of public amusements grumble because their houses are emptied by the cheaper and more novel attractions of South Kensington. As regards the last class, it is surely a sufficient answer to say that they must put up with legitimate competition, and that, if they want to get hold of the public's shillings, they must find out some means of enticing the public back from the Circe's garden at Brompton to the joys of the legitimate drama and the elevating pleasures of the music-hall.

The tradesmen have more reason in their wail. The class affected would not appear to be a very large one, since, after all, the main necessaries of life were not provided in Old London, even when the mediæval character of that interesting thoroughfare was completed by the introduction of sweet-stuff shops and stalls for the sale of photographs. Nor can even the competition of the 'Colonial Market' seriously injure the revenues of the West-End butchers and greengrocers. Still, the grievance is a legitimate one, and it is also for the most part unnecessary. It is not of the essence of an exhibition that it should be a bazaar. The executive has always sufficient power to prevent sales if they like to exercise it. When, indeed, the exhibition is 'international,' there is a divided authority, and difficulties arise. The earlier exhibitions of the present series were, at all events, in name international, and it is not too much to say that the sale difficulty was mainly due to this fact. The foreign Commissioners, naturally anxious to fill up their courts, did not in all cases very scrupulously investigate the claims of applicants for space, and so many English firms got in under the shelter of a foreign name. These people, having been put to trouble and expense in acquiring their rights, naturally tried to recoup themselves, and were the most persistent sellers in the show. They were protected by the ægis of their adopted country, and the dread of international complications prevented their being so readily disposed of as otherwise they might have been. There were also the authorised stalls in Old London, and the 'markets' of the Fisheries and the Colonies. For the existence of the stalls there was not much reason. They brought no profit to the executive and no credit to the Exhibition.

The Fisheries market was an attempt to improve the conditions under which an important article of food is supplied to London, and the Colonial market is intended to bring directly to the knowledge of consumers the food supplies of our Colonies. There is, indeed, one class of goods which almost of necessity must be sold within an Exhibition. When a firm undertakes to illustrate a process of manufacture, it is a common stipulation that the articles made, if suitable, are to be allowed to be sold. This is a reasonable plea; and so long as the privilege is exercised in a reasonable fashion, it should always be allowed. Perhaps it might be well in future to safeguard it by requiring that a special permit, liable to revocation, should be obtained in such cases as the executive thought necessary, and that without it no sales, even of articles made in the Exhibition, would be allowed.

On the whole, it will, perhaps, be admitted that the grievance of the tradesmen is not a very heavy one; but that it is a pity that it was not, as it might have been, reduced within such narrow limits as to have made it quite inconsiderable.

An exhibition is, of course, an enormous advertising agency, and to say this is not in the faintest degree to disparage the exhibition system. Traders and customers are brought together in a perfectly legitimate and useful manner. The customer can see for himself the best wares the manufacturer can produce, and the manufacturer has the opportunity of discovering which of his products attract the most notice and the highest praise. But in order to render the advertisement permanent, it is desirable to give the successful exhibitor some testimony of his success. In other words, a system of prizes is necessary. To decide what should be the character of these prizes, and to award them fairly, has been the greatest difficulty in all large exhibitions. In 1851 it was first proposed to offer prizes of great value. A first prize of 5,000*l.* was even talked about. Eventually, however, prizes of three grades were decided upon—the council medal, the prize medal, and the honourable mention. To make these awards, a jury system was elaborated which certainly has not been since improved. The most competent men in the country, aided by foreign nominees selected with equal care, gave a vast amount of time to the careful inspection of all the miscellaneous collection, and produced a prize-list as little liable to cavil as such a list could be. Of course there were jealousies, international and other. Of course there were disappointments and mistakes. The former were in the nature of the case inevitable; the latter were not numerous.

With the growth of exhibitions the inherent difficulties increased. First, the value of the medals, their actual trade value, proved to be very high, probably much higher than was anticipated. It might have been thought that at the present time their value

would have been discounted, considering the great number that have been distributed and the doubtful manner in which some of them have been obtained. But it is not so. At the Inventions Exhibition last year, the competition was as keen, the anxiety amongst makers of the highest standing was as great, as ever. New firms are anxious to get on a level with, or ahead of, their rivals of established reputation, and old firms, who would have been content enough to have let well alone without any exhibition at all, are afraid of their rivals being able to say they are surpassed and beaten at last. 'This means a difference of hundreds a week to my firm' is a remark that has been made more than once in the case of a disputed award.

With such large pecuniary interests depending on the decisions of the juries, it would be idle to assume that the difficulties of selection are not very gravely enhanced. The jurors must not only be painstaking and honest, but they must be in position and in reputation quite above suspicion. When it is remembered that a juror is expected to devote a good many hours, or rather days, to laborious and unpaid work; that he is certain to incur the enmity of a considerable portion of the disappointed; that he will be accused of unfairness, carelessness, ignorance, and malice, at all events by a smaller portion of the same class; and that he has for his reward only the consciousness of merit fortunately attendant on any completed task—it is no small testimony to the amount of public spirit existing in the world that so many men are ready to undertake the work. For it is to be borne in mind that almost nobody concerned can be satisfied. If there are, say, three classes of medals—gold, silver, and bronze—it is certain that nobody will be quite content who has not a gold medal. Then, even the man with a gold medal is dissatisfied if his rival has one, too; while even the single holder of a gold medal in his own class has been known to urge that the several classes of articles shown by him were of such separate and distinct natures that they required the recognition of a separate medal for each.

Thus at the commencement of the work the difficulty arises of finding suitable jurors—men not only competent for the work, but likely to be tolerably acceptable to the exhibitors—and of inducing them to undertake the duties. In two of the present series of exhibitions—the Health and the Inventions Exhibitions—the device was adopted of asking each exhibitor to nominate three persons, in the hope that at all events a list would be provided from which a proper selection might be made, and with the idea also that the exhibitors would be less ready to find fault if the awards were made by their own nominees. In practice the plan met with but moderate success. In the Health Exhibition, a few well-known sanitarians received a large number of votes, and these would certainly all have been asked to serve

in any event. Most of the other names suggested had but one or two votes apiece; a few had three. All who had more than three votes, unless they were considered unsuitable, were invited to serve. Many of them declined, and in the end a large proportion of the juries had to be made up without much reference to the suggestions. In the Inventions the nominations were even less valuable. The nominations of the exhibitors were too varied to be of much service. In both exhibitions it was evident that many exhibitors merely suggested some one likely to take a favourable view of their own wares, and were more anxious to secure a friend at court than to aid in the selection of an unbiassed jury. In a few cases it was ascertained that some exhibitors had agreed to nominate the same person, and had selected gentlemen whose qualifications did not appear very striking to others than their proposers. On the whole, the system of universal suffrage disappointed its projectors. It was very little help; and, if it prevented objections being taken to the jurors selected, that is as much as can be said for it. It must be borne in mind that the experiment was tried with absolute honesty, and that the Commissioners who in both exhibitions selected the jurors would have been extremely pleased if their task had been rendered easier by a sufficient consensus of opinion as to the best appointments. When foreign jurors are to be appointed, the appointment naturally rests with the country exhibiting. The central executive is therefore relieved of a part of the responsibility, though difficulties of a different sort are plentiful enough. The alien juror naturally feels that his first duty is to his own fellow-countrymen, and, with every wish to be honest, he is naturally more appreciative of their merits, and possesses a keener sense of their deserts. If representatives of firms exhibiting are not considered to be eligible, the choice is still further limited. Generally they have been considered free to serve, their exhibits being placed *hors concours*. Probably from the use of a foreign tongue, this has always been considered a distinction quite equivalent to a gold medal, and was therefore much sought after. At the Inventions a rule was laid down that no exhibitor should act on a jury; but there was probably little advantage in the alteration, and it was found to work inconveniently by excluding the services of several competent and willing jurors.

The juries once appointed, it becomes necessary to make arrangements to ensure that the whole miscellaneous mass of contributions is properly inspected, and by the proper men. This is a very troublesome and very difficult task, but it is only a matter of minute and careful organisation. If the original classification of the goods has been carefully prepared, the work is much simplified, and with the experience of so many previous exhibitions as a guide there is not now any real difficulty in preparing a proper classification.

Of course anomalies will be discovered, generally too late for remedy. The inventor of a meat-tin opener, which has been condemned by a jury of culinary experts, points out that a special application of his instrument is for drawing teeth, and complains that he has been unvisited by the judges of surgical apparatus. A new patent horse-shoe is discovered as part of a collection of ornamental iron-work—*und so weiter*; but, after all, care and attention suffice to prevent such mishaps.

But after all comes the real hardship to those who are honestly endeavouring to carry out the work in a satisfactory fashion, whether as jurymen or as organisers and directors. They know that, try as hard as they may, they cannot make absolutely just awards, they cannot fairly discriminate between the merits of the different competing articles. How can a mere inspection enable the cleverest engineer to decide which of two steam engines, each possessing special and untried features of novelty, is the best? Or two looms, or two reaping-machines, or two dynamos? He can only go by his own experience, or by what he has heard of the outside performances of the machines. A proper series of experimental tests, spread over the whole of the articles shown, would take years of time and cost thousands of pounds. And so the awards have to be made in a more or less hap-hazard way. Generally a rough and ready justice, like that of the Eastern *cadi* of fiction, is done, but many cases of hardship occur, and it is the knowledge of this that renders the work of the juries so unsatisfactory to those who enter upon it with a real anxiety to carry it out fairly and well. If the jury awards were estimated at their true value, as guaranteeing a certain standard of excellence, as expressing a favourable opinion given under qualifying conditions, it would not matter so much; but as it is, they are, naturally enough, put forward by their winners as testimony of supreme excellence, and it would appear that the public accept them as such.

Several times attempts have been made to base the awards upon actual tests. In 1874 the Society of Arts undertook an elaborate series of tests of the stoves shown in the exhibition of that year. The tests attempted were too elaborate and minute; before they were completed the money allotted for the purpose was all spent, and the attempt was abandoned. The authorities of the Smoke Abatement Exhibition in 1882 profited by their predecessors' experience, and carried to a conclusion the tests on which they based their awards. But the value of the tests has often been disputed, and it is doubtful how far their results had any correspondence with the results which would have been obtained by longer trials in ordinary practice. These, however, were trials of a single class of inventions only, and no conclusions could well be drawn from them as to the application of practical tests to the contents of a miscellaneous exhibition. The

Royal Agricultural Society have shown before now the value of careful and accurate testing of motors and machines capable of actual trial, and they could also testify how costly and how carefully conducted such trials must be if they are to be of actual use.

It will be allowed, therefore, that the honest discharge of jury work is beset with difficulties. And all the work is not honest. Illegitimate influence of every sort is but too often brought to bear on all who have it in their power to advance the claims of some of the competitors. I believe that in the great exhibitions such influences have rarely had much success, but in those of the second class favouritism, to use no stronger term, has been far too common. This part of the subject is not pleasant. Let it suffice to say that, if the public will regard with suspicion—or rather treat as of no value—any awards but those made at exhibitions under the highest authority, no great injustice will be done to anybody.

It is very possible that the multiplication of prize medals, and the doubtful value of any but those of the highest class, may before very long put an end to the system, though from what has been said above it may be judged that there are not at present many signs of such a tendency. Some there are. Many firms decline to exhibit, and are not to be tempted by such baits. The chances are that they are losers. Medals apart, the profits gained by exhibitors from increased trade are generally considerable. Any exhibitor who can make and sell articles—especially articles of food—will drive a roaring trade. Even manufacturers of heavy goods are tolerably certain to cover their expenses, unless these expenses are on a very lavish scale indeed.

The future of exhibitions, at all events in this country, cannot fail to be very greatly affected by the foundation of the Imperial Institute suggested by the Prince of Wales, since, whatever may be the eventual nature of the Institute, it is certain to fulfil, at all events in great part, the functions of an exhibition. The precise character of the Institute is not yet known. If it is to take the high place among English institutions which is evidently intended by its royal founder, this much may safely be said—that it must be permitted to develop itself gradually, to attain completion by a certain process of evolution. Experience does not teach us to expect success for institutions, however promisingly conceived, which are launched complete into existence. Gradual growth would appear to be an almost necessary condition of permanence in the political as in the physical world.

The ablest councils and the fullest experience are at the command of its founder, and it cannot be doubted that the constitution for the new Institute will be drafted in the wisest, the most judicious manner possible. May it be permitted to express a hope that it will not be too complete, that it will be to the utmost possible extent elastic,

that it will permit of growth in every imaginable direction, and even in directions not now imaginable? Not the wisest of us can forecast the future development of any human institution. Is it not therefore well to leave the influences of the future, untrammelled by restrictions now apparently desirable, but perhaps unfitted to the changed conditions of half a generation onward, to mould that development for itself? To give examples of institutions that have profited by freedom or suffered by restrictive conditions would be a task not less easy than invidious. Perhaps the moral may be accepted without the need for an instance, and may serve as a contribution to the discussion from the opposite side to that of those who ask that a fully completed scheme may be submitted before their adhesion to a large and liberal project is to be expected.

The object of the Institute is defined with perfect clearness in the letter addressed to the Lord Mayor, in which his Royal Highness gave publicity to his proposal: the encouragement of the arts, manufactures, and commerce of the Empire. The means by which this end is to be attained is the question. Some suggest themselves obviously enough. Of these, the first is a Museum or collection of Colonial and Indian products. The proposal for a Colonial Museum has several times been put forward, and could not fail to suggest itself as the outcome of the magnificent collection now at South Kensington. From the British Museum at one end of the list to the International Exhibition at the other end, there are many grades. What precise place should be occupied by the Imperial Institute is a matter which has been a good deal discussed, and will be discussed a good deal more. Those who would yield something to the popular demand for a place of amusement might fairly urge that the gardens at Kew detract nothing from the value of the botanical collections there, or those of the Luxembourg from the character of the adjoining galleries. However, be this as it may, it may fairly be assumed that part of the Institute will consist of a Colonial Museum, in which the natural products, the physical characteristics, the arts and the manufactures of the Colonies will be fully represented. If it be found possible to relegate specimens of purely scientific value to their places in such collections as the Natural History Museum, Kew Gardens, or the Museum of the Pharmaceutical Society, the purposes of the scientific student will be better served, without the value of the general Colonial collection being greatly lessened.

As regards the discussion of Colonial matters, whether political, commercial, or scientific, doubts must suggest themselves whether it will be found practicable to carry on in what will really be a State institution such full and free controversy as alone can be of value. Possibly on investigation it may be found best to leave this work in the hands of private, and therefore independent, bodies. To the provision of popular lectures, of a character to diffuse useful

information about the Colonies throughout the country, no such exception can be taken, and if such lectures could be delivered in the courts of the museum amongst the objects to which they would relate, it would be so much the better. Means for the examination and analysis of colonial produce; an organisation for the introduction of all such produce to the English market; a system for informing the English buyer what the colonist has to sell, and for teaching the colonist what the English trader desires to buy; a central office where information could be procurable by would-be emigrants—these and such objects suggest themselves among the first for consideration in elaborating a scheme for the new institution.

If in the fulness of years its success and wealth justify its extension, so that it may include the mother-country as well as her dependencies, and become a great trade museum for the illustration of the arts, manufactures, and commerce of the whole Empire, the new Institute will fulfil a worthier function still.

Such a development cannot be expected even in the immediate future, perhaps never. In the meantime it only remains to hope that the utmost care and thought will be devoted to the elaboration of a constitution for the Institute. Wisely established and prudently administered, it ought to be a fresh source of strength to the Union. Hastily set up, and managed without the greatest judgment, the very importance of the foundation could not fail to make it a most potent instrument for mischief.

H. TRUEMAN WOOD.
(Secretary to the Society of Arts)

MULTIPLEX PERSONALITY.

"Ὅσον γ' ἄλλοιοι μετέφυν, τόσον ἔρ σφισιν αἰεὶ
καὶ τὸ φρονεῖν ἄλλοια παρίστατο.

EMPEDOCLES.

I PURPOSE in this paper briefly to suggest certain topics for reflection, topics which will need to be more fully worked out elsewhere. My theme is the multiplex and mutable character of that which we know as the Personality of man, and the practical advantage which we may gain by discerning and working upon this as yet unrecognised modifiability. I shall begin by citing a few examples of hysterical transfer, of morbid disintegration; I shall then show that these spontaneous readjustments of man's being are not all of them pathological or retrogressive; nay, that the familiar changes of sleep and waking contain the hint of further alternations which may be beneficially acquired. And, lastly, I shall point out that we can already by artificial means induce and regulate some central nervous changes which effect physical and moral good; changes which may be more restorative than sleep, more rapid than education. Here, I shall urge, is an avenue open at once to scientific and to philanthropic endeavour, a hope which hangs neither on fable nor on fancy, but is based on actual experience and consists with rational conceptions of the genesis and evolution of man.

I begin, then, with one or two examples of the pitch to which the dissociation of memories, faculties, sensibilities may be carried, without resulting in mere insane chaos, mere demented oblivion. These cases as yet are few in number. It is only of late years—and it is mainly in France—that *savants* have recorded with due care those psychical lessons, deeper than any art of our own can teach us, which natural anomalies and aberrant instances afford.

Pre-eminent among the priceless living documents which nature thus offers to our study stand the singular personages known as Louis V. and Félicité X. Félicité's name at least is probably familiar to most of my readers; but Louis V.'s case is little known, and although some account of it has already been given in English,¹ it will be needful to recall certain particulars in order to introduce the speculations which follow.

¹ *Journal of Mental Science* for January 1886. *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, part x. 1886 (Trübner & Co.).

Louis V. began life (in 1863) as the neglected child of a turbulent mother. He was sent to a reformatory at ten years old, and there showed himself, as he has always done when his organisation has given him a chance, quiet, well-behaved, and obedient. Then at fourteen years old he had a great fright from a viper—a fright which threw him off his balance and started the series of psychical oscillations on which he has been tossed ever since. At first the symptoms were only physical, epilepsy and hysterical paralysis of the legs; and at the asylum of Bonneval, whither he was next sent, he worked at tailoring steadily for a couple of months. Then suddenly he had a hystero-epileptic attack—fifty hours of convulsions and ecstasy—and when he awoke from it he was no longer paralysed, no longer acquainted with tailoring, and no longer virtuous. His memory was set back, so to say, to the moment of the viper's appearance, and he could remember nothing since. His character had become violent, greedy, and quarrelsome, and his tastes were radically changed. For instance, though he had before the attack been a total abstainer, he now not only drank his own wine but stole the wine of the other patients. He escaped from Bonneval, and after a few turbulent years, tracked by his occasional relapses into hospital or madhouse, he turned up once more at the Rochefort asylum in the character of a private of marines, convicted of theft but considered to be of unsound mind. And at Rochefort and La Rochelle, by great good fortune, he fell into the hands of three physicians—Professors Bourm and Burot, and Dr. Mabile—able and willing to continue and extend the observations which Dr. Camuset at Bonneval and Dr. Jules Voisin at Bicêtre had already made on this most precious of *mauvais sujets* at earlier points in his chequered career.*

He is now no longer at Rochefort, and Dr. Burot informs me that his health has much improved, and that his peculiarities have in great part disappeared. I must, however, for clearness' sake, use the present tense in briefly describing his condition at the time when the long series of experiments were made.

The state into which he has gravitated is a very unpleasing one. There is paralysis and insensibility of the right side, and (as is often the case in right hemiplegia) the speech is indistinct and difficult. Nevertheless he is constantly haranguing any one who will listen to him, abusing his physicians, or preaching, with a monkey-like impudence rather than with reasoned clearness, radicalism in politics and atheism in religion. He makes bad jokes, and if any one pleases him he endeavours to caress him. He remembers recent events

* For Dr. Camuset's account see *Annales Médico-Psychologiques*, 1882, p. 75; for Dr. Voisin's, *Archives de Neurologie*, Sept. 1885. The observations at Rochefort have been carefully recorded by Dr. Berjon, *La Grande Hystérie chez l'Homme*, Paris, 1886. The subject was again discussed at the recent meeting (Nancy, Aug 1886) of the French Association for the Advancement of Science, when Professor Burot promised a longer treatise on the subject.

during his residence at the Rochefort asylum, but only two scraps of his life before that date—namely, his vicious period at Bonneval and a part of his stay at Bicêtre.

Except this strangely fragmentary memory there is nothing very unusual in this condition, and in many asylums no experiments on it would have been attempted. Fortunately the physicians of Rochefort were familiar with the efficacy of the contact of metals in provoking transfer of hysterical hemiplegia from one side to the other. They tried various metals in turn on Louis V. Lead, silver, and zinc had no effect. Copper produced a slight return of sensibility in the paralysed arm. But steel, applied to the right arm, transferred the whole insensibility to the left side of the body.

Inexplicable as such a phenomenon certainly is, it is sufficiently common (as French physicians hold) in hysterical cases to excite little surprise. What puzzled the doctors was the change of character which accompanied the change of sensibility. When Louis V. issued from the crisis of transfer, with its minute of anxious expression and panting breath, he was what might fairly be called a new man. The restless insolence, the savage impulsiveness, have wholly disappeared. The patient is now gentle, respectful, and modest. He can speak clearly now, but he only speaks when he is spoken to. If he is asked his views on religion and politics, he prefers to leave such matters to wiser heads than his own. It might seem that morally and intellectually the patient's cure had been complete.

But now ask him what he thinks of Rochefort; how he liked his regiment of marines. He will blankly answer that he knows nothing of Rochefort, and was never a soldier in his life. 'Where are you, then, and what is the date of to-day?' 'I am at Bicêtre; it is January 2, 1884; and I hope to see M. Voisin to-day, as I did yesterday.'

It is found, in fact, that he has now the memory of two short periods of life (different from those which he remembers when his *right* side is paralysed), periods during which, so far as can now be ascertained, his character was of this same decorous type and his paralysis was on the left side.

These two conditions are what are now termed his first and his second, out of a series of six or more through which he can be made to pass. For brevity's sake I will further describe his *fifth* state only.

If he is placed in an electric bath, or if a magnet be placed on his head, it looks at first sight as though a complete physical cure had been effected. All paralysis, all defect of sensibility, has disappeared. His movements are light and active, his expression gentle and timid. But ask him where he is, and you find that he has gone back to a boy of fourteen, that he is at St. Urbain, his first

reformatory, and that his memory embraces his years of childhood, and stops short on the very day when he had the fright with the viper. If he is pressed to recollect the incident of the viper a violent epileptiform crisis puts a sudden end to this phase of his personality.

Is there, then, the reader may ask, any assignable law which governs these strange revolutions? any reason why Louis V. should at one moment seem a mere lunatic or savage, at another moment should rise into decorous manhood, at another should recover his physical soundness, but sink backward in mind into the child? Briefly, and with many reserves and technicalities perforce omitted, the view of the doctors who have watched him is somewhat as follows: A sudden shock, falling on an unstable organisation, has effected in this boy a profounder severance between the functions of the right and left hemispheres of the brain than has perhaps ever been observed before. We are accustomed, of course, to see the right side of the body paralysed and insensible in consequence of injury to the left hemisphere, which governs it, and *vice versâ*. And we are accustomed in hysterical cases—cases where there is no actual traceable injury to either hemisphere—to see the defects in sensation and motility shift rapidly—shift, as I may say, at a touch—from one side of the body to the other. But we cannot usually trace any corresponding change in the mode of functioning of what we assume as the ‘highest centres,’ the centres which determine those manifestations of intelligence, character, memory, on which our *identity* mainly depends. Yet in some cases of *aphasia* and of other forms of *asemia* (the loss of power over *signs*, spoken or written words and the like) phenomena have occurred which have somewhat prepared us to find that the loss of power to use the left—which certainly is in some ways the more developed—hemisphere may bring with it a retrogression in the higher characteristics of human life. And the singular phenomenon of *automatic writing* (as I have tried elsewhere to show³) seems often to depend on an obscure action of the less-used hemisphere. Those who have followed these lines of observation may be somewhat prepared to think it possible that in Louis V.’s case the alternate predominance of right or left hemisphere affects memory and character as well as motor and sensory innervation. Inhibit his left brain (and right side) and he becomes, as one may say, not only left-handed but *sinister*; he manifests himself through nervous arrangements which have reached a lower degree of evolution. And he can represent in memory those periods only when his personality had assumed the same attitude, when he had crystallised about the same point.

Inhibit his right brain, and the higher qualities of character remain, like the power of speech, intact. There is self-control; there

³ *Proceedings of the Society for Psychological Research*, vol. iii. (Trübner & Co.).

is modesty; there is the sense of duty—the qualities which man has developed as he has risen from the savage level. But nevertheless he is only half himself. Besides the hemiplegia, which is a matter of course, memory is truncated too, and he can summon up only such fragments of the past as chance to have been linked with this one abnormal state, leaving unrecalled not only the period of sinister inward ascendancy, but the normal period of childhood, before his *Wesen* was thus cloven in twain. And now if by some art we can restore the equipoise of the two hemispheres again, if we can throw him into a state in which no physical trace is left of the severance which has become for him a second nature, what may we expect to find as the psychical concomitant of this restored integrity? What we do find is a change in the patient which, in the glimpse of psychical possibilities which it offers us, is among the most interesting of all. He is, if I may so say, born again; he becomes as a little child; he is set back in memory, character, knowledge, powers, to the days before this trouble came upon him or his worse self assumed its sway.

I have begun with the description of an extreme case, a case which to many of my readers may seem incredible in its *bizarrierie*. But though it is extreme it is not really isolated; it is approached from different sides by cases already known. The mere resumption of life at an earlier moment, for instance, is of course only an exaggeration of a phenomenon which frequently appears after cerebral injury. The trainer, stunned by the kick of a horse, completes his order to loosen the girths the moment that trepanning has been successfully performed. The old lady struck down at a card party, and restored to consciousness after long insensibility, surprises her weeping family by the inquiry, 'What are trumps?' But in these common cases there is but a morsel cut out of life; the personality reawakens as from sleep and is the same as of old. With Louis V. it is not thus; the memories of the successive stages are not lost but juxtaposed, as it were, in separate compartments; nor can one say what epochs are in truth intercalary, or in what central channel the stream of his being flows.

Self-severances profound as Louis V.'s are naturally to be sought mainly in the lunatic asylum.⁴ There indeed we find duplicated individuality in its grotesquer forms. We have the man who has always lost himself and insists on looking for himself under the bed. We have the man who maintains that there are two of him, and sends his plate a second time, remarking, 'I have had plenty, but the other fellow has not.' We have the man who maintains that

⁴ The cases cited here come mainly from Krishaber's *Névropathie Cérébro-cardiaque*. Several of them will be found cited in Rabot's admirable monograph *Maladies de la Personnalité*.

he is himself and his brother too, and when asked how he can possibly be both at once, replies, 'Oh, by a different mother.'

Or sometimes the personality oscillates from one focus to another, and the rival impulses, which in us merely sway different moods, objectify themselves each in a *persona* of its own. An hysterical penitent believes herself one week to be 'Sœur Marthe des Cinq Plaies,' and the next week relapses into an imaginary 'Madame Poulmaire,' with tastes recalling a quite other than conventual model. Another patient seems usually sane enough, but at intervals he lets his beard grow, and is transformed into a swaggering lieutenant of artillery. The excess over, he shaves his beard and becomes once more a lucid though melancholy student of the early Fathers. Such changes of character, indeed, may be rapid and varied to any extent which the patient's experience of life will allow. In one well-known case a poor lady varied her history, her character, even her sex, from day to day. One day she would be an emperor's bride, the next an imprisoned statesman—

Juvenis quondam, nunc femina, Cæneus,
Rursus et in veterem fato revoluta figuram.

Yet more instructive, though often sadder still, are the cases where the disintegration of personality has not reached the pitch of insanity, but has ended in a bewildered impotence, in the horror of a lifelong dream. Speaking generally, such cases fall under two main heads—those where the loss of control is mainly over *motor* centres, and the patient can feel but cannot act; and those where the loss of control is mainly over *sensory* centres, and the patient acts but cannot feel.

Inability to act just as we would wish to act is a trouble in which we most of us share. We probably have moods in which we can even sympathise with that provoking patient of Esquirol's who, after an attack of monomania, recovered all those social gifts which made him the delight of his friends, but could no longer be induced to give five minutes' attention to the most urgent business. 'Your advice,' he said cordially to Esquirol, 'is thoroughly good. I should ask nothing better than to follow it, if you could further oblige me with the power to *will* what I please.' Sometimes the whole life is spent in the endeavour to perform trifling acts—as when a patient of M. Billod's spent nearly an hour in trying to make the flourish under his signature to a power of attorney; or tried in vain for three hours, with hat and gloves on, to leave his room and go out to a pageant which he much wished to see. Such cases need heroic treatment, and this gentleman had the luck to be caught and cured by the Revolution of 1848.

Still more mournful are the cases where it is mainly the sensory

centres which lie, as it were, outside the personality; where thought and will remain intact, but the world around no longer stirs the wonted feelings, nor can reach the solitary soul. 'In all my acts one thing is lacking—the sense of effort that should accompany them, the sense of pleasure that they should yield.' 'All things,' said another sufferer, 'are immeasurably distant from me; they are covered with a heavy air.' 'Men seem to move round me,' said another, 'like moving shadows.' And gradually this sense of ghostly vacancy extends to the patient's own person. 'Each of my senses, each part of me, is separate from myself.' 'J'existe, mais en dehors de la vie réelle.' It is as though Teiresias, who alone kept his true life in unsubstantial Hades, should at last feel himself dream into a shade.

Sometimes the regretful longing turns into a bitter sense of exile, of banishment, of fall from high estate. There are words that remind us of the passionate protestations of Empedocles, refusing to accept this earth as his veritable home. Κλαῦσά τε καὶ κῶκυσα, said the Sicilian of Sicily, ἰδὼν ἀσυνήθεα χῶρον ('I wept and lamented, looking on a land to me unwonted and unknown'). 'Lorsque je me trouvais seul,' said a patient of Krishaber's, 'dans un endroit nouveau, j'étais comme un enfant nouveau-né, ne reconnaissant plus rien. J'avais un ardent désir de revoir mon ancien monde, de redevenir l'ancien moi; c'est ce désir qui m'a empêché de me tuer.'

These instances have shown us the *retrogressive* change of personality, the dissolution into incoordinate elements of the polity of our being. We have seen the state of man like a city blockaded, like a great empire dying at the core. And of course a spontaneous, unguided disturbance in a machinery so complete is likely to alter it more often for the worse than for the better. Yet here we reach the very point which I most desire to urge in this paper. I mean that even these spontaneous, these unguided disturbances do sometimes effect a change which is a marked improvement. Apart from all direct experiment they show us that we are in fact capable of being reconstituted after an improved pattern, that we may be fused and recrystallised into greater clarity; or, let us say more modestly, that the shifting sand-heap of our being will sometimes suddenly settle itself into a new attitude of more assured equilibrium.

Among cases of this kind which have thus far been recorded, none is more striking than that of Dr. Azam's often quoted patient, Félicité X.

Many of my readers will remember that in her case the somnambulant life has become the normal life; the 'second state,' which appeared at first only in short, dream-like accesses, has gradually replaced the 'first state,' which now recurs but for a few hours at long intervals. But the point on which I wish to dwell is this: that Félicité's second state is altogether *superior* to the first—physically

superior, since the nervous pains which had troubled her from childhood have disappeared; and morally superior, inasmuch as her morose, self-centred disposition is exchanged for a cheerful activity which enables her to attend to her children and her shop much more effectively than when she was in the 'état bête,' as she now calls what was once the only personality that she knew. In this case, then, which is now of nearly thirty years' standing, the spontaneous readjustment of nervous activities—the second state, no memory of which remains in the first state—has resulted in an improvement profounder than could have been anticipated from any moral or medical treatment that we know. The case shows us how often the word 'normal' means nothing more than 'what happens to exist.' For Félicité's *normal* state was in fact her *morbid* state; and the new condition, which seemed at first a mere hysterical abnormality, has brought her to a life of bodily and mental sanity which makes her fully the equal of average women of her class.

Now, before we go further, let us ask ourselves whether this result, which sounds so odd and paradoxical, ought in reality to surprise us. Had we any reason for supposing that changes as profound as Félicité's need always be for the worse, that the phase of personality in which we happen to find ourselves is the phase in which, given our innate capacities, it is always best for us to be?

To make this question more intelligible, I must have recourse to a metaphor. Let us picture the human brain as a vast manufactory, in which thousands of looms, of complex and differing patterns, are habitually at work. These looms are used in varying combinations; but the main driving-bands, which connect them severally or collectively with the motive power, remain for the most part unaltered.

Now, how do I come to have my looms and driving-gear arranged in this particular way? Not, certainly, through any deliberate choice of my own. My ancestor the ascidian, in fact, inherited the business when it consisted of little more than a single spindle. Since his day my nearer ancestors have added loom after loom. Some of their looms have fallen to pieces unheeded; others have been kept in repair because they suited the style of order which the firm had at that time to meet. But the class of orders received has changed very rapidly during the last few hundred years. I have now to try to turn out altruistic emotions and intelligent reasoning with machinery adapted to self-preserving fierceness or manual toil. And in my efforts to readjust and reorganise I am hindered not only by the old-fashioned type of the looms, but by the inconvenient disposition of the driving gear. I cannot start one useful loom without starting a dozen others that are merely in the way. And I cannot shift the driving gear to suit myself, for I cannot get at much of it without stopping the engines, and if I stopped my engines I should not know how to set them going again. In this perplexity I

watch what happens in certain factories—Félida's, for instance—where the hidden part of the machinery is subject to certain dangerous jerks or dislocations, after which the gearings shift of themselves and whole groups of looms are connected and disconnected in a novel manner. From hence I get at least a hint as to the concealed attachments; and if I see that new arrangement working well I have an object to aim at; I can try to produce a similar change, though a smaller one, among my own looms and by my own manipulation.

For even if these profoundest spontaneous changes are beyond the reach of imitation, there are smaller changes, long familiar to us, which we now see in a new light, as imitable in a manner which shall reproduce their advantages without their drawbacks. There is the painless trance which sometimes supervenes in hysteria; there is the action of alcohol; there is especially the action of opium, which from the first commended itself by its *psychical* effect, by the emotional tranquillity which it induces. Such at least seems to be the inference from the well-known passage where the wifely Helen determines to give her husband and his friends the chance of talking comfortably, without interrupting themselves by perpetual tears and lamentations,

Then heaven-born Helen in their cups would throw
Nepenthes, woeless banisher of woe:
This whoso drank daylong no tear should shed—
No, though he gazed on sire and mother dead;
No, though his own son on that dreamy day
Before his own eyes raging foes should slay.*

The successive discoveries of intoxicants, narcotics proper, and anæsthetics formed three important stages in our growing control over the nervous system. Mesmer's discovery, or rather his re-discovery of a process probably at least as old as Solon, marked an epoch of quite equal significance. And the refinements on Mesmer's process which this century has seen, the discoveries linked with the names of Puysegur, Esdaile, Braid, Charcot, &c., though often set forth with an air of controversy rather than of co-operation, will gradually be recognised as mutually concordant elements in a new branch of moral as well as physical therapeutics. Nay, it is a nascent art of self-modification; a system of pulleys (to return to our previous metaphor), by which we can disjoin and reconnect portions of our machinery which admit of no directer access.

One or two brief instances may indicate the moral and the physical benefits which hypnotisation is bringing within the range of practical medicine. And first I will cite one of the cases—rare as yet—where an insane person has been hypnotised with permanent benefit.⁶

⁵ *Od.* iv 219.

⁶ *Annales Médico-Psychologiques*, 1884, vol. ii. p. 289 *seqq.* The case was redis-

In the summer of 1884 there was at the Salpêtrière a young woman of a deplorable type. Jeanne Sch—— was a criminal lunatic, filthy in habits, violent in demeanour, and with a lifelong history of impurity and theft. M. Auguste Voisin, one of the physicians on the staff, undertook to hypnotise her on May 31, at a time when she could only be kept quiet by the strait jacket and ‘bonnet d’irrigation,’ or perpetual cold douche to the head. She would not—indeed, she could not—look steadily at the operator, but raved and spat at him. M. Voisin kept his face close to hers, and followed her eyes wherever she moved them. In about ten minutes a stertorous sleep ensued; and in five minutes more she passed into a sleep-waking state and began to talk incoherently. The process was repeated on many days, and gradually she became sane when in the trance, though she still raved when awake. Gradually too she became able to obey in waking hours commands impressed on her in the trance—first trivial orders (to sweep the room and so forth), then orders involving a marked change of behaviour. Nay, more; in the hypnotic state she voluntarily expressed repentance for her past life, made a confession which involved more evil than the police were cognisant of (though it agreed with facts otherwise known), and finally of her own impulse made good resolves for the future. Two years have now elapsed, and M. Voisin writes to me (July 31, 1886) that she is now a nurse in a Paris hospital and that her conduct is irreproachable. In this case, and in some recent cases of M. Voisin’s, there may, of course, be matter for controversy as to the precise nature and the prognosis, apart from hypnotism, of the insanity which was cured. But my point is amply made out by the fact that this poor woman, whose history since the age of 13 had been one of reckless folly and vice, is now capable of the steady, self-controlled work of a nurse at a hospital, the reformed character having first manifested itself in the hypnotic state, partly in obedience to suggestion and partly as the natural result of the tranquillisation of morbid passions.

M. Voisin has followed up this case with others equally striking, into some of which a committee of the Société Médico-Psychologique is now enquiring. And M. Dufour, the medical head of another asylum,⁷ has adopted hypnotic suggestion as a regular element in his treatment. ‘Dès à présent,’ he says, ‘notre opinion est faite: sans crainte de nous tromper, nous affirmons que l’hypnotisme peut rendre service dans le traitement des maladies mentales.’ As was to be expected, he finds that only a small proportion of lunatics are hypnotisable; but the effect produced on these, whether by entrancement or suggestion, is uniformly good. His best subject is a

cussed at the last meeting of the French Association for the Advancement of Science.

⁷ Dr E. Dufour, médecin en chef de l’asile Saint-Robert (Isère). See *Annales Médico-Psychologiques*, Sept. 1886, p. 238

depraved young man, who after many convictions for crimes (including attempted murder) has become a violent lunatic. 'T.,' says Dr. Dufour, 'a été un assez mauvais sujet. Nous n'avons plus à parler au présent, tellement ses sentiments moraux ont été améliorés par l'hypnotisme.' This change and amelioration of character (over and above the simple recovery of sanity) has been a marked feature in some of Dr. Voisin's cases as well.

There is, indeed, in the sleep-waking state even of sane persons, a characteristic change of character, more easily recognised than described. Without generalising too confidently I may say that there seems usually to be an absence of self-consciousness and anxiety, a diminution of mere animal instincts, and a sense of expansion and freedom which shows itself either in gaiety or in a sort of beatific calm. In Madame B. (a subject whose susceptibility to hypnotisation by Dr. Gibert and Prof. Janet from a distance has recently attracted much notice) there was something—as it seemed to me—inde-scribably absurd in the contrast between the peasant woman's humble, stolid, resigned cast of countenance and the childish glee with which she joked and babbled during the 'phase somnambulique' of her complex trance. On the other hand M. Richet says of a recent subject of his own,⁸ 'She seems when in the somnambulant state to be normal in all respects except that her character has changed. When awake she is gay and lively; when entranced, grave, serious, almost solemn. . . . Her intelligence seems to have increased.'

And I may remark that this phase of the somnambulant character, this tendency to absorption and ecstasy, is a fact of encouraging significance. It is an indication that we may get more work out of ourselves in certain modified states than we can at present. 'Ecstasy,' which in former ages was deemed the exalted prerogative of saints, is now described as a matter of course among the phases of a mere hysterical attack. The truth is, perhaps, more complex than either of these views would admit. Ecstasy (we may certainly say with the modern alienist) is for the most part at least a purely subjective affection, corresponding to no reality outside the patient and appearing along with other instabilities in the course of hysteria. True; but on the other hand ecstasy is to hysteria somewhat as genius is to insanity. The ecstasy, say, of Louise Lateau assuredly proves no dogma and communicates to us no revelation. Yet, taken strictly by itself, it is not altogether a retrograde or dissolutive nervous phenomenon. Rather it represents the extreme tension of the poor girl's spirit in the highest direction which her intellect allows; and the real drawback is that this degree of occasional concentration usually implies great habitual instability. The hysterical patient has an hour of ecstasy, during which her face, if we may trust Dr. Paul

⁸ *Revue Philosophique*, Sept. 1886, p. 327.

Richer's drawings,⁹ often assumes a lofty purity of expression which the ordinary young person might try in vain to rival. But she pays for the transitory exaltation by days of incoherent scolding, of reckless caprice. And similarly, as I maintain, the power of exaltation, of concentration, which constitutes genius implies a profound *modifiability* of the nervous system, a tendency of the stream of mentation to pour with a rush into some special channels. In a Newton or a Shelley this modifiability is adequately under control; were it not so our Shelleys would lapse into incoherence, our Newtons into monomania.

And I maintain that the hypnotic trance, with its liberation from petty preoccupations, its concentration in favourite channels, has some analogy to genius as well as to hysteria. I maintain that for some uneducated subjects it has been the highest mental condition which they have ever entered; and that, when better understood and applied to subjects of higher type, it may dispose to flows of thought more undisturbed and steady than can be maintained by the waking effort of our tossed and fragmentary days.

I have dwelt at some length on the *moral* accompaniments of the hypnotic trance, because they are as yet much less generally known than the physical. It would, indeed, be a mere waste of space to dwell on the lulling of *pain* which can be procured by these methods, or even on the painless performance of surgical operations during the hypnotic trance; but I will cite a case¹⁰ illustrating a point comparatively new—namely, that the insusceptibility to pain need not be confined to the entranced condition, but may be prolonged by hypnotic suggestion into subsequent waking hours.

An hysterical patient in the hospital of Bordeaux suffered recently from a malady which was certainly not imaginary. She had a 'phlegmon,' or inflamed abscess, as big as a hen's egg, on the thigh, with excessive tenderness and lancinating pain. It was necessary to open the swelling, but the screaming patient would not allow it to be touched. Judging this to be a good opportunity for testing the real validity of deferred hypnotic suggestion, Dr. Pitres hypnotised the woman by looking fixedly in her eyes, and then suggested to her that *after she had been awakened* she would allow the abscess to be opened, and would not feel the slightest pain. She was then awakened, and apparently resumed her normal state. M. A. Boursier proceeded to open and squeeze out the abscess in a deliberate way. The patient merely looked on and smiled. She had no recollection of the suggestion which had been made to her during her trance, and she was not a little astonished to see her formidable enemy thus disposed of without giving her the slightest pain.

⁹ *La Grande Hystérie*, 2nd edit. Paris, 1885.

¹⁰ First given in the *Journal de Médecine de Bordeaux*, and cited at length in Dr. Bérillon's *Revue de l'Hypnotisme* for Sept. 1886. Professor Pitres' name, I may add, carries great weight in the French medical world.

Cases like these are certainly striking enough to give a considerable impetus to further experiment. Hypnotism, however, has in England many prejudices to contend with. I shall touch on one such prejudice only—a very natural one and germane to the main argument of this paper. ‘These duplications of state,’ it is said, ‘are not *natural*; and what is unnatural, even if it is not morbid, can never be more than a mere curiosity.’ I would ask of such an objector one single question: ‘Which state, then, do you consider, as unnatural, your own ordinary sleep or your own ordinary waking?’

This rejoinder goes, I think, to the root of the matter; for we do indubitably undergo every day of our lives a change of state, a shifting of our internal mechanism, which is closely parallel to the artificial changes whose induction I am here recommending. Our familiar sleep, whether considered from the psychical or the physiological side, has a curious history, strange potentialities. In its psychical aspect—to take the point which here most concerns us—it involves at least the rudiments of a ‘second state,’ of an independent memory. I should like, had I space, to show how the mere recurrence of a dream-scene—a scene which has no prototype in waking life—is the first stage on the way to those recurrent accesses of somnambulism, linked by continuous memory, which have developed into the actual ordinary life of *Félida X*. Leaving this point for future treatment, and passing to sleep’s *physiological* aspect, we recognise in it the compromise or resultant of many tentative duplications of state which our lowly ancestors have known. Their earliest differentiation of condition, it may be, was merely the change between light and darkness, or between motion and rest. Then comes *encystation*, a fruitful quiescence, originally, perhaps, a mere immobility of self-defence, but taken advantage of for reproductive effort. And passing from protozoa to metazoa, we find numerous adaptations of this primitive duplicability of condition. We find sleep utilised as a protection against hunger, as a protection against cold. We find animals for whom what we call ‘true sleep’ is wanting, whose circumstances do not demand any such change or interruption in the tenor of their life-long way.

Yet why describe this undifferentiated life-history as a state of waking rather than of sleep? Why assume that sleep is the acquired, vigilance the ‘normal’ condition? It would not be hard to defend an opposite thesis. The new-born infant might urge with cogency that his habitual state of slumber was primary as regards the individual, ancestral as regards the race; resembling at least, far more closely than does our adult life, a primitive or protozoic habit. ‘Mine,’ he might say, ‘is a centrally stable state. It would need only some change in external conditions (as my permanent immersion in a nutritive fluid) to be safely and indefinitely maintained. Your waking state, on the other hand, is centrally unstable. While you

talk and bustle around me you are living on your physiological capital, and the mere prolongation of vigilance is torture and death.'

A paradox such as this forms no part of my argument; but it may remind us that physiology at any rate hardly warrants us in speaking of our waking state as if that alone represented our true selves, and every deviation from it must be at best a mere interruption. Vigilance in reality is but one of two co-ordinate phases of our personality, which we have acquired or differentiated from each other during the stages of our long evolution. And just as these two states have come to coexist for us in advantageous alternation, so also other states may come to coexist with these, in response to new needs of the still evolving organism.

And I will now suggest two methods in which such states as those described, say, in Dr. Voisin's or in Dr. Pitres' cases, might be turned to good account. In the world around us are many physical invalids and many 'moral invalids,' and of both these classes a certain percentage are sure to prove hypnotisable, with patience and care. Let us try to improve the moral invalid's character by hypnotic suggestions of self-restraint, which will continue effective after he wakes. And let us try to enable the physical invalid to carry on his intellectual life without the perturbing accompaniment of pain. I am not bringing out a panacea, and I expect that with the English race, and in our present state of knowledge, but few of these experiments will succeed. But increased experience will bring the process under fuller control, will enable us to hypnotise a larger proportion of persons and to direct the resulting phenomena with more precision. What is needed is the perseverance in experiment which springs from an adequate realisation of the ultimate gain, from a conviction that the tortuous inlet which we are navigating is one of the mouths of a river which runs up far into the unexplored interior of our being.

I have dealt elsewhere with some further cases which go to show the persistent efficacy of moralising suggestions—suggestions mainly of abstinence from pernicious indulgences—when made to a subject in the hypnotic trance.¹¹ It must suffice here to point out that such moralisation, whether applied to a sane or insane subject, must by no means be considered as a mere trick or a mere abnormality. It is but the systematisation of a process on which religious and moral 'revivals' have always largely depended. When some powerful personage has thrown many weaker minds into a state of unusual perturbation, unusual plasticity, there is an element in that psychical tumult which may be utilised for lasting good. A strong suggestion may be made, and its effect on the brain will be such that it will work itself out, almost automatically, perhaps for years to come. When Father Mathew spread the temperance pledge through Ireland he showed this power at its best. What it can be at its worst we see, for in-

¹¹ *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, part x. (Trubner, 1886).

stance, in the recent epidemic of frenzy in the Bahamas, where the hysterical symptoms were actually the main object sought, and the dogma only served to give to that hysteria a stimulating flavour of brimstone. Scenes not dissimilar have been witnessed in England too; yet the sober moralist has been forced to recognise that a germ of better life has often been dropped, and has quickened, amid the turbulence of what to him might seem a mere scandalous orgy.

Just so did the orthodox physician look on in disgusted contempt at the tumultuous *crises* of the patients around Mesmer's *baquet*. But science has now been able to extract from that confused scene its germ of progress, and to use a part of Mesmer's processes to calm the very accesses which Mesmer employed them to generate. Let her attempt, then, to extract the health-giving element from that moral turbulence as well, and to use the potency which in ignorant hands turns men and women into hysterical monomaniacs, to revive in the spirits which she dominates the docility of the little child.

This last phrase represents a true, an important analogy. The art of education, as we know, rests on the physiological fact that the child's brain receives impressions more readily, and retains them more lastingly, than the adult's. And those of us who have been well drilled in childhood are not apt to consider that the advantage thus gained for us was an unfair or tricky one, nor even that virtue has been made unduly easy to us, so that we deserve no credit for doing right. It surely need not, then, be considered as over-reaching Destiny, or outwitting the Moral Law, if we take persons whose early receptiveness has been abused by bad example and try to reproduce that receptiveness by a physiological process, and to imprint hypnotic suggestions of a salutary kind.

I ventured to make a proposal of this kind in a paper published a year ago; but, although it attracted some comment as a novelty, I cannot flatter myself that it was taken *au sérieux* by the pedagogic world. But as I write these lines I see from a report of the Association Française pour l'Avancement des Sciences (Session de Nancy, 1886) that the 'Section de Pédagogie' has actually passed a resolution desiring 'que des expériences de suggestion hypnotique soient tentées, dans un but de moralisation et d'éducation, sur quelques-uns des sujets les plus notoirement mauvais et incorrigibles des écoles primaires.' I commend the idea then, with the sense that I am not alone in my paradox, to the attention of practical philanthropists.

My second suggestion—namely, that we may conceivably learn to carry on our intellectual life in a state of insusceptibility to physical pain, may appear a quite equally bold one. 'We admit,' the critics might say, 'that a man in the hypnotic trance is insensible to pinching; but, since he can also notoriously, when in that state, be made to believe that his name is Titus Oates, or that a candle-end is a piece of plum cake, or any other absurdity, the intellectual work

which he performs in that mood of mind is not likely to be worth much.' But my point is, as may have been already gathered, that this clean-cut, definite conception of the hypnotic state is now shown to have been crude and rudimentary. Dr. Pitres' case, above cited, (where the patient was restored to ordinary life in all respects except that she continued insensible to pain), is a mere sample of cases daily becoming more numerous, where power is gained to dissociate the elements of our being in novel ways, to form from them, if I may so say, not only the one strange new compound 'hypnotic trance,' but a whole series of compounds marking the various stages between that and the life of every day. Hysterical phenomena, now for the first time studied with something like the attention which they deserve, point strongly in this direction. And apart from hysteria, apart from hypnotism, we find in active and healthy life scattered hints of the possible absence of pain during vigorous intellectual effort. From the candidate in a competitive examination who forgets his toothache till he comes out again, to the soldier in action unconscious of the bullet-wound till he faints from loss of blood, we have instances enough of an exaltation or concentration which has often made the resolute spirit altogether unconscious of conditions which would have been absorbing to the ordinary man. And here too, as in the case of moral suggestibility, already dealt with, the function of science is to regularise the accidental and to elicit from the mingled phenomenon its permanent boon. Already men attempt to do this by a mere chemical agency. There have been philosophers who have sought in laudanum intellectual lucidity and bodily repose. There have been soldiers who have supplemented with 'Dutch courage' the ardour of martial fire. Philosopher and soldier alike expose themselves to an unhappy reaction. But by the induction of hypnotic anæsthesia we are taking a shorter road to our object; we are acting on the central nervous system without damaging stomach or liver on the way. It was an *abridgment* of this kind when subcutaneous injection of morphia replaced in so many cases morphia taken by the mouth. Yet though the evil done *in transitu* was subtler and slower evil still was done. On the other hand the direct non-chemical action on the central nervous system, in which hypnotism consists, is not proved to be in any way necessarily injurious, and has thus far, when under careful management, resulted almost uniformly in good. Such at least is the view of all physicians, so far as I know, who have practised it themselves on a large scale, though it is *not* the general view at present of those men—physicians or others—who are content to judge from hearsay and to write at second-hand.

Let us not then, I would say, be satisfied if we can merely give some poor sufferer a good night by hypnotism, or even if we can operate on him painlessly in a state of trance. Let us approach the topic of the banishment of pain in a more thoroughgoing and

bolder spirit. Looking at that growing class of civilised persons who suffer from neuralgia, indigestion, and other annoying but not dangerous forms of *malaise*, let us consider whether we cannot induce—in those of them who are fortunate enough to be readily hypnotisable—a third condition of life, which shall be as waking but without its uneasiness and as sleep without the blankness of its repose, a state in which the mind may go serenely onward and the body have no power to distract her energy or to dispute her sway.

Is there anything in nature to render this ideal impossible? Let us consider the history of pain. Pain, it may be plausibly suggested, is an advantage acquired by our ancestors in the course of their struggle for existence. It would be useless to the fortunate animalcule, which, if you chop it in two, is simply two animalcules instead of one. But as soon as the organism is complex enough to suffer partial injury, and active enough to check or avoid such injury before it has gone far, the pain becomes a useful warning, and the sense of pain is thus one of the first and most generalised of the perceptive faculties which place living creatures in relation with the external world. And to the human infant it is necessary still. The burnt child must have some reason to dread the fire, or he will go on poking it with his fingers. But, serviceable though pain may still be to the child and the savage, civilised men and women have now a good deal more of it than they can find any use for. Some kinds of pain, indeed (like neuralgia, which *prevents* the needed rest), are wholly detrimental to the organism and have arisen by mere correlation with other susceptibilities which are in themselves beneficial. Now if this correlation were inevitable—if it were impossible to have acute sense-perceptions, vivid emotional development, without these concomitant nervous pains—we should have to accept the annoyance without more ado. But certain spontaneously occurring facts, and certain experimental facts, have shown us that the correlation is *not* inevitable; that the sense of pain can be abolished, while other sensibilities are retained, to an extent far beyond what the common experience of life would have led us to suppose possible.

Our machinery is hampered by a system of checks, intended to guard against dangers which we can now meet in other ways, and often operating as a serious hindrance to the work of our manufactory. A workman here and there has hit on an artifice for detaching these checks, with signal advantage, and is beginning to report to the managers his guess at a wider application of the seemingly trivial contrivance.

Be it mentioned too that not only pain itself, but anxiety, ennui, intellectual fatigue, may be held in abeyance by hypnotic treatment and suggestion. There is not, indeed, much evidence of any increase of sheer intellectual acumen in the hypnotic state, but in most kinds

of ordinary brain-work the difficulty is not so much that one's actual power of thinking is inadequate to the problems proposed as that one cannot use that power aright, cannot focus one's object steadily or gaze on it long. Hypnotism may not supply one with mental lenses of higher power, but in its *artificial attention* we have at least the rudiment of a machinery like that which holds firm the astronomer's telescope and sweeps it round with the moving heavens, as compared with the rough and shifting adjustments of a spy-glass held in the hand.

These speculations, especially where they point to moral progress as attainable by physiological artifice, will seem to many of my readers venturesome and unreal. And in these days of conflicting dogmas and impracticable utopias Science, better aware than either priest or demagogue of how little man can truly know, is tempted to confine herself to his material benefit, which can be made certain, and to let his moral progress—which is a speculative hope—alone. Yet now that Science is herself becoming the substance of so many creeds, the lode-star of so many aspirations, it is important that she should not in any direction even appear to be either timid or cynical. Her humble missionaries at least need not show themselves too solicitous about possible failure, but should rather esteem it as dereliction of duty were some attempt not made to carry her illumination over the whole realm and mystery of man.

Especially, indeed, is it to be desired that biology should show—not indeed a moralising bias, but—a moral care. There has been a natural tendency to insist with a certain disillusionising tenacity on the low beginnings of our race. When eminent but ill-instructed personages in Church or State have declared themselves, with many flourishes, 'on the side of the Angel,' there has been a grim satisfaction in proving that Science at any rate is 'on the side of the Ape.' But the victory of Science is won. She has dealt hard measure to man's tradition and his self-conceit; let her now show herself ready to sympathise with such of his aspirations as are still legitimate, to offer such prospects as the nature of things will allow. Nay, let her teach the world that the word *evolution* is the very formula and symbol of hope.

But here my paper must close. I will conclude it with a single reflection which may somewhat meet the fears of those who dislike any tamperings with our personality, who dread that this invading analysis may steal their very self away. All living things, it is said, strive towards their maximum of pleasure. In what hours, then, and under what conditions, do we find that human beings have attained to their intensest joy? Do not our thoughts in answer turn instinctively to scenes and moments when all personal preoccupation, all care for individual interest, is lost in the sense of spiritual union, whether with one beloved soul, or with a mighty nation, or with 'the whole

world and creatures of God ' ? We think of Dante with Beatrice, of Nelson at Trafalgar, of S. Francis on the Umbrian hill. And surely here, as in Galahad's cry of ' If I lose myself I find myself,' we have a hint that much, very much, of what we are wont to regard as an integral part of us may drop away, and yet leave us with a consciousness of our own being which is more vivid and purer than before. This web of habits and appetencies, of lusts and fears, is not, perhaps, the ultimate manifestation of what in truth we are. It is the cloak which our rude forefathers have woven themselves against the cosmic storm ; but we are already learning to shift and refashion it as our gentler weather needs, and if perchance it slip from us in the sunshine then something more ancient and more glorious is for a moment guessed within.

FREDERIC W. H. MYERS.

SISTERS-IN-LAW.

FROM time to time during the last five-and-forty years efforts have been made to alter the marriage law of England in the matter of the prohibited degrees. It is not surprising that many persons are tired of the discussion. Rather than listen to any further arguments they will vote for the change which is so persistently demanded, and hope to be troubled with it no more. I wish to point out that the Bill advocated by Lord Bramwell in the House of Lords, and more recently in this Review, will not, if enacted, fulfil their desire. It will be but the beginning of troubles to those whose chief anxiety is to lead a quiet life. It will unsettle the whole law of marriage and decide nothing. Its inherent unreason is a fatal defect.

For my present purpose it is not necessary to enter into the theological argument. It seems, indeed, but yesterday that a theological treatment of the question was generally deprecated. Speakers in Parliament a few years since disclaimed all intention of defending or attacking the law on that side. Nor would any one have expected that the Scriptural controversy should be revived under the auspices of a veteran lawyer who is careful to remind the world that he knows no more of theology than of astrology. Divines, perhaps, will remark, from their point of view, that their own science is not so easily set aside as lawyers or astrologers suppose. It has an awkward way of reappearing after it has been declared to be dead and buried by general consent. Even when polemics slumber, popular literature has a curious tendency to clothe itself in theological language, and to adapt Scriptural phraseology to its own use. An attentive reader of the Parliamentary debates of the late brief session could not fail to notice that there was hardly one speech of importance in which illustrations from Bible history, or adaptations of Scriptural language, did not occur. Men do not so easily unlearn even that which they repudiate, or wholly throw off the authority they have resolved to dethrone. Be this as it may, Lord Bramwell certainly devotes half his article to the theology of which he speaks so lightly. It would be foreign to my immediate purpose to follow him on this track. It is sufficient to reassert the facts that marriage between persons near of kin is prohibited in the Scripture, and that no distinction between relationship by affinity or consanguinity is there to be found.

It is on this last point that the whole subject at present really turns. In England no one openly denies that it is necessary to put some restrictions on the general liberty to contract marriage, even apart from any Scriptural or ecclesiastical rule; or that nearness of relationship between the parties to the proposed marriage constitutes a valid impediment. But what degree of nearness? This is the point in dispute. I am assuming that the idea of nearness includes the notion of *degrees* in nearness; although, to hear some persons talk on this subject, one might think that all relationships were the same. As they attach no particular meaning to the words they use, argument with them is impossible. Rational men will allow that all who are related to one another are more nearly or more distantly related: parents more nearly related to children than uncles and aunts to their nephews and nieces. They will hardly deny that kinsfolk related in the same degree must all be equally allowed, or forbidden, to intermarry; and that permission to marry given to the nearly related, and denied to those more distantly related, would be an arbitrary indulgence to the one, an intolerable wrong to the other. These positions have not been, to my knowledge, disputed in the abstract by any one.

But it is exactly with these positions that the law, in the proposed form, would be in direct conflict. The man would be allowed to marry two or more sisters; the woman forbidden to marry two brothers. Marriage with a wife's sister would be lawful; marriage with her niece absolutely contrary to law. Further, the only reason for prohibiting half the marriages named in the Table of Degrees would cease to exist. Marriage with a wife's near kinswomen is forbidden now *because* they are the wife's kinswomen, and for no other reason. Remove that reason, and they would be forbidden for no reason at all. Could it be expected that the persons subject to these disabilities would contentedly bear them? Once declare it lawful and right for a man to marry a near kinswoman of his wife, and it is inevitable that, if his affections were set on any other of her kinsfolk, he should feel himself the victim of a senseless tyranny, were he not allowed to gratify those affections with the sanction of the law. I am unable to think of any rational answer to the protest which such flagrant inequality would call forth.

Two answers, indeed, have been attempted, but they are mutually destructive. On the one hand, it is said that further relaxations would be so shocking that no one would ask for them; on the other, that as soon as they were asked for, they would be granted without demur. Taking the former line of argument, Lord Bramwell has urged that it is very foolish not to do a right thing because you may be asked thereafter to do a wrong one—forgetting, apparently, that the 'wrong' thing would cease to be wrong in Parliamentary and legal eyes in the event of his Bill becoming law. The wrong,

indeed, would be on the other side. It would be wrong to withhold the permission, which you had granted in one case, from others whose plea for it rested on the same grounds. It may be right, or it may be wrong, to marry your wife's near kinswoman; it cannot be right and wrong at the same time. It cannot be right to favour a particular case by exceptional treatment, or to draw lots for indulgences among those whose *status* of affinity is the same. It is not a question of being asked, as Lord Bramwell says, to do a wrong thing, but of being asked to do that which your own line of action has compelled you to acknowledge to be right.

From the larger part of the supporters of the Bill, however, we have a different and contradictory reply. They freely admit that the principle of it requires the abolition of all prohibitions of marriage between persons related by affinity, and profess themselves quite ready to promote that abolition *at the proper time*. Lord John Russell said as much in Parliament long ago; Lord Granville says it quite frankly and simply now. With the good-natured pleasantry which makes him so agreeable an opponent he said, when the Bill was moved in the House of Lords, 'I dote upon my wife's relations, but they are not *my* relations.' His argument was, that he ought to be free to marry any one of them without let or hindrance from the law.

It is natural to ask, if this be so, why the Bill does not include all the kindred whom the majority of its supporters admit to be within the scope of its principle. An alteration of a very few words would make it consistent with itself and with the arguments used in support of it. What hinders the alteration from being made? The answer to this question has more policy than honesty on its face. Shortly stated it is, 'One thing at a time. This is a world of expediency and compromise. We cannot'—say the advocates of the Bill—'persuade the great body of our countrymen that it is right to allow all these marriages, but there is a certain sentiment in favour of one of them. Kindly grant a *privilegium* for that one, then we shall have the lever we require for further action; we shall be able to show that the principle has been conceded, and that the rest must follow.' Truly this reasoning assumes a simplicity of character among those to whom it is addressed which can hardly be imputed without some disparagement of their understanding.

'Only just this little Bill, this innocent little Bill,' they entertain us to pass; then *aside* to their friends and allies, 'You shall soon be set at liberty to marry all your wives' relations, if we can only just carry this little Bill. Don't mention—for the world—those neeces, and brothers' widows, and all the rest, while we have this Bill in hand; but you shall soon see that we have done your business for you as effectually as if the whole list had been enumerated in our Act.' Let it not be thought I am imputing

motives to opponents; I am saying only what they have said for themselves wherever it was politic to say it, and I am thinking of cases, not a few, in which it is the brother's widow on whom the widower's heart is set.

I am very anxious that the lovers of a quiet life, for whose happiness I am much concerned, should open their eyes to the prospect before them. They must expect a long series of demands for successive relaxations of a series of prohibitions of which the foundation will have been already destroyed. Resistance to their demands must needs grow weaker year by year, as the want of any valid argument against them is more plainly seen. But what a prospect! Year after year to have the whole question of marriage and of family life dragged into the arena of Parliamentary discussion, with jibe and sneer and vulgar detraction of all sanctions hitherto revered, is surely not an anticipation which any good or wise man can with patience entertain. We stand on the ground of solid principle now; we are entitled at least to ask what principle is to be substituted for it before we sweep it away. To calm lookers-on, indeed, it must be little less than marvellous to observe the way in which the law of marriage, with its far-reaching influences on national life, has been at the mercy of chance majorities any time these last twenty years. Half a dozen young men, hastily summoned from a racecourse to give a vote in harmony with the known wish of some distinguished personage, have been able to influence divisions on which the welfare of every family in England depended. They may have had as little desire to take a part as they have had opportunity of acquainting themselves with the merits of the question at issue; but the Parliamentary game required their presence, and seemed to place the stakes of victory at their disposal. If any question ever demanded the careful study of skilled jurists and experienced masters of social ethics, it is this question of the Marriage Law. The results of careful study and sound historical knowledge should have been laid before Parliament by men capable of placing the whole question in its true light, with documentary evidence in support of their words. Some such speakers, indeed, have from time to time treated the subject in a worthy manner; but when one recalls the performances of triflers who have scarcely been at the pains to digest the scraps of information supplied to them—the hurried, ill-balanced debates, and the closure dictated by the approach of the dinner-hour; when the fringe of the question had been scarcely touched—one can but be profoundly thankful that a great disaster has notwithstanding been averted for so many years.

I shall be told that what I have written is beside the point, that no one defends the Bill as logical. It claims to be nothing more than a practical proposal to get rid—with or without reason—of a practical evil, arising from the want of a second bedroom in a poor

man's house. Far be it from me to extenuate the evils caused by over-crowded dwellings, or to hinder any honest effort to remedy them: they are grave evils indeed. The remedy, however, would hardly seem to lie in an arrangement by which a widower should be encouraged to marry the female who looks after his children as soon as possible after the poor wife's death. This is not always, nor indeed often, her sister, as any one acquainted with the habits of the people can testify. At the sudden death of a young wife the natural person to care for the orphans is the kinswoman who loved her best—her own mother; she takes the little ones to her own house, or stays at their home, until some plan can be devised for their care. Sometimes it is the man's sister in blood, sometimes the sister-in-law, who is the friend in time of need. But in a large proportion of these latter cases, the sister, or sister-in-law, is 'out at service,' and cannot leave her place without notice, or cannot afford to give it up to discharge a duty in her brother's house, for which he can give her no wages. In other cases the neighbours—and their charity at such times is marvellous—take in one or another of the young children until the darkest days are past. The notion that a working-man's family has its store of sisters living unemployed at home in readiness to help a brother-in-law in his bereavement is a fancy picture, which is exhibited in order to divert attention from the fact that it is quite a different class from which the promoters of this Bill are drawn. Not the labourers, but their employers, signed the notorious Norfolk petition, and for reasons altogether different from those which are connected with the experiences of cottages having but a single room. It must be added that the dwelling-house argument proves too much. It would require the bans of marriage with the successor to be put up as soon as the wife's funeral was past. The case, however, is not quite so lamentable in this respect as the advocates of the Bill would have us suppose. To those of us who have often visited poor dwellings it is well known that arrangements which would distress us, if they existed in our own homes, are often quite free from moral suspicion—even in Irish cabins—among those who have been familiar with the occupation of one room by a whole family all their lives. Evils arise, no doubt, from the crowding; but the ruined characters and blasted lives, of which our penitentiaries tell a mournful tale, do not come, for the most part, from one-roomed cottages, but from the contamination of the work-room or of low places of amusement, from domestic service to depraved employers, and the manifold opportunities for corruption which money and leisure supply. Certain it is that neither the Act of 1835, nor the agitation which has since grown up, had anything to do with poor men's cottages or poor men's needs.

I have said that the argument, to which I have just referred,

proves too much. As much may be said of every argument which has been urged in favour of the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill. When, for example, the laws of Prussia and other foreign countries are quoted in support of the proposed change, I ask, in reply, whether there is any country in Europe which differs from our own in this respect *only*, that it allows marriage with a wife's sister. After the change of our Marriage Law which this Bill, if carried, would effect, we should remain, as we now are, alone. Nor is there any such agreement between the various codes of law in force on the Continent as would give us any hope of sheltering ourselves by further changes behind the authority of some general rule. In this only they agree, that they all go beyond the point at which the Marriage Law Reform Association proposes, for the moment, to halt. Then we are told that it is our duty to follow our Colonies in their legislation on this subject. But why on this subject only? On important economical questions we have not yet shown any disposition to adopt Colonial theories or to introduce Colonial practice. In the days when slavery was part of the cherished institutions of more than one British colony, so far from holding ourselves bound to conform the laws of England to that example, we devoted millions of our money to the emancipation of the slaves, and compelled the Colonies, much as they disliked the change, to accept the legislation which set their bondsmen free. It would, indeed, be an evil day for England when we began to take the pattern of our laws from the medley of crude legislation which a score of inexperienced communities had chanced to enact. Nor should it be forgotten that in the countries inhabited by the majority of Her Majesty's subjects polygamy is an integral part of the law.

It is not surprising that Lord Bramwell should treat cursorily what he mentions as the 'ecclesiastical' objection, or that he somewhat misapprehends its bearing. It is true that most clergymen would think it a grievous wrong to be compelled to solemnise such marriages. Lord Bramwell would give them liberty to refuse. But he fails to see that the Church of England, as a religious society, would be sorely aggrieved if her clergy were even allowed to celebrate in her churches unions which for centuries her courts, her canons, and her Prayer Book have declared to be unlawful. Still the charge in the Marriage Service would remain, bidding the parties to confess any impediment, and solemnly reminding them that 'so many as are coupled together otherwise than God's Word doth allow are not joined together by God, neither is their matrimony lawful.' Still the table of kindred and affinity would be the only answer given by the Church to those who wish to know what persons, how related, are forbidden in Scripture to marry together. Few will contend that what Scripture has been held for centuries to forbid, ceases to be forbidden in Scripture because a narrow Parliamentary majority, created, it may be, by the votes of members who

deny the authority of the Bible, is of that opinion. The Table of Degrees would still be read on the walls of our churches, placed there as the canon directs. Preachers might still expound the law of God as forbidding such unions even in the presence of those who had contracted them, and parish priests might refuse—as the Bishop of Fredericton has bidden his clergy to refuse—Communion to the offenders. In all this the Church of England would not go beyond the Westminster Confession of Faith (which is the law of Presbyterian Scotland), declaring that

Marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the Word; nor can such incestuous marriages ever be made lawful by any law of man, or consent of parties, so as these persons may live together as man and wife. The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own.

'Very uncharitable language, whoever uses it,' say the advocates of the Bill. 'Two thoroughly well-conducted persons'—so Lord Bramwell describes all pairs of attached brothers and sisters-in-law—ought not to be treated with disrespect. The feeling, which he has more than once expressed, of sympathy with an agreeable and affectionate young couple, of like age and condition in life, apparently formed for each other's happiness, appeals to a universal sentiment. Astrologically they would petition, under his guidance, against the law which forbids their nuptials:

*Utrumque nostrum incredibili modo
Consentit astrum:*

and, so pleading, they would enlist—as they have enlisted—in their favour many a friend to whom fathers and councils, theology and law, are equally unknown. But, then, it must be remembered that the same engaging portrait may be painted with a variety of kinsfolk for the sitters; it does not apply to sisters-in-law and brothers alone. While I write, a case comes to me, in which a man has gone through the form of marriage with his half-brother's daughter, in spite of serious, but ineffectual, remonstrance, less than three months after his wife's decease. Reports of incestuous unions in contradiction to almost every prohibition in the Table of Degrees reach me from time to time—sometimes condemned by the better feeling of the community, sometimes, alas! condoned or defended, when personal popularity or a long purse blinds the neighbours to the grossness of the sin. For all these unions—so far at least as relations by affinity are concerned—the offenders will have the authority of statute law to plead if ever this unhappy Bill should pass. They will all have a claim on the sympathy which is now lavished on a single case.

I have admitted that there is a natural sympathy with young persons deeply attached to one another, who are prevented from marrying. But here again, when we try to translate the feeling

into solid reason, we find that the argument proves too much. 'The course of true love never did run smooth'; and infinitely various are the obstacles to marriage which youthful affections must be content to endure. The very man who has been declaiming against the table of prohibited degrees, will go home and threaten to turn his son or daughter out of doors if an imprudent courtship is not immediately broken off. And this parental sternness may have its justification too. A thoughtless young couple may be saved from lifelong trouble by the unwelcome intervention of wiser and more experienced counsellors. Or, on the other hand, that intervention may nip in the bud affections which might have blossomed into happy married life. Either way, however, it is part of the condition of things in which we live that young persons 'madly in love,' as the phrase is, must often be disappointed; it is not only widowers in love with their wives' sisters who have to bear their fate. If it is cruel to debar from marriage those who are sincerely in love, the Court of Chancery has more wanton cruelty to repent of than all the defenders of the Christian law of marriage. Has it never occurred to Lord Bramwell to turn a glance of pity on the sorrows of its wards? The maintenance of the Levitical prohibitions has at least the general good for its object; the hard-hearted guardian has nothing better than the preservation or augmentation of an estate in view. After all, the happiness of the community and the purity of social life must outweigh the particular grievances of which disappointed lovers naturally complain. So it is in many another case familiar to us all. It is a hardship, for instance, to our Jewish fellow-subjects to lose their trade on the Lord's Day when they have already kept their own Sabbath on the day before. But we could not preserve our national Sunday from the invasion of secular business if we made an exception in their favour; and, for the general advantage, they must bear the loss. We may pity the lovers whose sad case Lord Bramwell deplors; but they have really no right to the special aureole with which he would invest them.

The question is often asked, 'May I not marry my sister-in-law?' The real question is, whether I may still have a 'sister-in-law' at all. If the law which forbids us to marry is abolished, in what does the relation of sister between us consist? Thenceforward she is no more to her sister's husband than any other female friend. He must be content to see her welcomed by his wife with tenderest affection, caressed by his children with devoted love, but she is nothing to him; sister, either in law or in feeling, she cannot be. His wife's sister, his children's aunty, their best-loved kinswoman, is to be but an acquaintance to him. A sharp line of division is drawn through the midst of the family; the father, with his group of kinsfolk; the mother, with her's—two sets of kindred in one home. It will be hard, no doubt, for

those who have entered into the happy confidence of the old relationship to unlearn the lessons of a united home; but new generations as they arise, if the law is changed, must be brought up in a different experience and form a different estimate of family life. I am not suggesting any thoughts of improper attachment in the wife's lifetime. I am only asserting that one who is in no sense a sister, and may possibly become a wife, ceases absolutely to be what a sister-in-law has been, and happily still is, in many an English home.

Some persons make merry with descriptions of the family circle—perhaps because they have never known the pure and happy unity to which they refer. The Scripture expression that man and wife are 'one flesh' is to some of them particularly ludicrous. Lord Bramwell, with some endeavour to be serious, would dispose of it by the remark that it is a metaphor, on the apparent assumption that a metaphorical statement is necessarily untrue. I quite admit that metaphors are not freely used in the Courts, and that they would be a little out of place in the discussion of a dry point of law. Nor should I look for illustration of the use of metaphor in any case to writings from Lord Bramwell's pen. Nevertheless it would be a strange misconception to make metaphor and fiction synonymous terms. One might say of a celebrated statesman that his race is run, or that his sun has set; and it would be a reasonable answer to declare that his energies, bodily and mental, are unimpaired, or that he has still a great career in politics before him. But it would be absurd to argue that the statement was untrue because it was clothed in metaphorical language. If marriage be, as some free-thinkers assert, a time-bargain between two persons that they will live together as long as it is mutually convenient for them to do so, it follows that the Scriptural expression, 'they two shall be one flesh,' is unmeaning. But the truth or falsehood of it does not depend on its metaphorical character. It may well be that an expression has been chosen which, by its very paradoxical character, most strongly expresses the close and indissoluble union which marriage creates, not to add that the expression, as found in the language of the Old Testament Scripture, may exegetically have no metaphorical character; it may be a simple statement that the relationship of married persons is to be as close as that which exists between persons of the same blood, expressed in the plainest way of which the language would admit.

We come back, then—putting aside this unprovoked attack on the moral character of metaphor—to the point which touches the root of the matter. 'Ninety-nine out of every hundred advocates of legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister,' says one of them, 'are in favour of legalising marriage with wives' nieces and their wives' kinsfolk in general. A man's own nieces are blood

relations, but his wife's nieces are not. The reason marriage-law reformers confine themselves to one point at a time is that they believe success can best be obtained in this way.' For that very reason, among others, the upholders of the marriage law of England tenaciously defend the position which is the object of immediate attack. They have been fairly warned that all turns on this: its capture means the loss of the fort. Surely it is time for Parliamentary assailants to give up the disingenuous pretence that they have only this one point in view, and to discuss the whole question in a reasonable way. For my own part—disastrous as the change would be—I had rather see the law altered so as to abolish at once all legal prohibitions of marriage between persons connected by affinity than to have an enactment which would abolish them by implication, and require their legal abolition in detail as opportunity served. The Church would, in that case, have its own opposite principle clearly defined as a basis for consistent action; good people would be saved from the confusion of thought which would betray them into condonation of evil, as though it were a comparatively harmless exception to the general law. It is not immaterial to remember that this was the basis of the Act of 1835. That statute drew, for the first time, a partial distinction between the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and affinity. Lord Lyndhurst had not drawn any such distinction in the Bill which he introduced. His Bill, as he afterwards said, had nothing to do with annulling marriages; it had no other end in view than the condition of children, which the existing law left in an unsettled state during their parents' lifetime. In its passage through Parliament the distinction (retrospectively) between consanguinity and affinity was introduced. But neither then nor at any other time, until the tactics of the Marriage Law Reform Association were adopted, was a wife's sister dealt with on any other footing than that on which the whole of the wife's near kinsfolk stood. By the law of England, to use the words of Lord Wensleydale—certainly not one of the 'ecclesiastically-given' lawyers whom Lord Bramwell depreciates—the marriage of a widower with his deceased wife's sister was always as illegal and invalid as a marriage with a sister, daughter, or mother was. For the first time, as I have said, by Lord Lyndhurst's Act, though not by Lord Lyndhurst's will, a partial distinction between relationship in blood and relationship by marriage was recognised. To that distinction—if ever we are driven to allow any distinction at all—sound reason and good sense require us to adhere.

I am well aware that in what I have written I have laid myself open to Lord Bramwell's sneer at 'priests.' I am content to bear this reproach. I believe that the Church of Christ has done more than any power on earth to uphold the sacredness of family life in its pure affections and unity of interests. The members of other

religious denominations have not been wanting in zeal for morality, as they understand it. But in respect of marriage they avowedly take a 'liberal' view. They would make prohibitions of it as few as possible; they approve of facilities for the dissolution of it which the Church has always refused to allow. The tendency of these 'free' views may be illustrated by the existing state of things in North America. In the New England States it has come to pass that 2,000 families are now broken up every year, and 4,000 persons divorced. We conceive it to be our duty to resist these tendencies to the utmost of our power. The Church has spoken by her ministers—surely not unnatural exponents of her mind, and their loyalty has often brought upon them bitter hatred and personal loss. But on this question her laity have not been silent. To describe them as 'ecclesiastically-given' is but a disagreeable way of saying that they have been on the Church's side. On the other side are ranged a variety of interests and motives which do not see Parliamentary light. A traveller in a railway carriage heard some country folk discussing the Wife's Sister question. One of them mentioned a man who had 'married' his stepmother. The father had left her the house and some property. The grown-up son was living in the house, and 'married' the woman 'to keep the property together.' The relator quite approved of what the son had done. We, who deprecate even a distant approach to such laxity of morals, ought not to be regarded as hostile to the happiness or the welfare of our country. We believe that we are its true friends. I adopt the concluding sentence of Lord Bramwell's article—with a variation. I trust that a right view will be taken of this important matter, and the law *remain unchanged*.

J. F. OXON.

DISTRESS IN EAST LONDON.

THE poverty of the poor and the failure of the Mansion House Relief Fund are the facts which stand out from the gloom of a winter when dark weather, dull times, and discontent united to depress the hopes of the poor and the energy of their friends. The memory of days full of unavailing complaint and aimless pity is one from which all minds readily turn, quieting fears with the assumption that the poverty was exaggerated or that the generosity of the rich is ample for all occasions.

The facts, however, remain that the poor are very poor, and that the Fund failed as a means of relief; and these facts must be faced if a lesson is to be learnt from the past, and a way discovered through the perils of the future. The policies which occupy the leaders' minds, the interests of business, the theologies, the fashions, are but webs woven in the trees, while the storm is rising in the distance. Sounds of the storm are already in the air, a murmuring among those who have not enough, puffs of boasting from those who have too much, and a muttering from those who are angry because while some are drunken, others are starving. The social question is rising for solution, and, though for a moment it is forgotten, it will sweep to the front and put aside as cobwebs the 'deep' concerns of leaders and teachers. The danger is lest it be settled by passion and not by reason, lest, that is, reforms be hurriedly undertaken in answer to some cry, and without consideration of facts, their weight, their causes, and their relation.

The study of the condition of the people receives hardly as much attention as that which Sir J. Lubbock gives to the ant and the wasps. Bold good men discuss the poor, and cheques are given by irresponsible benefactors, but there are few students who reverently and patiently make observations on social conditions, accumulate facts, and watch cause and effect. Scientific method has won the great victories of the day, and scientific method is supreme everywhere except in those human affairs which most concern humanity.

Ten years ago Arnold Toynbee (it has been said) demanded a 'body of doctrine' from those who cared for the poor. He sought an intellectual basis for moral fervour, and yet to-day what a muck-

heap is our social legislation, what a confusion of opinion there exists about the poor-law, education, emigration, and land laws. All reformers are driving on, but what is each driving at? Sometimes the same driver has aims obviously incompatible, as when the Lord Mayor one day signs a report which says that 'the spasmodic assistance given by the public in answer to special appeals is really useless,' and another day himself inaugurates a fund by public appeal.

One of the facts of last winter is the poverty of the poor, and it is a fact about which the public mind is uncertain. The working men when they appear at meetings seem to be so well dressed in black cloth, the statistics of trades-unions, friendly, co-operative, and building societies show the members to be so numerous, and the accumulated funds to be so far above thousands and so near to millions sterling, that the necessary conclusion is 'There is no poverty among the poor.' But then the clergy or missionaries echo some 'bitter cry,' and tell how there are thousands of working folk in danger of starvation, thousands without warmth or clothing, and the necessary conclusion is, 'All the poor are poverty-stricken.' The public mind halts between these two conclusions and is uncertain. The uncertainty is due partly to the vague use of the term 'poor,' by which is generally meant all those who are not tradespeople or capitalists, and partly to an inability to appreciate the size of London. The poor, it is obvious, form a minority in the community, and a minority is regarded as a small and manageable body. Last winter's experience clears away all uncertainty, and shows that there is a vast mass of people in London who have neither black coats nor savings, and whose life is dwarfed and shortened by want of food and clothing. In Whitechapel there is a population of 70,000; of these some 20 per cent., exclusive of the Jewish population, applied at the office of the Mansion House Relief Fund during the three months it was opened. In St. George's, East, there is a population of 50,000, and of these 29 per cent. applied.

Among all who applied the number belonging to any trades-union or friendly society was very few. In Whitechapel only 6 out of 1,700 applicants were members of a benefit club. In St. George's only 177 out of 3,578 called themselves artisans. In Stepney 1,000 men applied before one mechanic came, and only one member of a trades-union came under notice at all. In the Tower Hamlets division of East London 17,384 applied, representing 86,920 persons. It may be safely assumed that all in need did not apply, and that many thousands were assisted by other agencies. The reports of some of the visitors expressly state that the numbers they give are exclusive of many referred to the Jewish Board of Guardians, the clergy, and other agencies, while numbers of those who did apply either did not wait to have their names entered, or were so manifestly beyond

the reach of money help that they were not recorded among applicants. Especially noteworthy among the remarks of the visitors is one, that all who applied would at any season of the year apply in the same way and give the same evidence of poverty. 'If a fund was advertised as largely as this Fund has been in summer, and when trade was at its best, precisely the same people would apply.' The truth of the remark has been put to the test, and during the summer a large number of those relieved in the winter have been visited, with the result that they have been found apparently in like misery and equally in need of assistance.

Of the poverty of those who made application there has been no question. Some may have brought it on themselves by drink or vice, some may have been thriftless and without self-control; but all were poor, so poor as to be without the things necessary for mere existence. The men and women who crowded the relief offices had haggard and drawn faces, their worn and thin bodies shivered under their rags of clothing, and they gave no sign of strength or hope. Their homes were squalid, the children ill-fed, ill-clad, and joyless, their record showed that for months they had received no regular wage, and that their substance was more often at the pawnbroker's than in the home.

Last winter's experience shows that outside the classes of regular wage-earning workmen, who are often included among 'the poor,' is a mass of people numbering some tens of thousands, who are without the means of living. These are the poor, and their poverty is the common concern.

Statistics prove what has long been known to those whose business lies in poor places, to many of whom the reports of the increased prosperity of the country have been like songs of gladness in a land of sorrow. They know the streets in which every room is a home, the homes in which there is no comfort for the sick, no easy chair for the weary, no bath for the tired, no fresh air, no means of keeping food, no space for play, no possibility of quiet, and to them the news of the national wealth and the sight of fashionable luxury seem but cruel satire. The little dark rooms may bear traces of the man's struggle or of the woman's patience, but the homes of the poor are sad, like the fields of lost battles, where heroism has fought in vain. By no struggle and by no patience can health be won in so few feet of cubic air, and no parent dares to hope that he can make the time of youth so joyful as to for ever hold his children to pleasures which are pure. The homes of the poor are a mockery of the name, but yet how many would think themselves happy if even their homes were secure, and they were able to look to the future without seeing starvation for their children and the workhouse for themselves. One example will illustrate many. The Browns are a family of five; they occupy one room. The man is a labourer,

London-born, quick-witted and slow-bodied, and, as many labourers do, he fills up slack time with hawking; the woman takes in her neighbours' washing. Their room, twelve feet by ten feet, is crowded with two bedsteads, the implements for washing, the coal bin, a table, a chest, and a few chairs; on the walls are some pictures, the human protest against the doctrine that the poor can 'live by bread alone.' The man earns sometimes 3*s.*, often nothing, in the day; and his wife brings in sometimes 6*d.* or 9*d.* a day, but her work fills the room with damp and discomfort, and almost necessarily keeps the husband out of doors. Both man and woman are still young, but they look aged, and the children are thin and delicate. They seldom have enough to eat and never enough to wear, they are rarely healthy, and are never so happy as to thank God for their creation. Hard work will make these children orphans, or bad air, cold, and hunger will make these parents childless.

In the case of another family, where the wage is regular—the income is 1*l.* a week—the outlook is not much brighter. Here there is the same crowded room, for which 3*s.* a week is paid, the same weary half-starved faces, the same want of air and water. Here, too, the parents dare not look forwards, for even if the income remains permanent, it cannot secure necessaries for sickness, it cannot educate or apprentice the children, and it cannot provide for their own old age. No income, however, does remain permanent, and the regular hand is always anxious lest a change in trade or in his employer's temper may send him adrift.

In the cases where there is drink, carelessness, or idleness, everything of course looks worse. The room is poorer and dirtier, the faces more shrunken, and the clothes thinner. Indignation against sin does not settle the matter. The poverty is manifest, and if the cause be in the weakness of human nature, then the greater and the harder is the duty of effecting its cure.

Cases of poverty such as these are common; they who by business, duty, or affection, go among the poor know of their existence; but if those who hire a servant, employ work-people, or buy cheap articles would think, they could not longer content themselves with phrases about thrift as almighty for good, and intemperance as almighty for evil. Fourteen pounds a year, if a servant has unflinching health and unbroken work from the age of twenty to fifty-five, will only enable her to save enough for her old age by giving up all pleasure, by neglecting her own family duties, and by impoverishing her life to make a livelihood. Very sad is it to meet in some back-room the living remains of an old servant. Mrs. Smith is sixty-five years old; she has been all her life in service, and saved over 100*l.* She has had but little joy in her youth, and now in her old age she is lonely. Her fear is lest, spending only 7*s.* a week, her savings may not last her life. She could hardly have done more, and

what she did was not enough. A wage of 20s. or 25s. a week is called good wages, yet it leaves the earners unable to buy sufficient food or to procure any means of recreation. The following table represents the necessary weekly expenditure of a family of eight persons, of whom six are children. It allows for each day no cheering luxuries, but only the bare amount of nitrogenous and carbonaceous foods which are absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the body.

	£	s.	d.
Food, i.e. oatmeal, 1½ lbs. of meat a day between eight persons, cocoa and bread	0	14	0
Rent for two small rooms	0	5	0
Schooling for four children	0	0	4
Washing	0	1	0
Firing and light	0	2	6
Total	1	2	10 ¹

If to this account 2s. a week be added for clothes (and what woman dressing on 100*l.* or 80*l.* a year could allow less than 5*l.* a year to clothe a working-man, his wife, and six children) then the necessary weekly expenditure of the family is 1*l.* 4s. 10*d.* Few fathers or mothers are able to resist, and ought not to resist the temptation of taking or giving some pleasure; so even where work is regular and paid at 1*l.* 5s. 0*d.* a week, there must be in the home want of food as well as of the luxuries which gladden life.

Those dwellers in pleasant places, without experience of the homes of the poor, who will resolutely set themselves to think about what they do know, must realise that those who make cheap goods are too poor to do their duty to themselves, their neighbours, and their country. The mystery, indeed, remains how many manage to live at all.

One solution is that there exists among these irregular workers a kind of communism. They prefer to occupy the same neighbourhoods and make long journeys to work rather than go to live among strangers. They easily borrow and easily lend. The women spend much time in gossiping, know intimately one another's affairs, and in times of trouble help willingly. One couple, whose united earnings have never reached 15s. a week, whose home has never been more than one small room, has brought up in succession three orphans. The old man, at seventy years of age, just earns a living by running messages or by selling wirework, but even now he spends many a night in hushing a baby whose desertion he pities, and whom he has taken to his care.

The poverty of the poor is understood by the poor, and their charity is according to the measure of Christ's. The charity of the rich is according to another measure, because they do not know of

¹ This table is taken from a paper written by my wife in the *National Review*, July 1886, in which she illustrates by many examples that the average wage is insufficient to support life.

poverty, and they do not know because they do not think. Only the self-satisfied Pharisee and the proud Roman could pass Calvary unmoved, and only the self-absorbed can be ignorant that every day the innocent and helpless are crucified. The selfishness of modern life is shown most clearly in this absence of thought. Absorbed in their own concerns, kindly people carelessly hear statements, see prices, and face sights which imply the ruin of their fellow-creatures. The rich would not be so cruel if they would think. Thought about the amount of food which 'good wages' can buy, about the hours spent in making matches or coats, about the sorrows behind the faces of those who serve them in shops or pass them in the streets—thought would make the rich ready to help, and the fact that there are in the 500,000 inhabitants of the Tower Hamlets 86,920 too poor to live, is enough to make them think.

The failure of the Fund is the other fact of the winter to stir thought. Mansion House relief represents the mercies to which the wisdom and the love of the completest age have committed the needs of the poor. Never were needs so delicate left to mercies so clumsy; needs intertwined with the sorrows and sufferings with which no stranger could intermeddle, have been met with the brutal generosity of gifts given often with little thought or cost. The result has been an increase of the causes which make poverty and a decrease of good-will among men.

The Fund failed even to relieve distress. In St. George's in the East there were nearly 4,000 applicants, representing 20,000 persons. All of these were in distress—were, that is, cold, hungry. 2,400 applicants, representing some 12,000 persons, the committee considered to be working people unemployed and within the scope of the Fund. For their relief 2,000*l.* was apportioned, and if it had been equally divided, each person would have had 3*s.* 4*d.* on which to support life during three months. Such sums might have relieved the givers, pleased by the momentary satisfaction of the recipient, but they would not have relieved the poor, who would still have had to endure days and weeks of want.

The Fund was thus in the first place inadequate to relieve the distress. An attempt was made by discrimination to make it useful to those who were 'deserving.' Forms were given out to be filled in by applicants; visitors were appointed to visit the homes and to make inquiries; committees sat daily to consider and decide on applications. The end of all has been, that in one district those assisted were found to be 'improvident, unsober, and non-industrious,' and in another the almoner can only say, 'they are a careless, hard-living, hard-drinking set of people, and are so much what their circumstances have made them, that terms of moral praise or blame are hardly applicable.' An analysis of the decisions of the committees shows that the decisions were according to different standards,

and with different views of what was meant by 'assistance.' A half-crown a week was voted for the support of one family in which the man was a notorious drunkard. Twelve pounds were given to start a costermonger on one day, while at a subsequent committee meeting 10s. was voted for a family in almost identical circumstances. In one district casual labourers were given 20s. or 30s., but in the neighbouring district casual labourers were refused relief.

Methods of relief were as many as were the districts into which London was divided. In Whitechapel a labour test was applied. The labourers were offered street-sweeping; and those who were used only to indoor work were put to whitewashing, window cleaning, or tailoring. The women were given needlework. When it was known to the large crowd brought to the office by the advertisement of the Fund that work was to be offered to the able-bodied, there was among the ne'er-do-weels great indignation. 'Call this charity!' 'We will complain to the Lord Mayor, we will break windows,' and, addressing the almoners, 'It is you fellows who are getting 1l. a day for your work.' Many 'finding they could not get relief without doing work did not persist in their application,' and they were not entered as applicants, but work was actually offered to 850 men and accepted by only 339. Of these the foreman writes, 'the labour test was a sore trial for a great many of them. I repeatedly had it said to me by them, 'The Fund is a charity, and we ought not to work for it.'

In St. George's there was no labour test, and there 1,689 men and 682 women received assistance in food or in materials for labour. In Stepney the conditions under which the Fund was collected were strictly observed, and only those 'out of employment through the present depression' were assisted. The consequence was that casual labourers, the sick, the aged, all known to be frequently out of work, were refused, and much of the fund was spent in large sums for the emigration of a few. In this district the committee was largely composed of members of friendly societies, men who, by experience, were familiar both with the habits of the poor and with the methods of relief. Their co-operation was invaluable, both in itself and also for the confidence which it won for the administration.

In Mile End the committee had another standard of character and another method of inquiry. They kept no record of the number of applications, and those relieved have been differently described as 'good men' and 'loafers' by different members of the committee. 2,539l. were spent among 2,133 families, an average of 4s. 10d. a person. The Poplar committee has published no report, but one of its members writes: 'Relief was often given without investigation to old, chronic, sick, and poor-law cases, without distinction as to character; the rule was, Give, give! spend, spend!' and another states the opinion 'that the whole neighbourhood was demoralised by the

distribution of the Fund.' As a result of their experiences, some of those engaged in relief in this district are now making efforts to unite workmen, and the members of benefit societies, in the administration of future funds.

The sort of relief given was as various as the methods of relief. Sometimes money, sometimes tickets, sometimes food; the variety is excused by one visitor, who says, 'We were ten days at work before instructions came from the Mansion House, and then it was too late to change our system.' Discrimination utterly broke down, and with all the appliances it was chance which ruled the decision. The gifts fell on the worthy and on the unworthy, but as they fell only in partial showers, none received enough and many who were worthy went empty away.

Discrimination of desert is indeed impossible. The poor law officials, with ample time and long experience, cannot say who deserves or would be benefited by out-relief. Amateurs appointed in a hurry, and confused by numbers, vainly try to settle desert. Systems must adopt rules; friendship alone can settle merit.

The Fund failed to relieve distress, and further developed some of the causes which make poverty.

Prominent among such causes are (1) faith in chance; (2) dishonesty in its fullest sense; (3) the unwisdom of so-called charity.

(1) The big advertisement of '70,000*l.* to be given away' offered a chance which attracted idlers, and relaxed in many the energies hitherto so patiently braced to win a living for wife or children. The effect is frequently noticed in the reports. The St. George's in the East visitors emphasize the opinion that it was 'the great publicity of the Fund which made its distribution so difficult.' A visitor in Poplar thinks 'the publicity was tempting to bad cases and deterrent of good ones.' The chance of a gift out of so big a sum was too good to be missed for the sake of hard work and small wages.

Faith in chance was further encouraged by the irregular methods of administration. Refusals and relief followed no law discoverable by the poor. In the same street one washerwoman was set up with stock, while another in equal circumstances was dismissed. In adjoining districts such various systems were adopted that of three 'mates' one would receive work, another a gift, and the third nothing. 'The power of chance' was the teaching of the Fund, started through the accidental emotions of a Lord Mayor, and they who believe in chance give up effort, become wayward, lose power of mind and body. Chance gives up her followers to poverty, and the increase of the spirit of gambling is not the least among the causes of distress.

(2) The remark is sometimes made that 'the righteous man is never found begging his bread,' or, in other words, that there is always work for the man who can be trusted. Honesty in its fullest sense, implying absolute truth, thoroughness, and responsibility, has

great value in the labour market, and agencies which increase a belief in honesty increase wealth. The tendency of the Fund has been to create a belief in lies. Its organisation of visitors and committees offered a show of resistance to lies, but over such resistance lies easily triumphed, and many notorious evil-livers got by a good story the relief denied to others. Anecdotes are common as to the way in which visitors were deceived, committees hoodwinked, and money wrongly gained, while the better sort of poor, failing to understand how so much money could have had so little effect, hold the officials to have been smart fellows, who took care of themselves. The laughter roused by such talk is the laughter which demoralises, it is the praise of the power of lies, and the laughers will not be among those who by honesty do well for themselves and for others.

(3) The mischief of foolish charity is a text on which much has been written, but no doubt exists as to the power of wise charity. The teaching which fits the young to do better work or to find resource in a bye-trade, the influence by which the weak are strengthened to resist temptation, the application of principles which will give confidence, and the setting up of ideals which will enlarge the limits of life—this is the charity which conquers poverty. In East London there are many engaged in such charity, and to their work the action of the Fund was most prejudicial. Some of them, carried away by the excitement, relaxed their patient silent efforts, while they tried to meet a thousand needs with no other remedy than a gift. Others saw their work spoiled, their lessons of self-help undone by the offer of a dole, their teaching of the duty of helping others forgotten in the greedy scramble for graceless gifts. They devoted themselves to do their utmost and bore the heavy burden of distributing the Fund, but most of them speak sadly of their experience. They laboured sometimes for sixteen hours a day, but their labour was not to do good but to prevent evil—a labour of pain—and one speaking the experience of his fellows, says, ‘their labours had the appearance of a hurried and spasmodic effort.’ The fund of charity, like a torrent, swept away the tender plants which the stream of charity had nourished.

In the face of all this experience it is not extravagant to say that the means of relief used last winter developed the causes of poverty. It may be that if all the poor were self-controlled and honest, and if all charity were wise, poverty would still exist; but self-indulgence, lies, and unwise charity are causes of poverty, and these causes have been strengthened. One visitor’s report sums up the whole matter when it says:—

They (the applicants) have received their relief, and they are now in much the same position as they were before, and as they will be found, it is feared, in future winters, until more effectual and less spasmodic means of improving their condition can be devised, for the causes of distress are chronic and permanent. The founda-

tion of such independence of character as they possessed has been shaken, and some of them have taken the first step in mendicancy, which is too often never retraced.

Examples, of course, may be found where the relief has been helpful, and some visitors, in the contemplation of the worthy family relieved from pressure and set free to work, may think that one such result justifies many failures. It is not, though, expedient that many should suffer for one, or that a population should be demoralised in order that two or three might have enough.

The Fund as a means of relief has failed: it is condemned by the recipients, who are bitter on account of disappointed hopes; by the almoners, whose only satisfaction is that they managed to do the least possible mischief; and by the mechanics, whose name was taken in vain by the agitators who went to the Lord Mayor, and who feel their class degraded by a system of relief for working men which assumes providence and imposition.

The failure of the latest method of relief has been made as manifest as the poverty, and no prophet is needed to tell that bad times are coming. The outlook is most gloomy. The August reports of trades societies characterise trade as 'dull' or 'very slack.' The pawnbrokers report in the same month that they are taking in rather than handing out pledges, and all those who have experience of the poor consider poverty to be chronic. If not in the coming winter, still in the near future there must be trouble.

Poverty in London is increasing both relatively and actually. Relative poverty may be lightly considered, but it breeds trouble as rapidly as actual poverty. The family which has an income sufficient to support life on oatmeal will not grow in good-will when they know that daily meat and holidays are spoken of as 'necessaries' for other workers and children. Education and the spread of literature has raised the standard of living, and they who cannot provide boots for their children, nor sufficient fresh air, nor clean clothes, nor means of pleasure, feel themselves to be poor, and have the hopelessness which is the curse of poverty, as selfishness is the curse of wealth.

Poverty, however, in London is increasing actually. It is increased (1) by the number of incapables: 'broken men, who by their misfortunes or their vices have fallen out of regular work,' and who are drawn to London because chance work is more plentiful, 'company' more possible, and life more enlivened by excitement. (2) By the deterioration of the physique of those born in close rooms, brought up in narrow streets, and early made familiar with vice. It was noticed that among the crowds who applied for relief there were few who seemed healthy or were strongly grown. In Whitechapel the foreman of those employed in the streets reported that 'the majority had not the stamina to make even a good scavenger.' (3) By the disrepute into which saving is fallen. Partly because happiness (as

the majority count happiness) seems to be beyond their reach, partly because the teaching of the example of the well-to-do is 'enjoy yourselves,' and partly because 'the saving man' seems 'bad company, unsocial and selfish;' the fact remains that few take the trouble to save—only units out of the thousands of applicants had shown any signs of thrift. (4) By the growing animosity of the poor against the rich. Good-will among men is a source of prosperity as well as of peace. Those bound together consider one another's interests, and put the good of the 'whole' before the good of a class. Among large classes of the poor animosity is slowly taking the place of good-will, the rich are held to be of another nation, the theft of a lady's diamonds is not always condemned as the theft of a poor man's money, and the gift of 70,000*l.* is looked on as ransom and perhaps an inadequate ransom. The bitter remarks sometimes heard by the almoners are signs of disunion, which will decrease the resources of all classes. The fault did not begin with the poor; the rich sin, but the poor, made poorer and more angry, suffer the most.

On account of these and other causes it may be expected that poverty will be increased. The poorer quarters will become still poorer, the sight of squalor, misery, and hunger more painful, the cry of the poor more bitter. For their relief no adequate means are proposed. The last twenty years have been years of progress, but for want of care and thought the means of relief for poverty remain unchanged. The only resource twenty years ago was a Mansion House Fund, and the only resource available in this enlightened and wealthy year of our Lord is a similar gift thrown, not brought, from the West to the East.

The paradise in which a few theorists lived, listening to the talk at social science congresses, has been rudely broken. Lord Mayors, merchant princes, prime ministers, and able editors have no better means for relief of distress than that long ago discredited by failure. One of the greatest dangers possible to the State has been growing in the midst, and the leaders have slumbered and slept. The resources of civilisation, which are said to be ample to suppress disorder, and to evolve new policies, have not provided means by which the chief commandment may be obeyed, and love shown to the poor neighbour.

The outlook is gloomy enough, and the cure of the evil is not to be effected by a simple prescription. The cure must be worked by slow means which will take account of the whole nature of man, which will regard the future to be as important as the present, and which will win by waiting.

Generally it is assumed that the chief change is that to be effected in the habits of the poor. All sorts of missions and schemes exist for the working of this change. Perhaps it is more to the purpose that a change should be effected in the habits of the rich.

Society has settled itself on a system which it never questions. It is assumed to be absolutely within a man's right to live where he chooses and to get the most for his money.

It is this practice of living in pleasant places which impoverishes the poor. It authorises, as it were, a lower standard of life for the neighbourhoods in which the poor are left; it encourages a contempt for a home which is narrow; it leaves large quarters of the town without the light which comes from knowledge, and large masses of the people without the friendship of those better taught than themselves. The precept that 'every one should live over his shop' has a very direct bearing on life, and it is the absence of so many from their shops, be the shop 'the land' or 'a factory,' which makes so many others poorer. Absenteeism is an acknowledged cause of Irish troubles, and Mr. Goldwin Smith has pointed out that 'the greatest evils of absenteeism are—first, that it withdraws from the community the upper class, who are the natural channels of civilising influences to the classes below them, and, secondly, that it cuts off all personal relations between the individual landlord and his tenant.' He further adds that it was 'natural the gentry should avoid the sight of so much wretchedness . . . and be drawn to the pleasures of London or Dublin.' The result in Ireland was heartbreaking poverty which relief funds did not relieve, and there is no reason why in East London absenteeism should have other results.

In the same way the unquestioned habit of every one to get the most for his money tends to make poverty. In the competition which the habit provokes, many are trampled under foot, and in the search after enjoyment wealth is wasted which would support thousands in comfort.

The habits of the people are in the charge of the Church, so that by its ministers (conformist and nonconformist) God's Spirit may bend the most stubborn will. Those ministers have a great responsibility. God's Spirit has been imprisoned in phrases about the duty of contentment and the sin of drink; the stubborn will has been strengthened by the doctor's opinion as to the necessity of living apart from the worry of work, and by the teaching of a political economy which assumes that a man's might is a man's right. The ministers who would change the habits of the rich will have to preach the prophet's message about the duty of giving and the sin of luxury, and to denounce ways of business now pronounced to be respectable and Christian. Old teaching will have to be put in new language, giving shown to consist in sharing, and earning to be sacrifice. For some time it may be the glory of a preacher to empty rather than to fill his church as he reasons about the Judgment to come, when twopence a gross to the match-makers will be laid alongside of the twenty-two per cent. to the shareholders, and penny dinners for the poor compared with sixteen courses for the rich—

when the 'seamy' side of wealth and pleasure will be exposed.² For some time the ministers who would change habits may fail. It is not until they are able again to lift up the God whose presence is dimly felt, and whose nature is misunderstood, that they will succeed. In the knowledge of God is eternal life. When all know God as the Father who requires rich and poor to be perfect sharers in His gifts of knowledge, beauty, and joy, as well as in His gifts of virtue, forgiveness, and peace, then none will be satisfied until they are at one with Him, and His habit has become their habit.

It may, however, be well here to suggest in a few words what may be done while habits 'remain the same' by laws or systems for the relief of poverty.

It would be wise (1) to promote the organisation of unskilled labour. The mass of applicants last winter belonged to this class, and in one report it is distinctly said that the greater number were 'born within the demoralising influence of the intermittent and irregular employment given by the Dock Companies, and who have never been able to rise above their circumstances.' It is in evidence that the wages of these men do not exceed 12s. a week on an average in a year. If, by some encouragement, these men could be induced to form a union, and if by some pressure the Docks could be induced to employ a regular gang, much would be gained. The very organisation would be a lesson to these men in self-restraint and in fellowship. The substitution of regular hands at the Docks for those who now, by waiting and scrambling, get a daily ticket, would give to a large number of men the help of settled employment and take away the dependence on chance, which makes many careless. Such a change might be met by a *non possumus* of the directors, but it is forgotten that to the present system a weightier *non possumus* would be urged if the labourers could speak as shareholders do speak. A possible loss of profit is not comparable to an actual loss of life, and the labourers do lose life, and more than life, as they scramble for a living that the dividend may be increased.

(2) The helpers of the poor might be more efficiently organised. The ideal of co-operating charity has long hovered over the mischief and waste of competing charity. Up to the present denominational jealousy, or the belief in crotchets, or the self-will which 'dislikes committees,' has prevented common work. If all who are serving the poor could meet and divide—meet to learn one another's object and divide each to do his own work—there would be a force applied which might remove mountains of difficulty. Abuse would be known, wise remedies would be suggested, and foolish remedies prevented. Indirect means would be brought to the support of direct, and those

² Prices paid according to the Mansion House report are: Making of shirts, 3d. to 4d. each; making soldiers' leggings, 2s. a dozen; making lawn-tennis aprons, elaborately frilled, 5½d. a dozen to the sweater, the actual worker getting less.

concerned to reform the land laws, to teach the ignorant, and beautify the ugly, would be recognised as fellow-workers with those whose object is the abolition of poverty. Money would be amply given, and the high motives of faith and love applied to the reform of character. The ideal is in its fulness impossible until there be a really national Church, in which the denominations will preach their truth, and in which 'the entire religious life of the nation will be expressed.' Such a Church, extending into every corner of the land and drawing to itself all who love their neighbours, would realise the ideal of co-operative charity, and so order things that no one would be in sorrow whom comfort will relieve, and no one in pain whom help can succour.

(3) Lastly, the qualification for a seat on a board of guardians might be removed and the position opened to working men.³ The action of the poor-law has a very distinct effect on poverty, and intelligent experience is on the side of administration by rule rather than by sentiment. In poor-law unions, where it is known that 'indoors' all that is necessary for life will be provided, but that 'outdoors' nothing will be given, the poor feel they are under a rule which they can understand. They are able to calculate on what will happen in a way which is impossible when 'giving goes by favour or desert,' and they do not wait and suffer by trusting to a chance. Public opinion, however, does not support such administration, and as public opinion is largely now that of the working men, it is necessary that these men should be admitted on to boards of guardians, where by experience they would learn how impossible it is to adjust relief to desert, and how much less cruel is regular sternness than spasmodic kindness. A carefully and wisely administered poor-law is the best weapon in hand for the troubles to come, and such is impossible without the sympathy of all classes.

By some such means preparation may be made for dealing with poverty, but even these would not be sufficient and would not be in order at a moment of emergency.

If next winter there be great distress, what, it may be asked, can possibly be done? The chief strain must undoubtedly be borne by the poor-law, and the poor-law must follow rules—hard-and-fast lines. The simplest rule is indoor relief for all applicants, and if for able-bodied men the relief take the form of work which is educational, its helpfulness will be obvious. The casual labourer, whose family is given necessary support on condition that he enters the House, may, during his residence, learn something of whitewashing, woodwork, and baking, or, better yet, that habit of regularity which will do much to keep up the home which has been kept together for him.

³ It might be necessary at the same time to abolish 'the compounder,' so that the tenant of every tenement might himself pay the rates and feel their burden

The poor-law can thus help during a time of pressure without any break in its established system. If more is necessary, perhaps the next best form of relief would be an extension of that tried last year by the Whitechapel Committee of the Mansion House Fund. By co-operation with other local authorities the guardians might offer more work at street sweeping, or cleaning—which in poor London is never adequately done—under such conditions of residence or providence as would prevent immigration, but would be free of the degrading associations of the stone-yards. The staff at the disposal of the guardians would enable them to try the experiment more effectively than was possible when a voluntary committee without experience, time, or staff, had to do everything.

By some such plans relief could be afforded to all who belong to what may be called the lowest class; for the assistance of those who could be helped by tools, emigration, or money, the great Friendly societies, the Society for Relief of Distress, and the Charity Organisation Society might act in conjunction. These societies are unsectarian, are already organised and may be developed in power and tenderness to any extent by the addition of members and visitors.

These means and all means which are suggested seem sadly inadequate, and in their very setting forth provoke criticism. There are no effectual means but those which grow in a Christian society. The force which, without striving and crying, without even entering into collision with it, destroyed slavery will also destroy poverty. When rich men, knowing God, realise that life is giving, and when poor men, also knowing God, understand that being is better than having, then there will be none too rich to enter the kingdom of heaven, and none too poor to enjoy God's world.

SAMUEL A. BARNETT.

GUSTAVE FLAUBERT AND GEORGE SAND.

THE genius of each generation chooses instinctively among traditional forms its particular method of expression and the means by which it can most easily influence mankind. It is mainly through the agency of the novel that this end is attained in our portion of the nineteenth century. Forty-two years ago Sainte-Beuve, while singing the requiem of the extraordinarily fertile period that reigned in the intellectual life of France from 1830 to 1840, prophesied that the old forms of art were passing away, and that new ones must arise : 'I place my hopes for the future on dramatic literature. In it will be found, I believe, the new development. The theatre, and the theatre alone, can rouse the wearied mind of this generation from its apathy, and give shape and colour to the mental speculations now germinating in men's minds.

The great critic failed to see that the new departure was destined to take place in the domain of novel-writing rather than in the domain of the drama, and that not only would the novelist appropriate much of the influence hitherto wielded by the playwright, but would compel the drama to join issue with the novel, as far as theatrical conventions would allow, in its realism and accuracy of finish. Many novels are now dramatised, and many novelists have become writers of plays. Alexandre Dumas, fils, before he was bitten by the desire to occupy the position of tragic moralist, led the way to naturalism on the stage. Emile Augier and Octave Feuillet have both successfully followed in his footsteps. Until, however, the naturalistic millennium, foretold by the new school, has completely descended upon the intellectual world the novel must depend for its effects on motives very different from those which rule dramatic action. The one evolves its story by describing every shade, every gradation, in surroundings and background which influence its personages, while the other is constrained to catch the attention of the public by colour, movement, sudden contrasts, and anomalous situations. 'Le Théâtre vit d'exceptions,' and our generation, living at high pressure as it does, likes, in its rare moments of repose, to take its doses of philosophy diluted, and its quota of morality in solution. A transcript of ordinary life, as it passes around it, suits its over-burdened digestion better than exceptional events or abnormal individualities.

It is to France we must look for the highest development of the modern novel. The French intellect is analytic, quick to seize the phantasies and fashions of the hour and give them expression and shape, sensitive to the ridiculous and to the weaker side of human nature, and gifted with an artistic appreciation of form and proportion which permits its imagination to 'vagabond' here and there, yet keeps its work symmetrical and within the limits of probability. The novel on so fruitful a soil has taken every form, socialistic and pathological, pastoral and erudite, political and domestic. No reticence hinders, no moral consideration prevents, the French writer of fiction from touching on any and every subject. Of these classifications, the most arrogant in its pretensions is the so-called 'Scientific' or 'Experimental' novel, by which, its exponents tell us, 'a work of fiction is to be approached like a study in pathology and reduced to the observation of the "Universal Mechanism of Matter"'

As the science of medicine, they tell us, has emerged, thanks to the experimental method, from a state of empiricism into the definite region of facts, so the study of mental feeling and passion is to be reduced from theory and supposition to a stern deduction from actuality. The high priests of this school of fiction are Zola, the De Goncourts, Guy de Maupassant, and a host of others in our day; Stendhal, Balzac, and Flaubert, a quarter of a century ago. In 1830 Stendhal (Henri Beyle), with the cynicism and materialism that has since distinguished the naturalistic following, gave forth his confession of pessimism and atheism to the world with a crudity and explicitness that offended a public accustomed to the vaporous vagueness of De Musset and Baudelaire. 'I shall be understood in 1880,' he said, with a shrug of the shoulders, divining, with a shrewd comprehension of human nature, that his theory of fiction was the one destined to rule men's minds in the future. *La Chartreuse de Parme* and *Rouge et Noir*, considered by the 'Moderns' as occupying a foremost position in French literature, were so disregarded at the time of their publication as to induce their author to shake the dust of his ungrateful country off his feet and spend the last years of his life in Italy. 'Arrigo Beyle, Milanese,' as he caused himself to be called on his tombstone, was only a little in advance of his time. Already young Balzac had entered upon his prodigious work the *Comédie Humaine*, and had paid a tribute to the memory of his predecessor in an exhaustive article on his literary method. George Sand met the innovator in Italy during her visit to Venice. Being then in the days of her fiery youth, she could not brook his plain speaking, and they parted with indignant words. Before becoming a friend of Flaubert's, she had begun to see the reverse of the medal; though remaining a 'troubadour' to the end of her days, singing ideal and romantic love without regard to science or

psychology, she listened to those who ranged themselves on the other side.

In the correspondence lately published between her and Flaubert we have a full exposition of this disparity in their views. The letters were never intended for publication, and we quite agree with the critic, M. Brunetière, that the editors have done their work carelessly and hastily; that they have not taken the trouble *de faire leur toilette*; that they have evidently suppressed pages without acknowledging the fact or without deigning to give explanatory notes; and that the dates are in many instances palpably wrong, showing that they cannot have taken the trouble to collate and compare her letters with his. For our part, we are glad the correspondence was published with its 'toilet unmade,' without the elision of Flaubert's misanthropy, or his strong language on the subject of the stupidity of mankind. As it stands at present it might be a dialogue between the two artists at 'Nohant,' or 'Croisset'—in her study looking out on the 'Vallée Noire,' or by 'the river that brings fresh breezes to his cavern.' They talk without reference either to the public or to professional considerations, or to anything that can check the full flow of confidential and unreserved plain speaking. We hear every phase and point of view of the two intellectual standpoints which they occupy discussed and ventilated. We are shown the stratagems of their craft. We see the ropes and pulleys, the shifting of the scenes, the necessary appearance or non-appearance of the principal figure, the extent to which idealism or realism is required to deceive the audience before which they perform. Sometimes there is a want of sentiment in Flaubert's matter-of-fact manner of discussing the methods of his art which is disturbing to all illusion. He is like a child in a garden pulling up the flowers to see how the roots grow. There is no pretension to fine writing; indeed, one is surprised at the want of fluency displayed by the author of *Mme. Bovary*; yet every now and then he demonstrates the 'anatomy' of his art with a rare precision and skill.

His first letter is dated 1866. He was then forty-five, George Sand sixty-two. It is written ceremoniously to thank her for a favourable criticism of some of his work. The next arranges a visit she is to pay him at Rouen. After this visit a constant interchange of letters sets in. The two discuss every subject in art, religion, and literature. They coin words for their own use. She signs herself the old Troubadour, 'qui toujours chante et chantera le parfait amour;' he addresses her as 'mon bon maitre.' She rates him on his indolence.

And you, my Benedictine, alone in your charming monastery, working and never going out, that is what comes of travelling too much in your youth; and yet you can do a 'Bovary,' and describe out-of-the-way corners like a great master. You are a creature quite out of the way, very mysterious, but gentle as a sheep. . . .

Sainte-Beuve declares that you are very immoral—perhaps he sees with unclean eyes, like that learned botanist who says the ‘germander’ is a ‘dirty yellow.’ The observation is so untrue that I could not help writing in the margin of his book, ‘It is your eyes that are unclean.’ . . . I believe you to be in a state of grace, since you like work and solitude, in spite of the rain.

They differ on every conceivable point, intellectual and moral. After ten years of correspondence, she writes,—

We are, I think, as unlike in our manner of seeing things as it is possible to be; yet, since we love one another, all is well, since we think of one another at the same moment. I conclude people require their opposite. Minds find their completion in identification for a time with elements essentially different to themselves.

As much dissimilarity existed in the origin, birth, and early surroundings of George Sand and Flaubert as in every other particular. Both are striking examples of the laws of heredity so insisted upon by the pathological school of fiction. She had royal and heroic blood in her veins, and reproduced in her fiction the personage of Maurice de Saxe, and women at variance with social laws—as were three of her ancestresses—to the end of her literary career. Gustave was the son of a doctor. The only ray of romance that illumined his bourgeois origin was the friendship subsisting in childhood between his maternal grandmother and Charlotte Corday. He was born at Rouen on December 12, 1821. Reared among the unbeautiful, almost sordid, surroundings of the doctor’s home, the boy grew up quiet, reserved, and backward for his age, except in the art of weaving stories out of the everyday occurrences round him. Flaubert’s father was a humane man in the best acceptance of the word. ‘The sight of a suffering dog,’ his son tells us, ‘brought tears to his eyes. He performed his surgical operations skilfully nevertheless, and invented some terrible ones.’ He took the same view of Gustave’s literary pursuits as the old Hamburg banker did of his nephew Henri Heine’s, ‘Hatte der dumme Knabe was gelernt, so brauchte er keine Bucher zu schreiben.’ The boy’s freedom was never interfered with, however, and he was allowed to sit reading all day long, his head between his hands. In the strange preface, with its mixture of reserve and effusion, which he wrote to the last poems of his friend Louis Bouilhet, he relates with subtle force of humour the absurd enthusiasms of their schoolboy life at the Alma Mater of Rouen:—

I do not know what the dreams of schoolboys are, but ours were splendid in their extravagance. The last ebullitions of romanticism that reached us, circumscribed by our everyday surroundings, brought about a strange excitement. Whilst enthusiastic hearts sighed after dramatic loves, with their accompaniments of gondolas, black masks, and great ladies fainting in post-chaises in Calabria, others dreamt of conspiracies and rebellions. One rhetorician composed an ‘Apology for Robespierre,’ which circulated outside the school and led to a duel between the author and a stranger. I remember that one schoolmate wore a red cap; another

declared his intention to live as a Mohican, while one of our intimate friends determined to turn renegade and seek service under Abd-el-Kader. We attempted suicide, we meditated every absurdity, but what a hatred of the commonplace! What aspirations, what respect for the masters! How we adored Victor Hugo!

As a young man he was exceptionally handsome, but no woman's love could tempt him from the one constant passion that animated his life. 'Je n'ai jamais pu emboiter Vénus avec Apollon,' he declared. From his earliest youth he devoted his entire intellectual and physical energy to literature, undermining his health, and ultimately sacrificing his existence to his imperious and exacting mistress. 'It is better to get drunk on ink than on eau-de-vie,' he answers, when his friend tells him prophetically, 'You love literature inordinately; it will kill you.'

Infinitely touching is the exhortation with which he ends the preface to Bouilhet's poems, alluded to above:—

Since the public always ask for a moral, here is mine: Are there two young students who spend their leisure moments reading the poets together, who, full of literary ambition, compare words and sentences, indifferent to all else; hiding their passion with the modesty of a young girl—then I give them this advice: Spend the days of your youth in the arms of the Muse; her love replaces all other, and consoles for every loss. Then, if events passing around you seem transposed into shape and form, and you feel imperiously driven to reproduce them, so that everything, even your own existence, seems useless for other purpose, and that you are prepared for all disappointments, ready for all sacrifices, proof against all trials, then I say, 'Take the plunge! publish! You will have put your powers to the test, and be able to bear reverses and trials of every kind with equanimity.'

In 1843 a cloud came over Flaubert's life. One evening, after a long walk with his brother, he fell in a fit, which proved to be epileptic. From that time he was subject to frequent similar attacks. His father did what he could for him, but medical skill seemed powerless. Flaubert himself studied every medical work upon the subject, but to no purpose. 'I am a lost man,' he said one day to a friend. 'Fêlé, si fêlé est le mot juste, car je sens le contenu qui fuit,' is his tragic lament, at a later period, to George Sand.

The attacks ceased in middle life, but recurred in later years, until one day he fell dead on his study table, strewn at the time with books of reference and the manuscript of a new novel.

The correspondence which is before us shows how this affliction was present to his mind at all times. In studying his literary work the recollection of his impaired health must never leave us, for there is no doubt it accounts for the intense gloom that pervades it. 'The saddest mourning is not the one we wear upon our hats,' as he says.

Towards the end of the year 1849 Flaubert finished the *Tentation de Saint Antoine*, and read it aloud to Du Camp and Bouilhet. The reading lasted thirty-two hours (eight hours a day for four days)

His friends were in a predicament. Neither ventured to tell him his work was hopelessly dull. At length Bouilhet plucked up courage. 'Mon cher,' he said, 'we think you ought to put that book in the fire, and not think any more about it.' Flaubert took his friends' advice so far as not to publish *Saint Antoine* until long after in a completely different form. Out of this incident, however, arose one of the most important events in his history, and indeed in the history of the French literature of the day. Bouilhet, after his frank advice, suggested the subject which Flaubert gave form to in *Mme. Bovary*. Bouilhet had heard the story in Rouen. Charles Bovary had been an old pupil of Flaubert's father, and all the main incidents were taken from the life:—the young girl married to a plain, uninteresting husband; the crime, the misery, the debts; ending with the wife's suicide and the man's death, after discovering his wife's infidelity;—nothing can be imagined more tragic than the subject, nothing more cruelly realistic than Flaubert's treatment of it. The very supplementary title, *Mœurs de province*, startles us by its cynicism and bitterness.

So base, so mean, so vulgar are the manners and minds of the people whom he describes, that we feel inclined, a dozen times during the reading of the book, to lay it aside disheartened and irritated, and a dozen times we are charmed back again by the marvellous descriptions and touches of realism in which it abounds. There are days on the coast of his own Normandy that remind one of its pages—days dark and stormy, when the sea breaks with a ceaseless, mournful sound. You look round in vain for a bright spot in the leaden sky; when, suddenly, a flash of lightning reveals a whole landscape undreamed of before.

Both the public and private history of *Mme. Bovary* form curious episodes in the history of literature. On its publication in 1857, the Second Empire, like all governments who attain to power with not very clean hands, wished to show the extreme orthodoxy of its moral and religious views, and endeavoured to suppress the book. The lawsuit that followed it was vehemently attacked by the counsel for the prosecution, and eloquently defended by M. Sénart for the defence. The acquittal of the author was obtained with difficulty; yet he was more than compensated by the publicity given to the book, and by its extraordinary and unprecedented success.

Its private history has been revealed by Guy de Maupassant. After five years of incessant labours Flaubert entrusted his manuscript to his friend Maxime Du Camp, who passed it on to Laurent-Pichat, editor of the *Revue de Paris*. Soon after, Maxime wrote to Flaubert to the effect that he and Laurent-Pichat, having read it, recommended him to allow them to cut out and shorten, as they saw fit, for publication in the *Revue*. They would concede him the right to publish it subsequently in any form he might like. If he did not

consent to this proposal, he was told that by the publication of a book overweighted with detail and involved in style, he would hopelessly compromise his literary reputation.

Be courageous [this remarkable letter ends]; shut your eyes during the operation, and have confidence, if not in our talent, at least in the experience we have acquired in dealing with affairs of this sort, and also in our affection for you. You have buried your story under a mass of matter artistic but useless. It must be unearthed. We will have this done under our own supervision by an experienced and skilful hand; not a word shall be added to your copy—only portions cut out. It will not cost you more than a hundred francs, which can be deducted from your royalties, and you will have published a really good book instead of an indifferent one.

This letter was found religiously preserved among Flaubert's papers, with the one word 'Gigantesque' written on it. He submitted to the operation, for a copy of the first edition of the book was found on which was written:—

This copy represents my book as it left the hands of *Sieur Laurent-Pichat*, poet, and proprietor of the *Revue de Paris*,—GUSTAVE FLAUBERT, 20th April, 1857.

The alterations were noteworthy. Each page was covered with erasures; paragraphs, entire pieces were cut out; almost all the original and striking passages ruthlessly expurgated. Flaubert at once took it out of their hands and published it in its entirety. Both the public prosecution and the private negotiation with *Maxime Du Camp* did much to embitter his views of 'la bêtise humaine.' 'When a man's got his limbs whole he can bear a smart cut or two;' but neither Flaubert's limbs nor his mind were whole.

In his *Opinions de Thomas Grandorge* *Taine* describes a dinner at which a young diplomat, seated beside a stiff Evangelical Englishwoman, attempts to defend French novels from the charge of immorality brought against them:—

'Miss Mathews, you judge us severely because you have not read us. Permit me to send you a French novel to-morrow, just published, the profoundest and most soul-stirring of all the moral writings of our time. It is written by a kind of monk, a Benedictine, who went to the Holy Land, and was even shot at by the infidels. This monk lives secluded in a hermitage near Rouen, shut up night and day, working incessantly. He is very learned, and has published a work on ancient Carthage. He ought to be in the Academy; it is to be hoped he will succeed *Mgr. Dupanloup*. Not only is he full of genius, but so conscientious. He studied medicine for some time under his father, who was a doctor, and judges character by physique. If he has a fault, it is that he is too profound, too laborious to please frivolous readers. His end and object is to warn young women against indolence, vain curiosity, and indiscriminate reading. His name is *Gustave Flaubert*, and his book is called "*Mme. Bovary; or the Results of Bad Conduct.*"' Miss Mathews looked pleased, asked the name of the editor: 'I will,' she said, 'translate the book immediately on my return to London, and we will distribute it through the Wesleyan society for the advancement of morality.'

Flaubert had no intention of 'showing the results of bad conduct' in *Mme. Bovary*. 'Art for art' was his axiom; but like all true artists he was forced, in spite of himself, into 'preaching a moral.' He had lived long enough in the world to know its sorrows, and to know that deepest tragedy of all, unlawful, cruel, sensual love; and therefore he wrote the story of Emma Bovary, with its pitiful ending. He abstains from judging the conduct of his characters, but sees life through a glass darkly, and represents it so to his readers. His theory was that a novel ought to be a philosophical transcript of life, dispassionately and faithfully done, uninfluenced by the sentiment or bias of the author. 'If the reader does not without help discover the moral of a book,' he observes, 'either the reader is a fool, or the book is false and inexact.'

I do not write [he declares to George Sand] 'about the misery of the world' for pleasure, believe me; but I cannot change my eyes! As to my 'having no convictions'—alas! convictions smother me. I burst with internal rage and indignation. But in the ideal I have of art, I think one ought not to show one's convictions; the artist ought no more to appear in his work than God in nature. Man is nothing; the work everything. This discipline, which may start from an entirely erroneous basis, is not easy to observe, and, so far as I am concerned, it is a sort of permanent sacrifice that I make to good taste. I would like to say what I think, and to comfort the *Sieur Gustave Flaubert* by phrases; but what is the importance of said *Sieur*?

They both of them in their letters hark back to this vexed question, a vital one between the romantic and the realistic schools, whether the artist's individuality ought to appear in what he writes. 'As to giving expression to my personal opinion of the people I put on the stage,' Flaubert declares, 'No, a thousand times no. . . . I have an unconquerable dislike to put anything of my *heart on paper*.' Her answer, dated Nohant, February 2, 1863, says:—

To put nothing of one's heart in one's writing? I do not understand such a statement. It seems to me impossible to put anything else. Can I separate my mind from my heart? Can sensation be limited? Not to give myself up entirely to my work seems to me as impossible as to cry with anything but my eyes and to think with anything but my brain. What do you really mean? You will tell me when you have time.

Again, speaking of the novels they were going to set to work at in 1875, she says:—

What shall we do? You for certain will portray 'desolation,' and I 'consolation.' I do not know what influences our destinies. You see your characters as they pass, you criticise them; from a literary point of view you abstain from appreciating them, you content yourself with painting them, hiding your personal bias carefully and systematically. Still, it is visible through your work, and you only make people who read you more sad. I wish to make them less unhappy. I cannot forget that my personal victory over despair was the work of my will

and of a new method of comprehension which is the complete opposite of that which I held formerly.

I know you blame the intervention of the doctrine of personality in literature.

Are you right? Is it not rather a want of conviction than an æsthetic principle? It is impossible to have a philosophy in the soul without its showing itself. I have no literary counsels to give you. I believe firmly your school have more talent and power of work than I have. Only I think theirs and your great want is a settled and wide view of life. Art is not only portrayal, and real painting must be always full of the soul that rules the brush. Art is not only criticism and satire; criticism and satire only paint one side of truth.

I wish to see man as he is. He is neither good nor evil, he is good and evil; but he is something yet more—a soul! Being good and bad, he has an internal force which leads him to be very bad and a little good, or very good and a little bad.

In this discussion, as in almost all they hold, 'George Sand is right, and Flaubert is not wrong.' She allowed her personality to appear to an overweening extent. She never wrote a novel that was not an account of one of her own love affairs or an exposition of some of her social or socialistic ideas, while he was impersonal and impartial to an unsympathetic and depressing degree. His characters submit to circumstances. They never mould them to their will. There is little doubt this is what constitutes the immorality of *Mme. Bovary* and although never alluded to in the prosecution it is this fatalism, or, as the school call it, 'determinism,' which instinctively filled moralists and ecclesiastics with dread. So you are made, and so you must act. Providence has developed your sensual appetites, therefore it is useless to resist them. If Emma Bovary does not yield to Léon, it is not from a moral effort to save herself, but because she is not ripe for the fall; and afterwards there is no passionate regret for sin, no endeavour to lift herself out of the degradation, no compunction even on account of her child. And when at the end she commits suicide, it is not from remorse for the ruin she has brought on all around her; but because it is the only possible means of escape from her own difficulties. All the exhilaration of human struggle and endeavour is ruthlessly eliminated.

Flaubert was above all an artist, nothing but an artist, and one of those artists in whom two or three predominant faculties absorbed and ended literally in annihilating the others. The result was that he understood nothing of the world, or of life, but that 'which could help to the completion of his own artistic individuality,' 'sa consommation personnelle.' He recognised nothing else. He was the head of the school of art designated 'L'art pour l'art.' He did not admit that any æsthetic creation should have any object but itself and its own completion. He had too great a contempt for his fellow-men to endeavour to improve them. His pessimism would have deterred him from any utilitarian tendency.

'Art,' he wrote, 'must be self-sufficing, and must not be looked on as a means.'

The end and aim of art for me is beauty. I remember my heart beating, with acute delight, as I looked at a wall of the Acropolis, a perfectly plain wall (the one on the left on the ascent to the Propylea). I wonder if a book independently of what it says can produce the same effect? In the precision of arrangement, the rarity of material, the polish of its surface, the harmony of the completed work, is there not intrinsic merit?—a sort of divine force, something eternal, like a great principle?

The one thing that seemed to him enduring and absolute in his life made up of delusions and disappointments was form and beauty of expression. A well-proportioned sentence presented an indestructible and complete force to his senses that was as concrete and exact as the resolution of a problem to a mathematician.

When one knows how to attract the whole interest of a page on one line, bring one idea into prominence among a hundred others, solely by the choice and position of the terms that express it; when one knows how to *hit* with a word, one only word, placed in a certain position; when one knows how to move a soul, how to fill it suddenly with joy, or fear, or enthusiasm, or grief, or rage, by putting an adjective under the reader's eye, then one is really the greatest of artists, a real writer of prose.

There is something pathetically comic in the way he struggles with his composition—

I pass weeks without exchanging a word with a living being, and at the end of the week I cannot recall a single day or a single event. I see my mother and my niece on Sundays, that is all. My only society consists of a band of rats who make an infernal row in the garret above my head, when the water does not gurgle and groan and the wind blow. The nights are as black as ink, and a silence like that of the desert reigns around me. Such an existence reacts on the nerves. My heart beats at the least thing.

All this is the result of our intellectual occupations. This is what comes of torturing body and soul; but that torture is the only thing worth having in the world.

You astound me [George Sand replies] with the difficulty you find in your work. Is it coquetry? You show it so little! My great difficulty is to choose between the thousand and one scenic combinations, which can vary *ad infinitum* the simple situation. As to style, I treat it much more cavalierly than you. The wind plays on my old harp as it pleases: high or low, loud or soft. It is all the same to me, so long as the emotion is there. Yet I cannot evolve anything out of myself. It is the 'other' who sings as he lists, well or ill. And when I try to think about it, I get frightened, and tell myself that I am nothing, nothing at all.

A certain amount of philosophy saves us from despondency. Suppose we are really nothing but instruments, it is a delightful state, and a sensation unlike anything else to let yourself vibrate.

Let the wind rush through your chords. I think you take too much trouble, and that you ought to let the 'other' influence you oftener. The instrument might sound weak at times, but the breath of inspiration continuing would increase in strength. Then you could do afterwards what I don't do, but what I ought to do—you would raise the tone of colour of your picture, putting in more light or shade.

He had the faults as well as the merits of an artist. Towards the end of his life his exclusiveness and impatience with commonplace

humanity became predominant, often to the deterioration of his good heart and liberality of mind. It is not without a pained feeling of surprise, for instance, that we see a Frenchman writing in 1867, 'At the last Magny dinner the conversation was so "boorish" that I swore internally never to go again. They talked of nothing but "M. de Bismarck and the Luxembourg." I was sick of it.' This ebullition was perfectly sincere. He did not understand that among literary people and artists a conversation could turn on politics. Politics, as he thought, were outside of, and almost antagonistic to art. Man is made for art, and not art for man; 'La sacro-sainte littérature' is the only thing of any importance in life; everything else is but unmeaning and vulgar. Such is his estimate of men and things.

As a natural consequence of this extreme literary fastidiousness Flaubert declared that the artist ought only to work for a chosen few, and that the crowd for him did not exist. We can imagine how antagonistic this was to all George Sand's views of work and life. 'We novelists must write for all the world, for all who need to be initiated. When we are not understood, we are resigned to the inevitable and begin again. When one is understood, one rejoices and goes on.' And then she says, later on, 'You can hardly be accurate in saying that you write to please a dozen people, for failure irritates and affects you.' She knew that, like many others, when Flaubert succeeded, he did not find humanity so stupid, nor the public so dense; but also, that when he did not succeed, instead of trying to find out the reason, he declared it was a cabal, or prejudice, or jealousy. This incapacity of submitting to the mildest criticism did not arise so much from wounded vanity as from his incapacity to see that his work could have been conceived or executed in any other method than that in which he had conceived and executed it.

This exclusiveness, as far as the outside public was concerned, did not extend to his own circle of intimates. Guy de Maupassant has given us an interesting glimpse of his Sunday receptions in Paris in his bachelor apartments on the fifth floor. His intimate friend, Ivan Tourguénieff, 'le Muscove,' was often the first to arrive. He would sink into a chair and begin speaking slowly and softly, but with an intonation that gave the greatest charm to all he said. He was generally laden with foreign books, and would translate the poems of Goethe, Pouschkine, or Swinburne as he read. He and Flaubert had many sympathies and ideas in common. Others soon followed: Taine, his eyes shining behind his spectacles, full of information and talk; then Alphonse Daudet, bringing the life, the vigour, the brightness of Paris, making jokes and telling stories with the sing-song voice and quick gestures of a southerner, shaking his black hair from his handsome, finely cut face, and stroking his long silky beard. George Sand, when in Paris, would sometimes join the circle.

In her coarse, black serge gown, made perfectly plain without crinoline or trimming, her hair cut short, looking as like the 'troisième sexe,' to which Flaubert compared her, as possible, with a nod for all and a shake of the hand for a favoured few who crowded round, she also would sit down, and after the cigars were handed round, of which she partook, the talk began. Not a conversation, perhaps, which M. Taine would have recommended his imaginary Evangelical lady to listen to, or a society he would have recommended her to mix in; but interesting as all societies are interesting in which the yeast of speculative thought is working. Such was the moment, his biographer says, to see Flaubert. With grand gestures, moving from one to the other of his guests, his long dressing-gown blown out behind him like the dark sail of a fishing-boat, full of excitement, indignation, vehement expression of opinion, of overflowing eloquence, his voice like a trumpet, his good-natured laugh; amusing in his indignation, charming in his good-nature, astounding in his erudition and surprising memory, he would terminate a discussion with a profound and pertinent remark, rushing through the centuries with a bound to compare two facts of the same genus, two men of the same race, two religions of the same order, from which, like flints struck together, he kindled a light.

Since, as Flaubert says, the public 'will have a moral,' what conclusion do we come to between these two great artists? Is idealism, or realism to be the issue of true art? Is the primitive, often discordant and painful tune evolved by the human instrument to be transcribed by the hand of the artist without comment or addition? Or is it the mission of great art, by the aid of counterpoint and modulation, to give us a symphony which, from gradation to gradation, through unison and dissonance will lead us up to wider planes of sensation and knowledge? Either side argues, as we have seen, from its own standpoint. But after all the best test of art must be its results. And what are the results of Flaubert's tenet of 'art for art'?

Zola, who has formulated the axioms of his school more boldly than any, says, alluding to some coarse stories that had been made in *Gil Blas*, a low Parisian paper:—

Not that I blame the inspiration of them, for did I do so I should but blame Rabelais, La Fontaine, and many others I think highly of; but in truth these stories are too badly written. That is my only reason for condemning them. An author is guilty if his style is bad. In literature this is the one unpardonable crime. I do not see any other question of immorality. A well-turned phrase is a good action.

The pathological or scientific method of romance-writing, has brought us to the present school of French realistic novel, of which one would be sorry even to write down the name of one of the productions. We are surprised indeed that so artistic and analytic a

race as the French can accept the term 'scientific novel.' We have heard the theories of science ironically called a fiction, but it is difficult to see how fiction can be erected into a science. The knowledge of a scientific student of medicine remains empirical until, by amassing a number of facts, and carrying out a large number of experiments, he makes it actual. This, the writer of fiction, by the nature of his art, which ties him to the treatment of one set of facts, is precluded from doing. Flaubert himself says:—

In spite of all the genius brought to bear on the development of one fable taken as an example, another fable can be made use of to prove the contrary, for 'denouements' are not conclusions. You cannot deduce general principles from one fact, and people who think they are making a step forward in that direction are at issue with modern science, which insists on the multiplication of facts before establishing a law.

The art of fiction is entirely governed by personality. It is a spontaneous effort of the creative faculty, and has nothing in common with the conclusions of natural phenomena, in which nothing can be created. We stop the new school, then, at the science of sociology, keystone of their edifice; for sociology is a study of humanity in the aggregate, while the novel must essentially be a study of humanity in the individual.

Flaubert had the misfortune to promulgate many theories, and unfortunately to be accepted literally by an inferior set of thinkers. We had a right to ask bread of such a genius as he, and he has given us a stone; but the pessimism, that like a canker has eaten into Flaubert's work, is farther to seek than in his own personality or that of his followers. Frenchmen are dreamers of dreams. Their genius ever endeavours to scale the heavens. The Revolution had awakened hopes and ambitions it had never been able to fulfil. Full of feverish restlessness they had fought and apparently conquered Europe under the leadership of Napoleon. When he disappeared the whole fabric tumbled to pieces like a pack of cards. They were cast back on themselves to feed on their disillusionment; hence a morbid cynicism and bitter atheism permeated all classes, finding expression in Alfred de Musset's *Rolla*, in Balzac's *Comédie Humaine*, and later in Gustave Flaubert's *Mme. Bovary*. The third Napoleon endeavoured to follow in the footsteps of his uncle; we know with what result. Deceived a second time, the gloom of pessimism seems to have descended on the young school of realists more impenetrably than ever. Their critics laugh at them; recommend 'douches,' 'iron,' 'devotion to domestic duties,' or repeat Voltaire's celebrated advice to the pessimists of his time, 'cultivez votre jardin.' The evil exists, and is undermining all vigorous thought and artistic endeavour in France. 'Le monde Latin s'en va,' Flaubert writes to George Sand; but at the same time he hardly recognises the superior robustness of those gentlemen (the

Germans) who smash mirrors in white kid gloves, know Sanscrit, drink one's champagne, but who, he is obliged to confess naively, took nothing from La Croisset but a 'needle-case and a pipe.' George Sand had inherited some of the Koenigsmarck blood, and with it a healthier, robuster texture of mind, which, had she been a man, subjected to the same scientific and practical bringing up as Flaubert, would have made a greater artist.

The individual named George Sand is well [she writes towards the end]; he is enjoying the wonderfully mild winter that reigns in Berry, is gathering flowers, making botanical discoveries, sewing dresses and mantles for his daughter-in-law, costumes for marionnettes, arranging theatrical decorations, dressing dolls, reading music, and playing with little Aurore, the most wonderful child on the face of the globe. There is no one calmer or more happy in his domestic surroundings than this old troubador retired from business, who sings from time to time his little romance to the moon, without particularly caring whether he sings well or ill so long as he speaks what passes through his brain, and who the rest of the time idles delightfully. It has not been so well with him all his life; he was stupid enough to be young once; but as he did not do any ill, or know bad passions, or live for personal vanity, he is happy enough to be quiet and find amusement in everything.

Alexandre Dumas describes her in her old age wandering about her garden in a broad-brimmed hat. She was gathering impressions, he says, absorbing the universe, steeping herself in nature; and at night she would give this forth as a sort of emanation. George Elot recognised her greatness in spite of the prejudice that existed in England against the author of *Lelia*. 'I don't care,' she says, 'whether I agree with her about marriage or not—whether I think the design of her plot correct, or that she had no precise design at all, but began to write as the spirit moved her, and trusted to Providence for the catastrophe—which I think the more probable case. It is sufficient for me, as a reason for bowing before her in eternal gratitude to that "great power of God manifested in her," that I cannot read six pages of hers without feeling that it is given to her to delineate human passion and its results, and (I must say in spite of your judgment) some of the moral instincts and their tendencies, with such truthfulness, such nicety of discrimination, such tragic power, and, withal, such loving, gentle humour, that one might live a century with nothing but one's own dull faculties and not know so much as those six pages will suggest.'

We cannot resist giving two more extracts from her letters. She writes to Gustave Flaubert from Nohant, January 15, 1870:—

Here I am at home, tolerably convalescent, except an hour or two every evening, but that will pass away in time. 'The suffering, or he who endures it,' as my old curé used to say, 'cannot endure for ever.'

I received your letter this morning, dear friend. Why do I care for you more than many others, even more than old and tried friends? I am trying to find out, for the attitude of my mind at this moment is that of him—

‘ — qui va cherchant,
Au soleil couchant,
Fortune!’

Yes, intellectual fortune, *light!* There is no doubt, when we grow old and reach the sunset of life (the finest hour for tones and harmonies of colour), we form new ideas of everything, and above all of affection.

When, in the age of vigour and strong personality, we advance towards friendship timorously and tentatively, feeling the ground of reciprocity, one feels solid oneself, and would wish to feel the solidity of that which bears you. But when the intensity of personality has gone, we love people and things for those qualities which they themselves possess, for that which they represent to the eyes of your mind, and not for the possible influence they may exert on your life. They become like a picture or a statue that we wish to possess, when we imagine at the same time a beautiful dwelling in which to place it.

I have traversed the green plains of Bohemia without amassing anything. I have remained foolish, sentimental, a ‘troubadour.’ I know it will ever be the same, and that I shall die without hearth or home. Then I think of the statue, the picture—and say to myself, What would I do with them if I possessed them? I have no place of honour to put them in, and I am content to know that they are in some temple unprofaned by cold analysis, too far off to be looked at too closely. One loves them all the better, perhaps, and says to oneself, ‘I will pass again through the country where they are. I will see and love all that has made me love and appreciate them, but the contact of my personality will not have changed them. It will not be myself I will love in them.’

Thus it is that the ideal that one has given up endeavouring to incorporate, incorporates itself in us, because it remains itself. That is the whole secret of beauty, truth, and love, of friendship, enthusiasm, and faith. Think it over, and you will agree with me.

To the last she is to do battle for her opinions. Two months before her death, she writes:—

Because Zola’s *Rougon* is a valuable work I do not change my opinion. Art ought to be the search for truth, and truth is not the mere portrayal of evil and good. A painter who only sees the one is as wrong as he who only sees the other. Life is not made up of villains and brutes. Honest people cannot even be in a minority, since a certain order reigns in society, and there are no unpunished crimes.

Stupidity abounds, it is true, but there is a public conscience that influences stupid people and obliges them to respect right. Let rascals be shown up and punished—that is just and moral; but let us see the other side also. Otherwise the unthinking reader is shocked, frightened, and, to save himself from a disagreeable impression, refuses to listen.

His letter in reply to the last of the series ends, ‘You have always done me good, intellectually and morally. I love you tenderly.’

And so ends this delightful artistic dialogue, from which indeed we would gladly have given other extracts had space allowed of our doing so.

In an interesting essay of Hazlitt’s he discusses what characters he would rather have met, and under what circumstances. He suggests a gossip at their club with Addison and Steele, a dinner

with Johnson and Burke, a supper with Charles Lamb. I would add a morning spent with George Sand in her garden at Nohant, when age had modified her views and matured her judgment. While the world 'scolded and fought' she remained an enthusiast, a believer in good, a troubadour singing ideal art and love. Through all her correspondence there is no trace of vanity, selfishness, or jealousy of others' fame; but, on the contrary, a generous carelessness, a courage and independence which are rare in the greatest of her sex. She touches every subject, often superficially and inaccurately; but her brain is ever active, ever bright, full of hope, aspiration, and the impetuous desire for good.

N. H. KENNARD.

WORKHOUSE CRUELTIES.

NOTWITHSTANDING the vast improvements that have taken place in the department of legal relief to the poor during the last twenty-five years, those who are best acquainted with the subject can hardly rest satisfied with the amount of reform to which we have attained, and we therefore desire briefly to call attention to some points which we consider still demand investigation and redress.

It need hardly be said that the subject is not a popular one, and that it meets with little sympathy from the public—scarcely even from philanthropists whose study may be the poor and their requirements. Had the vast interests involved in the expenditure and control of eight millions annually been considered as it deserves to be in the past, the grievances and abuses which have now been exposed during the last thirty years could never have taken place. Had even a due interest been felt in the election of our representatives for this great work we might have left the matter safely in their hands; but to the apathy and neglect of this primary duty may be traced the mismanagement to which we have alluded. Even if the large institutions scattered through the land were closed and inaccessible to the outside public, who contributed the rates for their support, still it was open to all, and an obvious duty, to use every exertion to secure the election of the best men (and we may now add women) to ensure the right management of these vast concerns.¹

We can now thankfully acknowledge that an improvement has begun in this respect, which may, we believe, be partly traced to the interest excited in the fact that women have come forward to fill these posts of usefulness; fifty are now scattered through the 647 Boards of Guardians in the land, and, small as the number is by comparison, yet we can truly say they have made their mark and done good service to the cause of the poor and helpless, of whom women and children form so large a proportion.

Yet this is one of the points still urgently requiring attention and interest, as is proved by the fact that in one important West-end

¹ One means of creating an interest in Poor Law management would be the publication in each union of an annual report or statement of the workhouse and infirmary, with details of expenditure. It will scarcely be believed that only two Metropolitan Boards print and circulate any such statement at present.

parish so much indifference prevailed that out of 17,000 voting papers issued but a few over 5,000 were returned, or, in other words, instead of the maximum number of 463,000 votes which might have been given, only 143,000 were actually polled. That there is great neglect in the issuing and collecting of voting papers is not denied, and there is besides another reason, which has been noticed elsewhere, deterring large numbers of the upper classes from recording their votes, viz. the almost invariable coincidence of the elections with the season of Easter, when many are absent from home, no interval of time being allowed for sending papers into the country for signature.²

When the educated classes come to see that it is not only their duty to vote, but to fill the office of guardian also, we may look for the disappearance of those few remaining evils of which we still complain. We will now only dwell upon two departments of Poor Law management which seem to us to call for reforms, some requiring legislative interference, others the action of public opinion alone, to bring them about.

First in interest we may name the sick, now, within the Metropolitan District, contained within twenty-three separate, and chiefly new, buildings, in all respects like hospitals, under a management apart from the workhouse, with resident medical superintendents, matrons, stewards, and for the most part a staff of nurses who have had some training to fit them for their duties.³ Outside the Metropolitan District, we may add, there are but three of our large towns which have as yet provided separate infirmaries (Manchester, Liverpool, and Leeds), but Birmingham is preparing to do so, and we believe it is a step which is desired by the Local Government Board, as well as all who have the welfare of our sick poor at heart, and know the blessing which these our 'State Hospitals' have been to them. It may be said, then, what more remains to be done in this direction? We reply that public opinion, or legislative control, must require; 1st, that the matrons of these important hospitals should be educated women who have received a special training in the care of the sick to fit them for their work, and not, as too often at present, former workhouse officers, with little or no knowledge of sickness; 2nd, that pauper nurses should be excluded from all power and authority over the sick. And on this point we cannot refrain from adding how little is known or cared about the sad revelations which reach us from time to time through the pages of country newspapers of the cruelties still committed by such so-called nurses of the sick, rivalling in horror those stories which are supposed to belong only

² A petition has been sent to the Local Government Board to ask for a further extension of time.

³ The 'Workhouse Nursing Association' has done good service in this cause during the last seven years, and has now sixty trained nurses employed in the metropolitan infirmaries and country workhouses. Office, 44 Berners Street, W.

to past history. Five such instances are now before us, resulting in death, and investigations before magistrates or the Central Board.

It will be impossible to give all the details of these events, they are too revolting in all their deliberate cruelty, but some facts must be stated, in order that we may not be accused of exaggeration. In March an inquiry was held in Lincoln as to the alleged manslaughter of an imbecile inmate of the workhouse by an attendant, the man being seventy-five years old, and suffering from *senile dementia*, as well as acute bronchitis. The following evidence was given by the master at the inquest:—‘There were no paid attendants in the imbecile wards, but two pauper attendants, and one to make the beds. There was a nurse who only looked after the imbeciles if they were ill. The medical officer stated that he had only inmate help for the imbeciles; there were only two nurses for over sixty patients, and there were twenty-eight imbeciles; he considered that it was impossible for two nurses to discharge the duties properly.’ The man who died had been beaten with a strap, and a verdict of manslaughter against one attendant was returned, the coroner adding, in summing up, that ‘it was a sad state of affairs, and very lamentable, that there should be no supervision, that is, no paid nurses to look after the imbeciles.’

From Falmouth we have a report of the terrible death of a man subject to epileptic fits: he was left seated before a fire, on which he fell, and when he was found, the flesh was burnt to a cinder. At the inquest it transpired that although there were several epileptic patients in the house, there was no one specially appointed to look after them, and that the grates were all open and without fire-guards. From Ireland we have two sad tales: at Limerick an old blind woman was found dead in bed with her hands tied. It was stated that the *paid pauper nurses*, to save themselves trouble with the sick woman, tied her to the bed with a sheet, the patient released herself and fell out of bed, and then the nurses tied her hands, the woman being soon afterwards found dead. The doctor was of opinion that death was hastened by this treatment; and the guardians gave instructions for the body to be exhumed for the purpose of holding an inquest, at which the cruelty was proved, one of the culprits being committed for trial. The magistrate commented on ‘the wholly insufficient nursing arrangements in the hospital.’ Our tale of horrors is not, however, yet complete. There was recently an inquiry held at Dungarvan Workhouse into the death of a patient, when a male and female nurse were committed for trial. The man had been in the workhouse many years, and in hospital three months, from paralysis and softening of the brain. Being called in the night to assist this poor helpless creature, the nurse revenged himself by assaulting him, inflicting severe injuries, and death was accelerated, though not caused by them. The doctor stated he had frequently reported on the want of hospital accommodation, and the

advisability of appointing a paid night nurse, but no order was made on his report.

When we consider the startling fact that of all deaths occurring in London, one in fifteen takes place in a workhouse, and one in nine in a workhouse or hospital, we are able to form some idea of the awful amount of misery and suffering that is going on in our midst, when revelations such as these are occasionally brought before us. So much is heard now of the improvements carried out during the last few years, that we had begun to hope such tales were only of the past. In looking back upon scenes and events of thirty years ago, we have often wished that photography had then lent its valuable aid in perpetuating the aspect of some of the pauper helps who were then the sole attendants upon the sick. One is at least before our mind's eye, who had more than once been within prison walls, and had emerged from thence to take charge by day and night—for she slept, lived, and ate in the ward—of numerous sick and dying patients; coarse, bloated, repulsive in look and manner, clothed in the pauper dress, drinking whenever the opportunity occurred, such was the sister of mercy in a large London workhouse, in which the sole paid woman was the matron! Often have we wished we could place the portrait of such a one beside that of our modern infirmary nurses, in order to point the moral of our tale. But the days of such tyrants are not yet over, and it is well that we should be reminded of this fact, and aroused from a pleasant dream to the terrible reality.

Closely connected with this subject is the urgent need (which was named, we may remark, thirty years ago) of a higher class of workhouse officials, especially as masters and matrons, the sick being still, in country unions, entirely under their control. Here again, definite reports are before us, of drunkenness, speculation, and other evil practices, which are far more common than the outside public believe. Surely the post of caring for hundreds of our fellow-creatures, consisting of many various classes, is one worthy of the intelligence and love and zeal of the many educated men and women who are now seeking remunerative work, and who would find in the administration of these large institutions (including district schools) an occupation worthy of their best energies.

And perhaps as important a reform as any is now being called for from many of high standing in the medical profession, viz. the admission of students into Poor Law infirmaries. There is more than one reason for this demand, the chief being that these institutions afford opportunities for studying a variety of chronic diseases which hospitals do not give, because such long-standing cases of months or years are not, and cannot be, retained there; many cases of rare interest are to be found in these wards, which can at present be studied only by the one medical superintendent and his assistant; another reason is that as 600, or even a larger number of patients, are often under the care of two such medical officers, it would be obviously a

help to them and a gain to the poor sufferers if such persons were admitted into the wards. An application has already been made from one large parish for permission thus to introduce a limited number of students under the eye of the medical superintendent, but the reply of the central board was (as might be expected) that such a practice was not contemplated by their rules. As infirmaries did not exist when those rules for the treatment of the sick were framed, it could hardly be supposed that the admission of students would then be provided for; but at the present time and under present circumstances, can there be any conceivable reason why such an advantageous use should not be made of our state and rate-supported institutions, or that greater difficulties would be presented than in the case of hospitals?

As no general consolidated orders have as yet been issued by the Local Government Board for the guidance of the new infirmaries, which have been increasing in number ever since 1870, it may be hoped that some of these recommendations may be shortly considered and ordered by the authorities.

We now come to a less interesting, but not less important, part of the subject of Poor Law management which loudly calls for revision and alterations, viz. that which relates to the able-bodied, or, in other words, the class of men and women which makes use of the workhouse as a convenient hotel, to which they are at liberty to come and go at their own convenience and for their own pleasure. This class is known to all conversant with pauper life as 'Ins and Outs,' and so trying are their habits to all officials that there is an almost unanimous consent that some alteration of the law with regard to them has become absolutely necessary. Guardians of different parishes, as well as masters and relieving officers, have represented the present state of things to be well-nigh intolerable, both men and women being able to take their discharge with twenty-four hours' notice, and to claim re-admission whenever it suits them, whether sober or drunk. The occasions for which such persons desire a temporary absence from the workhouse are various; business or pleasure may be the object; of the latter, may be named the day of the annual boat-race, which always causes a large exodus, with a return at night, as may be supposed, not in the most satisfactory condition; from one able-bodied workhouse in London there is a departure on Saturdays in order to partake of a 'free breakfast,' with its accompanying religious devotions, on Sunday morning, in a distant part of London. From another, an old woman, although past eighty, goes out to stand at a crossing on Sunday mornings, to pick up pence from a generous and confiding public, to spend at the neighbouring public-house, before her return to her 'home.' In the country, girls go out on Fair days, dressed in their finery, as well as on other occasions, often, as is known, for immoral purposes. Women from the lying-in wards take their discharge, often at the end of a

fortnight, in order to baffle the inquiries that may be made as to any redress from the partners of their sin, such proceedings requiring a far longer time to carry them out. These and many other abuses, far too numerous to be detailed here, have brought about a conviction that greater powers of detention should be demanded, extending at the least to a week's notice of discharge. One pauper was discharged and re-admitted twenty-three times in ten weeks, and an experienced relieving officer urges that there should be power to detain such persons, even for a month, he having noted in his district 1,482 paupers who went out and returned the same day in the course of three months.⁴ The Master of St. Marylebone Workhouse says, as the conviction of many years: 'The frequency with which a large number of able-bodied men still continue to leave the house for their weekly holiday shows, as I have pointed out on former occasions, the necessity for increased powers of detention for dealing with this class; 157 returned drunk and disorderly, in most cases on the evening of the day on which they left the house.'

Not less urgent, in the estimation of all who have to do with pauper children, is the need of increased power over them when their life in school is ended, and when, at present, the worst of parents have the right to claim them and employ them for their own purposes. The State, which has educated them, should surely, as in other countries, have control over them, at least till the age of eighteen.

Can the 'workhouse test' be considered of such great value in the face of facts like these? and is not the abuse of legal relief very great and real, when such facilities of admission and discharge exist as to render the workhouse a free and convenient abode to all the idle and depraved of every age who choose to resort to it, and who claim the right to do so? Persons with pensions amounting to 26s. a week are inmates because they choose to spend them on drink and vice out of doors, and then return as paupers to this refuge for the destitute, the authorities claiming the cost of their maintenance from the remainder. We cannot refrain from asking, is there any other country where similar practices are carried on, and are we not thus creating many of the evils we are seeking to remedy?

We earnestly hope that the attention of all guardians of the poor may be directed to these results of the system which we have endeavoured to point out, and that thus pressure may be put upon the central authority of the Local Government Board, to introduce reforms which are so earnestly desired by those who have to carry out the existing law, and are able to judge of its results.

LOUISA TWINING.

⁴ This officer adds the remark, that the permission to smoke is a great encouragement to this class, and should be refused.

THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE ON COMTE.

ONLY the high office and good name of the Bishop of Carlisle could justify serious notice of his article in this Review, entitled 'Comte's famous Fallacy.' His piece is based on a misconception—a typical example, indeed, of *ignorantia elenchi*—nay, a misconception which has often before been made by theologians, and which has been over and over again exposed. Yet such is the persistence of the 'theological stage,' even in the nineteenth century, that here the old primitive 'fiction' about the meaning of Comte's 'law of the three states' crops up again after twenty or thirty years, apparently under the impression that it is a new discovery. To any serious student of philosophy it might be enough to cite half-a-dozen passages from Comte, Mill, Lewes, and others, to show that the 'law of the three states' has no such meaning as the Bishop puts into it. But when a writer, who has won in other fields a deserved reputation, gravely puts forth a challenge to his philosophical opponents, although rather by way of sermon and for edification than by way of strict logic, perhaps it is respectful to do more than cite a few passages from the author whom he attacks.

Two main misconceptions pervade the whole of the Bishop's criticism on Comte's law.

I. First; he understands the 'theological' state to mean, a belief in a Creator; the 'metaphysical' state to mean, general philosophy; and the 'positive' state to mean, the denial of Creation, or atheism. Now, that never was, and never was understood to be, Comte's meaning.

II. Secondly, the Bishop assumes Comte to have said, that men, or a generation of men, are necessarily at any given time, in one or other of the three states exclusively, passing *per saltum*, and as a whole, from one to the other; and that one mind cannot combine any two states. Now, Comte expressly said that men do exhibit traces of all three states at the same time, in different departments of thought.

This last remark of his obviously proves that Comte could not have meant by the 'theological state,' believing in God, and by the 'positive state,' the denial of God; because no man can believe and deny the same thing at the same time. Again, had Comte said

that every man 'up to his age' can remember that he believed in God in his childhood, and that he denied his existence in manhood, he would have said something so transparently false, that it would hardly be needful for a bishop forty years afterwards to write an essay to expose so very 'famous a fallacy.' Had Comte's law of the three states implied what the Bishop takes it to mean, it never would have received the importance attached to it by friends and opponents of Positivism alike; it never would have been a 'famous fallacy' at all; it would have been the 'obvious fallacy,' and would have called forth no admiration from eminent thinkers. It must be remembered that the value of 'the law of the three states' has been acknowledged by men who have been as far as possible from being 'Positivists' in any special sense of the term, and who have been foremost in repudiating Comte's social and religious scheme. Mr. Mill, who wrote a book to that effect, expressed his profound admiration for this particular law of philosophy. So did Mr. G. H. Lewes in his *History of Philosophy*. Miss Martineau, Professor Caird, Mr. John Morley, who have written upon the system of Comte, have given us no criticism upon the principle involved in this 'law of the three states.' It is, to say the least, unlikely that writers like these would have missed so obvious a criticism as that now put forth by the Bishop, had they understood Comte as he does.

Forty years ago, Mr. Mill gave an admirably lucid account of the 'law of the three states,' and at the same time expressed his agreement with it, in words that are remarkable as coming from so cautious and measured a mind. He says:—

Speculation, he [Comte] conceives to have, on every subject of human inquiry, three successive stages; in the first of which it tends to explain the phenomena by supernatural agencies, in the second by metaphysical abstractions, and in the third or final state confines itself to ascertaining their laws of succession and similitude. *This generalisation appears to me to have that high degree of scientific evidence, which is derived from the concurrence of the indications of history with the probabilities derived from the constitution of the human mind.* Nor could it be easily conceived, from the mere enunciation of such a proposition, what a flood of light it lets in upon the whole course of history. (*Logic*, vol. ii. chap. x.)

I. By the term 'theological state,' Comte does not mean the ultimate belief in God. He means, as Mr. Mill says in the words quoted, a state in which the mind 'tends to explain (given) phenomena by supernatural agencies.' Comte first put forth his law in an essay published so early as 1822, where he states the theological stage to be one where, 'the facts observed are explained, that is to say, conceived *à priori*, by means of invented facts.' (Pos. Pol. iv. App. iii.) In his *General View of Positivism*, he calls the theological stage that 'in which free play is given to *spontaneous fictions admitting of no proof*.' In the *Positive Polity*, he usually calls it the *Fictitious* stage. The theological state of mind is one where

the phenomena we observe are supposed to be directly caused by vital agencies which we imagine, but of the activity of which we have no real proof. This state is certainly not identical with a belief in God; it includes all forms of Fetichism, of Nature-worship, Ghost-worship, or Devil-worship: and all the habits of mind out of which these forms of worship spring. The nonsense known as Spiritualism, Spirit-rapping, Raising the Dead, and the like, is a typical form of the theological state, in which men give 'free play to fictions admitting of no proof.' And men, otherwise eminent in science and letters, have been known so to play, even when they have ceased to believe in God.

Not only is Comte's 'theological stage' something widely different from ultimate belief in a Creator, but few educated men, however deeply they hold such belief, are now in what Comte calls the 'theological stage.' To all minds 'up to the level of their age,' even if theologians by profession, the phenomena of nature and of society are associated with regular antecedents, capable of being explained by known laws, physical, social, or moral. That is in fact the 'positive,' or scientific state of thought. If a man has a fit, or if smallpox breaks out, or two nations go to war, intelligent Christians do not cry aloud that it is a special judgment, or the wrath of God, or the malice of Devil. They trace the disease or the war to its scientific causes, or rather to its positive conditions. Men in the true theological stage attribute ordinary phenomena to the direct and special interposition of a supernatural being of some kind. This was done by devotees in the Middle Ages; is still done by Fetichists everywhere; and by the negroes the other day during the earthquake at Charlestown. But cultivated Englishmen do not so reason. In fact, very few thoughtful men in our age can be said to be, properly speaking, in the theological stage at all. They reason about life and man on the basis of both being amenable to observed laws, and not on the basis that both are directly subject to the caprice of supernatural wills.

The habitual reference of facts to observed conditions of nature, physical or human, does not prevent strong minds from believing in Creation and a Personal Creator. That is a very different thing. They refer all observed facts to observed antecedents; and behind this enormous mass of observations, they assume an ultimate source, as First Cause. Mr. Mill indeed insists that it is quite compatible with the Positive state in Comte's sense, to believe that the Universe is guided by an Intelligence. Comte himself warmly repudiates the atheistical hypothesis of the origin of the Universe from Chance. He calls Atheism a form of Theology: meaning that Dogmatic Atheism, as a theory of the Universe, is 'a spontaneous fiction admitting of no proof.' He thought that a mind perfectly attuned to scientific habits in all forms of observed facts, would cease to busy itself with any

theory of Origins, and would be entirely absorbed in theories of growth. But he would not have regarded as being in the theological stage, any mind which, taking a scientific view of all observed phenomena, clung to the ultimate solution of their origin in Creation.

II. By the 'positive' stage, Comte certainly does not mean Atheism, the denial of a possible Creator. In the first place, he repudiates that hypothesis, as itself a form of Theological figment. And secondly, he says that the Positive stage is that 'which is based on an exact view of the real facts of the case.' That is what he means: neither more nor less. And the Bishop is quite mistaken in constantly assuming that Positive is either Positivist or Atheist. Comte neither said, nor imagined, that any man who 'takes an exact view of the real facts' in each case is a Positivist or a believer in the Religion of Humanity. Dr. Martineau in the passage cited with approval by the Bishop, does indeed make Comte say that every cultivated man is a *Positivist* in his maturity. That, however, is only a bit of careless rhetoric. Comte says nothing of the kind. Comte says that a cultivated man becomes '*a natural philosopher*' in his maturity—meaning a man whose habit of mind is to accept scientific evidence in each subject.

III. It is no objection at all to the 'law of the three states,' to argue, as the Bishop does, that many men of science are not atheists, but believers in God. Even if the 'theological stage' and the 'positive stage' had this meaning (and they have not) Comte has carefully guarded himself by saying that many persons exhibit all three stages at the same time, *on different subject matters*. His law is not that 'each human *mind* passes through three stages': but that 'each *class of human speculations* does.' If that were Comte's meaning, the whole of the Bishop's criticism falls to the ground. And it is easy to show that this was Comte's meaning.

Had the Bishop pursued his study of Comte a little beyond the opening pages of a translation of one of his works, he would have found this. In the second volume of the *Positive Philosophy* (1st ed. p. 173), we read:—

During the whole of our survey of the sciences, I have endeavoured to keep in view the great fact that all the three states, theological, metaphysical, and positive, may and do exist at the same time in the same mind in regard to different sciences. I must once more recall this consideration, and insist on it; because, in the forgetfulness of it, lies the only real objection that can be brought against the grand law of the three states. It must be steadily kept in view that the same mind may be in the positive state with regard to the most simple and general sciences; in the metaphysical with regard to the more complex and special; and in the theological with regard to social science, which is so complex and special as to have hitherto taken no scientific form at all.

Again in the *Positive Polity*, iii. p. 34.

Although each class of speculations really passes through these three successive stages, the rate of progress is not the same for all. Hence while some speculations

have already become Positive, others still remain Metaphysical or even Theological; and so it will be till our race has entirely accomplished its initiation. This temporary co-existence of the three intellectual states furnishes backward thinkers with their only plausible excuse for denying my law of filiation. Nothing will completely clear away this difficulty but the complementary rule, which lays down that the unequal rate of progress is caused by the different nature of the phenomena in each class.

In the Positivist Catechism, he says, (Engl. tr. p. 174):—

Certain theories remain in the metaphysical stage; whilst others of a simpler nature have already reached the positive stage; others again, still more complicated remain in the theological stage.

It is thus abundantly clear that Comte intended his law of the three states to be applied not to the mind as a whole, nor to ages as a whole, but to different classes of speculation, and to the prevalent tendencies in different ages. And so he has been always understood by his exponents. Mr. Mill in his book, *Auguste Comte and Positivism*, to meet an objection such as the Bishop now urges, writes thus:—‘that the three states were contemporaneous, that they all began before authentic history, and still co-exist, is M. Comte’s express statement’ (p. 31).

And so, Mr. G. H. Lewes, in his more lively manner, replying to similar objections, tells us in his *History of Philosophy* (vol. ii. p. 715):—

To these causes of opposition must also be added the licence men permit themselves of pronouncing confidently on questions which they have not taken the preliminary trouble of understanding. Two-thirds of the objections urged against this law of the three stages are based on a radical misapprehension of it, and there is something quite comic in the gravity with which these misconceptions are advanced.

The law does not assert that at distinct historical periods men were successively in each of the three stages, that there was a time when a nation or even a tribe was exclusively theological, exclusively metaphysical, or exclusively positive; it asserts that the chief conceptions man frames respecting the world, himself, and society, must pass through three stages, with varying velocity under various social conditions, but in unvarying order. Any one individual mind, inheriting the results of preceding generations, may indeed commence its thinking on some special topic, without being forced to pass through the stages which its predecessors have passed through; but every class of conceptions must pass through the stages, and every individual mind must, more or less rapidly, in the course of its evolution from infancy to maturity, pass through them.

Another eminent theologian, once Regius Professor of History in the University of Oxford, fell into the same error as the Bishop, as long ago as 1861, and he was corrected at the time. In those days Professor Goldwin Smith used to rage about Comte as furiously as he now rages about Mr. Gladstone, and, as a polemist is apt to do, he walked into this open pit. This is how the blunder was corrected in the *Westminster Review* N. S. xl. Mr. Smith replied to the *Review* with some warmth; but he did not establish his view as to the law of the three states.

The *Review* said:—

Comte invariably insists that the three stages have actually co-existed in nearly all minds. He says that a man takes a theological view of one subject, a metaphysical of another, and a positive of a third; nor did he ever pretend that one of these methods rigidly excludes the other. Most minds retain traces of all three, even in the same subject-matter. What an objector has really to show is this, that men use other methods of thought, or that they do not in the main use these successively in the order stated, and that in proportion to the complication of the subject-matter.

In considering a law of the human mind, such as this is, we should bear in mind the golden rule of Aristotle 'to demand that degree of precision that fits the matter in hand.' A law of our mental evolution, dealing with a subject so subtle and complex as the reasoning processes, does not admit of absolutely rigid mathematical exactness. Mathematical reasoning alone, partly because pure mathematics spring from laws of the mind itself, and are not inductions from imperfect observations, admits of absolute precision. In no physical science, perhaps, is the reasoner at all times strictly employing scientific methods without alloy. Few men of science, however competent, are incapable of error in their reasoning; and we know how liable they are to slide into dogmatism a good deal short of positive proof. But for all that, a trained physicist, or chemist, is properly said to be in the positive stage of thought, *when reasoning about physics, or chemistry*. A few minds trained in a variety of sciences, may remain at a uniformly positive level. If their scientific training embraces history, morals, philosophy, and the entire range of the social, moral, and intellectual laws, then they may be said to have completely attained to the positive stage of thought. Now the Creation of the Universe and the Moral Providence of all Creation, is an ultimate resultant of a man's reflections in the whole range of speculation—physical, social, intellectual, and moral. And to that great assize of human thought, few men in England come with a full positive training in the entire range. Hence the opinions about Creation of men like Herschel, or Faraday, are not the opinions of men in the positive stage of thought, but of men in the positive stage of astronomy and chemistry, and in the metaphysical or the theological stage in sociology and in morals. When Faraday was dealing with gases, he was rigidly working out physical and chemical problems on the basis of physical and chemical laws. If he discovered a new electrical phenomenon, he did not, as a savage or an alchemist might, attribute the flash to some latent god, or an explosion to some bottled-up devil. When Faraday was dealing with the special inspiration of the Holy Spirit, he deliberately put aside all reference to law, or to science; possibly when he was dealing with some big political problem, he grounded his opinion entirely on strong prejudices formed in youth, but certainly not tested as he tested his chemical compounds. The 'law of the three states' is, like all

other logical laws, a law of tendency in a subtle and complex organ; and absolute exactness and rigid exclusiveness is out of place with our imperfect mental resources.

When Comte said that one state of mind excludes the other, he did not imply that a reasoner never makes a slip, or that a mind in the positive stage may not at times 'revert' back into a less scientific process. He meant that, in the main, a mind accustomed to true scientific processes in any class of speculation will adhere to that habit of mind, though it may occasionally lapse in its own subject, and may fail to apply the same scientific process in another class of speculation. The Bishop of Carlisle undoubtedly applies a truly positive process to the science of physics. Though perhaps he would hardly claim to be infallible there, even in method. But in dealing with a philosophy at once 'pernicious and dangerous' he collates the original authorities with far less patient scrutiny, than when he is tracing the growth of the Baconian induction.

Finally, the Bishop seems to me to err, in seeking to test the 'law of the three stages' by applying it to exact and real science. He declares that there are no three stages in Mathematics, in the science of Political Economy, and many such branches of our knowledge. Certainly, there are no three stages in any kind of *real knowledge*. Nor, strictly speaking, are there in *any science*—much less in *exact science*. All *real knowledge*, all *science*, truly so named, and certainly an exact science, like pure Mathematics, is already *positive*. Comte never said that there were three stages in *science*. He says, there are, 'three stages in each *branch of speculation*.' In many subjects, which are perfectly simple, a really positive state of thought is reached in the very infancy of the individual and the race. No doubt, there is a brief moment in the evolution of thought, when fictitious beings, or crude abstractions are supposed to determine the very simplest and commonest facts. When scarcity of food was thought to be a Divine warning to a King who defied the Pope, or when a strike was supposed to result from some physical law of Supply and Demand beyond human control, Political Economy was in the theological, or the metaphysical stage. That merchants, manufacturers, or workmen believe in Creation, or believe in Adam Smith, or in Mr. Ruskin, has nothing to do with Comte's law.

As to Mathematics something further may be said. Pure Mathematics, according to Comte, are really a branch of Logic, part of the furniture, an analysis of the processes, of the mind itself. There are of course not three stages in the 'law of the three states' itself, or in any other true logical process. Mathematics are wholly positive, i.e. proveable, and based on 'an exact view of the true facts.' Everything that we can call Mathematics, from the first idea of addition, is entirely *positive*. All our definite notions about number, form, and movement are strictly positive. But there was a time before the

birth of Mathematics; and then men's ideas about number, form, and movement were in a metaphysical (that is, hypothetical) stage, or even in a theological stage (that is, they are referred to supposed wills). Infants and savages, as the history of language suggests, associate changes in number and form with imaginary vital agents. A child, learning that two and two make four, thinks of a person purposely giving two more things. The counting and measuring of savages is formed out of organic movements. In Mathematics, even in Arithmetic, there is properly none but a positive stage. The proper sphere of the 'law of the three stages' is in the observation of phenomena; and to that Comte carefully limits it. Directly any mind attains to *real knowledge* in such observations, there are no further stages to pass. The mind remains in the one stage, the positive, or final.

I shall not follow the Bishop into the analogies to Comte's law, with which his reading furnishes him, or his own substitute for it. I fail to see what the analogies or the substitute have to do with the matter. The 'law of the three states' professes to be a theory of *mental evolution*, an account of a set of *successive processes* of thought. The Bishop's analogies and his substitute profess to be a *classification of ideas, a grouping of knowledge*. What have these in common? The first is a serial record of *movement*; the second is a coordination of *simultaneous* conceptions. One might as well find analogies between history and logic; or suggest that Kepler's laws are a history of astronomy. It is quite true that all men's knowledge can be looked at from different points of view, and may possibly be arranged under three groups. But how does that help us to explain the genesis of thought in the past? So, I fail to see how the citations from Bacon, the *Philosophick Cabbala*, or Mr. Gladstone, advance the matter in hand. The matter in hand is the law of progress in the genesis of science. No one of the three passages cited touches on that subject. And is it likely that Bacon, Henry More, or anyone else who wrote before any true science existed and before any social or moral science was imagined, could tell us much about the law of progress in the genesis of science? So I leave Bacon, the *Philosophick Cabbala*, and Mr. Gladstone, who seems to have written something profound on the latter topic.

With the Bishop's proposed substitute for Comte's law I have no wish to quarrel. He says that, instead of a law of the three successive stages, we may have a law of three simultaneous modes of thought. Certainly we may. And the Bishop proposes as his law this:—that 'many branches of knowledge may be contemplated from three points of view—the Theological, the Metaphysical (or Philosophical), and the Scientific.' With a slight modification of the terms, to which the Bishop ought not to demur, I should most heartily assent to this. Our general knowledge is Religious, Philosophical, or Scientific.

Religion, Philosophy, Science, is a threefold coordination of ideas, very much used by Comte: the distinctions between which three, and the harmonies of which he is constantly expounding. Positivism, as a system of thought, does not mean Science only. It means Religion—Philosophy—Science: each in their sphere completing and aiding the other. So far Comte is entirely at one with the Bishop. But this eminently Positivist idea is no sort of substitute for the ‘Law of the three stages.’

As to that the Bishop must try again; and I cordially invite him to do so. But he must begin by understanding the law which he is to overthrow. The matter in hand has nothing to do with the belief in Providence, in the sense of a ‘Great First Cause, least understood,’ as modern men of science conceive Providence. The law is this:—that in the infancy of thought, the mind attributes changes in phenomena to a will of some kind, which it supposes to be acting, but of which it has no real proof; secondly, that the mind gradually passes to attribute the changes to some abstract principle, which it formulates without true verification; finally, that the mind comes to take an exact view of the true facts of the case. These three modes of thought pass gradually into each other, are applied to different matters in different degrees, and in the early stages are sometimes only traceable in transient pre-historic types. Now what an objector has to do is to show—that the sciences have been built up by some other definitely marked stages, or have passed through these stages in a reverse order, or do not pass through stages at all.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

THE BUILDING UP OF A UNIVERSITY.

SOME years ago I found myself in a Northern capital, and committed myself to the guidance of a native coachman, whose business and pride it was to drive me from place to place, and indicate to me the important buildings of his majestic city. He was a patriotic showman, and I am bound to say he showed us a great deal; but the most memorable moment of that instructive day was when he stopped before, what seemed to us, a respectable mansion in a respectable street, and announced to us that 'yon' was 'the Free Kirk Univairisity.' It was the first time in my life that I had heard four stone walls with a roof over them called a University. It was not long, however, before I discovered that I myself had been living with my head in a sack and, in more senses than one, had been of those

who sweep the crossings, wet or dry,
And all the world go by them;

only so could it have come to pass that this new meaning for an old word had struck me as strange, not to say ludicrous.

Licuit semperque licebit
Signatum præsentē nota producere nomen.

Allowable? Yes! and much more than merely allowable; it is inevitable that as the ages roll we should attach new meanings to old words. And if this is inevitable, not the less inevitable is it that, when we desire to trace the history of the thing signified, we should be compelled to recur to the original meaning of the name by which the thing is designated.

A word at starting upon the remarkable book¹ which has suggested the following article. To say of it that it is quite the most sumptuous work that has ever proceeded from the Cambridge Press, is to say little. It is hardly too much to say that it is one of the most important contributions to the social and intellectual history of England which has ever been made by a Cambridge man. The title of the work conveys but a very inadequate notion of its wide scope, of the encyclopædic learning and originality of treatment which it displays,

¹ *The Architectural History of the University of Cambridge, and of the Colleges of Cambridge and Eton.* By the late Robert Willis, M.A., F.R.S. Edited, with large additions, and brought up to the present time, by John Willis Clark, M.A., late Fellow of Trin. Coll. Camb. 4 vols super-royal 8vo. Cambridge: The University Press.

and, least of all, of the abundance of *human interest* which characterises it so markedly. It is because of this wealth of human interest that the book must needs exercise a powerful fascination upon those who have a craving to get some insight into the life of their forefathers; and it is because I believe the number of such students of history is in our times rapidly on the increase, that I am anxious to draw attention to some few of the many matters treated of so ably in these magnificent volumes.

The term *University*, in its original acceptation, was used to designate any aggregate of *persons* associated in a political, religious, or trading corporation, having common interests, common privileges, and common property. The inhabitants of a town, the members of a fraternity, the brethren of a guild, the monks or canons of a religious house, when addressed in formal instruments, were addressed as a *University*. Nay! when the whole body of the faithful is appealed to as Christian men, the ordinary phrase made use of by lay or ecclesiastical potentate, when signifying his wishes or intentions, is 'Noverit *Universitas* vestra.' A University in this sense, regarded as an aggregate of persons, might be localised or it might not; its members might be scattered over the whole Christian world, or they might constitute an inner circle of some larger community, of which they—though a *Universitas*—formed but a part. A University in its original signification meant no more than our modern term an Association. When men associated together for purposes of trade, they were a trading *Universitas*; when they associated for religious objects, they were a religious *Universitas*; when they associated for the promotion of learning, they were a learned *Universitas*. But the men came first, the bricks and mortar followed long after. The architectural history, in its merely technical and professional details, could only start at a point where the University, as an association of scholars and students, had already acquired power and influence, had been at work for long, and had got to make itself felt as a living force in the body politic and in the national life. It was because the antiquaries of a former age lost sight of this truth that they indulged in the extravagances they did. Starting from the assumption that stone walls make an institution, they professed to tell when the Universities came into existence and who were their earliest founders. The authors of this modern *Magnum Opus* have set themselves to deal with a far more instructive problem. Their object has been to trace the growth of the University of today in its concrete form, down from the early times when it existed only in the germ; and to show us how 'the glorious fellowship of living men,' which constituted the *personal* University of the eleventh or the twelfth century, developed by

slow degrees into the brick-and-mortar Universities of the nineteenth—such Universities as are springing up all over the world; their teachers advertised for in the *Times*, and their students tempted to come and be taught in them by the bait of money rewards.

As to the exact time when a band of scholars and teachers first made their home in Cambridge or Oxford, and began to attract to themselves from the four winds classes of eager youths hungry for intellectual food and anxious to listen and learn, that we must be content to leave undetermined. They who like the flavour of the old antiquarianism may enjoy it in its spiciest form, if they choose to hunt up among certain forgotten volumes now grown scarce. They may read what John Caius (pronounced Keys) wrote as the champion of Cambridge, and Thomas Caius wrote as champion of Oxford; they may rejoice their hearts over the Battle of the Keys, and come to what conclusion they prefer to arrive at. For most of us, however, this sort of old-world lore has lost its charm. A man lives through his taste for some questions. The student of history nowadays is inclined to say with St. Paul, 'So fight I not as one that beateth the air,' and to reject with some impatience the frivolous questions which help not a jot towards bringing us into closer relation with the life and personality of our ancestors.

'I am half sick o' shadows,' said
The Lady of Shalott;

and we, too, have grown weary of weaving our webs with our backs to the light. There is no making any way in Cloudland. We ask for firm ground on which to plant our footsteps, if we would move onwards.

It would have been very galling to the Oxford antiquaries of Queen Elizabeth's days to have to acknowledge that there was a Cambridge before there was any Oxford. Nevertheless the fact is so. Hide your diminished heads, ye rash ones who would fain have us believe that a thousand years before our era, King Mempric, the wicked king whom the wolves ate—as was right and fitting they should—bult a noble city, which as time went on 'was called *Oxonía*, or by the Saxons *Oxenfordia*.' Alack! it turns out that we must make an enormous step along the course of time before we can find trace of any such city or anything like it. It turns out that 'the year 912 saw Oxford made a fortified town, with a definite duty to perform and a definite district assigned to it.' What! Seven years after the great Alfred had closed his eyes in death, and left to others the work which he had showed them how to do? Yes! Even so. It may be very hard to have to confess the odious crime of youth;

but it seems almost capable of demonstration that Cambridge, as a fortress and a town, existed a thousand years before Oxford was anything but a desolate swamp, or at most a trumpery village, where a handful of Britons speared eels, hunted for deer, and laboriously manufactured earthenware pots. What have we to do with thee, thou daughter of yesterday? Stand aside while thine elder sister—ay, old enough to be thy mother—takes her place of honour. She has waited long for her historian; he has come at last, and he was worth waiting for.

In times before the Roman legionaries planted their firm feet in Britain, there was a very formidable fortress at Cambridge. It contained about sixty acres; it was surmounted by one of those mighty earthworks which the hand of man in the old days raised by sheer brute force, or rather by enormous triumph of organised labour. The Romans drove out the Britons, and settled a garrison in the place. Two of the great Roman roads intersected at this point, and the conquerors called it by a new name, as was their wont, retaining some portion of the old one. In their language it was known as *Camboritum*. This primeval fortress stood on the left bank of the river, which some called the Granta and some called the Cam; and for reasons best known to themselves, the Romans did not think fit to span that river by a bridge, but they made their great *Via Devana* pass sheer through the river—as some Dutch or German Irrationalist has pretended that the children of Israel did when they found the Jordan barring their progress—that is, those Roman creatures constructed a solid pavement in the bed of the sluggish stream, over which less audacious engineers would have thrown an arch. Through the water they carried a kind of causeway, and the name of the place for centuries indicated that it was situated on the *ford* of the Cam. But what the Roman did not choose to do, that the people that came after him found it needful to do. In the Saxon Chronicle we find that the old fortress which the Romans had held and strengthened, and then perforce abandoned, had got to be called *Grantabrygge*; and this name, or something very like it, it retained when the great survey was made as the Norman Conqueror's reign was drawing to its close. By this time the town had moved across to the right bank of the river, and had become a town surrounded by a ditch and defended by walls and gates. Already it contained at least four hundred houses, and on the site of the old mound the Norman raised a new castle, and in doing that he laid some twenty-nine houses low.

The early history of Oxford is more or less connected with that of the obscure and insignificant monastery of St. Frideswide, though even at Oxford it is observable that the town and the University grew up in almost entire independence of any influence exercised by any of the older religious houses. At Cambridge this was much

more the case. There were no *monks* at Cambridge at any time; there never were any nearer than at the Abbey of Ely, in the old days 'a long day's journey off, and accessible in the winter, if accessible at all, only by water. King Knut, we are told, greatly favoured the Abbey of Ely, visited it, was entertained there, in fact restored it. But at Cambridge there were no monks. No *real monks*; a fact which ought to be a significant hint to 'all educated men,' but which, unhappily, is likely to be significant only to the few who have taken the trouble to learn what a real monk professed to be. If there were no monks at Cambridge, there was something else. Outside the walls of the town there rose up, in the twelfth century, the priory of Barnwell—a priory of Augustinian *canons*; and, moreover, a nunnery—the Benedictine nunnery of St. Rhadegunda. Within the walls there was another house of Augustinians, which was known as St. John's Hospital; that is, a house where the canons made it part of their duty to provide a spurious kind of *hospitality* to travellers, much in the same way that the Hospice of St. Bernard offers food and shelter now to the wayfarer, and with such food and shelter something more—to wit, the opportunity of worshipping the Most High in peace, up there among the eternal snows. At St. John's Hospital, as at St. Bernard's, the grateful wanderer who had found a refuge would leave behind him his thankoffering in recognition for the kindly treatment he had met with, and it might happen that these free gifts constituted no small portion of the income on which the canons—for the most part a humble and unpretentious set of men—kept up their houses.

With the dawn of the thirteenth century came the great revivalists—the friars. Wherever the friars established themselves they began not only to preach, but to teach. They were the awakeners of a new intellectual life; not only the stimulators of an emotional pietism always prone to run into religious intoxication and extravagance. With the coming of the friars what may be called the modern history of Cambridge begins. Not that it can be allowed that there were no schools of repute on the banks of the Cam till the coming of the friars. It is certain that learning had her home at Cambridge long before this time.

As early as 1187 Giraldus Cambrensis came to Oxford and read his *Expugnatio Hibernicæ* in public lectures, and entertained the doctors of the diverse faculties and the most distinguished scholars.² Oxford was doubtless at that time more renowned, but Cambridge followed not far behind. If the friars settled at Cambridge early in their career, it was because there was a suitable home for them there—an opening as we say—which the flourishing condition of the University afforded. There were scholars to teach, there were masters to dispute with, there were doctors to criticise, oppose,

² Stubbs's *Lectures on Medieval and Modern History*, p. 141, 8vo, 1886.

or befriend. Doubtless, too, there were already strained relations between the townsmen and the gownsmen at Cambridge as at Oxford. The first great 'town and gown row' which we hear of took place at Oxford in 1209, but when we do hear of it we find the other University mentioned by the historian in close connection with the event recorded. The townsmen under great provocation had seized three of the gownsmen *in hospitio suo* and threw them into the gaol. King John came down to make inquiry, and promptly hung the three, guiltless though they were, as Matthew Paris assures us. Hereupon there was intense indignation, and the University dispersed. Three thousand of the gownsmen migrated elsewhere, some to Cambridge we learn. Oxford for a while was deserted. This was fifteen years before the Franciscans settled among us. It was the year in which King John was excommunicated. There were only three bishops left in England; the king had worried all the rest away. There was misery and anarchy everywhere. Yet, strange to say, in the midst of all the bitterness men *would* have their sons educated, and the Universities did not despair of the republic. Shadowy and fragmentary as all the evidence is on which we have to rely for the history of the Universities during the twelfth century, it is enough to make us certain that the friars settled at Cambridge because there they found scope for their labours. There was undoubtedly a University there long before they arrived. Nevertheless it is not till the middle of the reign of Henry the Third (A.D. 1216-1272) that we come upon any direct mention of a corporation which could be regarded as a chartered society of scholars at Cambridge, and it is difficult to resist the conviction that, whatever may have been its previous history, and however far back its infancy may date, the friars were to some extent nursing fathers of the University of Cambridge.

And this brings us again to the point from which we started a page or two back, and gives me the opportunity of quoting a passage from Professor Willhs's introduction, which will serve at once as a continuation of and comment upon what has been said, while leading us on to what still lies before us.

The University of the Middle Ages was a corporation of learned men, associated for the purposes of teaching, and possessing the privilege that no one should be allowed to teach within their dominion unless he had received their sanction, which could only be granted after trial of his ability. The test applied consisted of examinations and public disputations; the sanction assumed the form of a public ceremony, and the name of a *degree*; and the teachers or doctors so elected or created carried out their office of instruction by lecturing in the public schools to the students who, desirous of hearing them, took up their residence in the place wherein the university was located. The degree was in fact merely a license to teach; the teacher so licensed became a member of the ruling body.

We have arrived at this point—we find ourselves at the begin-

ning of the thirteenth century face to face with a *University* at Cambridge, a University which, existing originally in its inchoate condition of an association vaguely aiming at the improvement of the methods of education and the encouragement of scholars, had gradually grown into a recognised and powerful body, with direct influence and control over its members; a body, too, which had become so identified with the interests of culture and research that a change had already begun in the generally received acceptance of its name, and already the word 'university' had begun to be restricted to such a *Universitas* as was identified with the life and pursuits of learning and learned men. This means that, *pari passu* with its increase in power, the University had grown, too, in the number of its members—the teachers and the taught. The time had arrived when the demands of professors and students for adequate accommodation would become pressing. Lecturers with popular gifts would expect a hall capable of holding their audiences. Public disputations could not be held in a corner. Receptions of eminent scholars from a distance, and all those ceremonials which were so dear to gentle and simple in the middle ages, required space, and were more effective the grander the buildings in which they were displayed. Yet how little the Cantabs of the thirteenth century could have dreamt of what was coming! What a day of small things it was! Six hundred years ago the giant was in his cradle.

Meanwhile, another need than that of mere schools and lecture-halls had begun to be felt. The scholars who came for what they could get from the teachers—the regents and the doctors—flocked from various quarters; they were young, they were not all fired with the student's love of learning; they were sometimes noisy, sometimes frolicsome, sometimes vicious. As now is the case at Edinburgh and Heidelberg, so it was then at Cambridge, the bonds of discipline were very slight; the scholars had to take their chance; they lodged where they could, they lived anyhow, each according to his means; they were homeless. It was inevitable that all sorts of grave evils should arise.

The lads—they were mere boys—got into mischief, they got into debt with the Jews; for there were Jews at Cambridge, not a few; they were preyed upon by sharpers, were fleeced on the right hand and on the left; many of them learned more harm than good. The elder men, and they who had consciences and hearts, shook their heads, and asked what could be done? For a long time the principle of *laissez faire* prevailed: the young fellows were left to the tender mercies of the townfolk. There was no grandmotherly legislation in those days. Gradually a kind of joint-stock arrangement came into vogue. Worthy people seemed to have hired a house which they called a *hostel* or hall, and sub-let the rooms to the young fellows;

the arrangement appears to have been clumsily managed, and led to dissensions between town and gown; the townsmen soon discovered that the gownsmen were gainers by the new plan, and they themselves were losers. They grumbled, protested, quarrelled. But it was a move in the right direction, and a beginning of some moral discipline was made, and that could not but be well. These *hostels* were set up at Cambridge certainly at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and how long before we cannot tell; but it was at Oxford that the first *college*, as we understand the term, rose into being. It was Walter de Merton, Lord High Chancellor of England, who was the father of the collegiate system in England. So far from embarking upon a new experiment without careful deliberation, he spent twelve years of his life in working out his ideas and in elaborating the famous *Rule of Merton*, of which it is not at all too much to say that its publication constituted an era in the history of education and learning in England. Merton died in 1277. Hugh de Balsham, Bishop of Ely, who survived him nine years, appears to have been moved with a desire to do for Cambridge what Merton had done for Oxford. Balsham is spoken of as the founder of St. Peter's College, and in one sense he was so. The bishops of Ely were the patrons of Cambridge. Bishop Balsham asked himself what could be done, and set himself to deal with the problems which presented themselves for solution in the condition of his own University. He was not a great man, that seems clear enough: his schemes were crude; he bungled. The truth seems to me to be that the feeling at Cambridge was one of suspicion, and there are indications that the bishops of Ely in an awkward fashion were opposed to anything like *secular education*. We hear of money being left to support *priests* studying theology, and of an experiment for introducing scholars as residents in the Hospital of St. John. The canons were to take in the young scholars as *boarders* into their house, and look after their conduct and morals. The plan did not answer. It was an attempt to put new wine into old bottles. There came an explosion. Cambridge in the thirteenth century had not the *men* that Oxford had, so Oxford kept the lead. Perhaps there was some soreness. Did ecclesiastics shake their heads as they saw the walls of Balliol College rise, and learnt that there was just a little too much importance given to mere scholarship, and no prominence given to theology in those early statutes of 1282? Did they, without knowing why, anticipate with anxiety the awakening of a spirit of free thought and free inquiry among those scholars of the Merton Rule? Did the orthodox party resort to prophecy, which is seldom very complimentary or cheerful in its utterances?

This is certain, that while Balliol College was building there was a stir among the Benedictines, and an effort made to assert themselves and take their place among the learned. John Giffard

started his great college for the reception of student monks at Oxford. It became, and for centuries continued to be, the resort of the Benedictine order, and was supported by levies from a large number of the old monasteries. The inference is forced upon us that the English monasteries no longer stood in the front rank as seats of learning. Students and scholars would no longer go to the monks; the monks must go to the scholars. But the establishment of a seminary for the reception of young monks at Oxford tended to the strengthening of the ecclesiastical influence in that University. Cambridge lost in the same proportion that Oxford gained. Even the great Priory of Norwich sent its promising young monks to Oxford, passing by the nearer and more conveniently situated University. As early as 1288 we find entries in the Norwich Priory Rolls of payments for the support of the schools and scholars at Oxford. It was long after this that Cambridge offered any similar attraction to the 'religious.'

Be it noted that until Merton's day people had never heard of what we now understand by a *college*. It was a novelty in English institutions. Men and women had lived commonly enough in societies that were essentially religious in their character. Some of those societies, and only some, had drifted into becoming the quiet homes of learning as well as of devotion; but the main business—the *raison d'être* of monks and nuns and canons—was the practice of asceticism, the keeping up of unceasing worship in the church of the monastery—the endeavour to be holier than men of the world need be, or the endeavour to make the men of the world holier than they cared to be. The religious orders were religious or they were nothing. Each new rule for the reformation of those orders aimed at restoring the primitive idea of self-immolation at the altar—a severer ritual, harder living, longer praying. Nay! the new rules, in not a few instances, were actually aimed against learning and culture. The Merton Rule was a bringer in of new things. Merton would not call his society of scholars a *convent*, as the old monkish corporations had been designated. That sounded too much as though the mere promotion of pietism was his aim; he revived the old classical word *collegium*. There had been *collegia* at Rome before the imperial times; though some of them had been religious bodies, some were decidedly not so. They were societies which held property, pursued certain avocations, and acted in a corporate capacity for very mundane objects. Why should not there be a *collegium* of scholars? Why should students and men of learning be expected to be holier than other people? When Merton started his college at Oxford, he made it plain by his statutes that he did not intend to found a society after the old conventual type, but to start upon a new departure.

The scholars of the new college were to take no vows they were

not to be worried with everlasting ritual observances. Special chaplains, who were presumably not expected to be scholars and students, were appointed for the ministration of the ceremonial in the church. Luxury was guarded against; poverty was not enjoined. As long as a scholar was pursuing his studies *bonâ fide*, he might remain a member of the college; if he was tired of books and bookish people, he might go.

When a man strikes out a new idea, he is not allowed to keep it to himself very long. The new idea soon gets taken up; sometimes it gets improved upon; sometimes very much the reverse. For a wise man acts upon a hint, and it germinates; a fool only half-apprehends the meaning of the hint, and he displays his folly in producing a caricature. Hugh de Balsham seems to have aimed at improving upon Merton's original idea. He meant well, doubtless; but his college of Peterhouse, the first college in Cambridge, was a very poor copy of the Oxford foundation. Merton was a man of genius, a man of ideas; Balsham was a man of the cloister. Moreover, he was by no means so rich as his predecessor, and he did not live to carry out his scheme. The funds were insufficient. The first college at Cambridge was long in building. Cambridge, in fact, was very unfortunate. Somehow there was none of the dash and enthusiasm, none of the passion for progress, which characterised Oxford. Cambridge had no moral genius like Grosseteste to impress his strong personality upon the movement which the friars stirred, no commanding intellect like that of Roger Bacon to attract and dazzle and lead into quite new regions of thought the ardent and eager spirits who felt that a new era had begun; no Occam or Duns Scotus or Bradwardine; no John Wiclif to kindle a new flame—say, rather, to take up the torch which had dropped from Bradwardine's hand, and continue the race which the others had run so well. What a grand succession of men it was!

Five colleges had been founded at Oxford before a second arose at Cambridge. After that they followed in rapid succession, and the reign of Edward the Third had not come to an end when no less than seven colleges had been opened at Cambridge. Five of them have survived to our own days, and two were eventually absorbed by the larger foundation which Henry the Seventh was ambitious of raising, and which now stands forth in its grandeur, the most magnificent educational corporation in the world.

Where did all the money come from, not only to raise the original buildings in which the *University*, as a teaching body, pursued its work, but which also provided the *houses* in which the *colleges* of scholars lived and laboured?

Unhappily, we know very little of the University buildings during this early period. All the industry of Mr. Clark has not

availed to penetrate the thick obscurity; but this at least is pretty certain, namely, that the earliest University buildings at Cambridge were very humble structures clustering round about the area now covered by the University schools and library, that it was not till the middle of the fourteenth century that any attempt was made to erect a building of any pretension, and that the 'Schools Quadrangle was not completed till 130 years after the first stone was laid.' The University of Cambridge was for ages a very poor corporation; it had no funds out of which to build halls or schools or library. The ceremonies at *commencement* and on other great occasions took place in the churches, sometimes of the Augustinian, sometimes of the Franciscan friars. In these early times the gownsmen dared not contemplate the erection of a senate-house wherein to hold their meetings. When the fourteenth-century schools were planned their erection was doubtless regarded as a very bold and ambitious experiment. The money came in very slowly, the work stopped more than once, and when it proceeded it was only by public subscription that the funds were gathered. In 1466, William Wilfete, Master of Clare Hall and Chancellor of the University, actually made a journey to London to gather funds from whatever quarters he could, and he dunned his friends, and those on whom the University had any claim, so successfully that on June 25 of that year a contract for proceeding with the work was drawn up and signed, but it was nearly nine years after this before the schools were finally completed, together with a new library over them, by the special munificence of Archbishop Rotherham, who had further enriched the library with numerous volumes of great value.

The tie which bound the members of the *University* together was much weaker than that which united the members of the same *colleges*. The colleges were, in almost every case, founded by private munificence, and in most cases were commenced during the lifetime of the several founders; but when we come to look into the sources of the college revenues we find that the actual gifts of money, or indeed of lands, was less than at first sight appears. A very large proportion of the endowments of these early colleges came from the *spoliation of the parochial clergy*. Popular writers in our own time declaim against the horrible sin of buying and selling church preferment, as if it were a modern abomination. Let a man only spend half an hour in examining the *finances* or records of transfers of property in England during the fourteenth century and he will be somewhat surprised to discover what a part the buying and selling of advowsons played in the business transactions of our forefathers five centuries ago. Advowsons were always in the market, and always good investments in those days. But not only so. A pious founder could do a great deal in the way of making perpetual provision for the mention of his name by posterity at a small cost if he took care to manipulate ecclesiastical property with prudence. There was a

crafty device whereby the owner of the advowson could appropriate the tithes of a benefice to the support of any corporation which might be considered a *religious* foundation. The old monasteries had benefited to some extent from this disendowment of the secular clergy, the Augustinian canons, during the twelfth century, being the chief gainers by the pillage. When the rage for founding colleges came in, and the awful ravages of the Black Death had depopulated whole districts, the fashion of alienating the revenues of the country parsons and diverting them into the new channel grew to be quite a rage. The colleges of secular priests living together in common, or what it is now the fashion to call a clergy house, might be and were strictly *religious* foundations; and could the colleges of scholars, of teachers and learners who presumably were all priests, or intended for the priesthood, be regarded as less *religious* than the others? So it came to pass that the tithes of parish after parish were diverted into a new channel, and these very colleges at Cambridge which were professedly meant to raise the standard of education among the seculars were endowed at the expense of those same secular clergy. In order that the country parsons might be better educated, it was arranged that the country parsons should be impoverished!

Seven new colleges opened in less than thirty years at Cambridge alone! Think what this must have meant. I suspect that Oxford had attracted the reading men, and Cambridge possessed charms for the fast ones. How else are we to explain Archbishop Stratford's stringent order in 1342 for the repression of the dandyism that prevailed among the young scholars? These young Cantabs of the fourteenth century were exquisites of the first water. Their fur-trimmed cloaks and their tippets; their shoes of all the colours of the rainbow; their dainty girdles, bejewelled and gilt, were a sight to see. And then their hair! positively curled and powdered, and growing over their shoulders, too; and when they passed their fingers through the curls, look you, there were rings on their fingers! Call you these scholars? Chaucer's 'Clerk of Oxenforde' was of a very different type:—

For all that he might of his frendes hente
On bookes and in learning he it spente.

Nevertheless it can hardly have been but that the foundation of so many colleges at Cambridge brought in a stricter discipline; the new collegiate life of the scholars began. Perhaps for the majority of readers no part of Mr. Clark's great work will prove so attractive as the last four hundred pages, with their delightful essays on 'The Component Parts of a College.' Here we have traced out for us, in the most elaborate manner, the gradual development of the collegiate idea, from the time when it expressed itself in a building that had no particular plan, down to our own days, when colleges vie with one

another in architectural splendour and in the lavish completeness of their arrangements.

At the outset the uninitiated must prepare to have some of their favourite theories rudely shattered. We are in the habit of assuming that a quadrangle is one of the essential features of a college. It is almost amazing to learn that the quadrangular arrangement was adopted very gradually.

Again, we are often assured that the colleges at the two older universities are the only relics of the monastic system, and are themselves monastic in their origin. A greater fallacy could hardly be propounded. It would be nearer the truth to say that the founding of the colleges was at once a protest against the monasteries and an attempt to supersede them.

More startling still is the fact that a college did not at first necessarily imply that there was a chapel attached. So far from this being the case, it is certain that Peterhouse, the oldest college in Cambridge, never had a chapel till the present building was consecrated in 1632. It was with great difficulty that the Countess of Pembroke in 1366 was allowed to build a chapel within the precincts of her new college; and, so far from these convenient adjuncts to a collegiate establishment having been considered an essential in early times, no less than eight of the college chapels at Cambridge and four at Oxford date from a time after the Reformation. In the fourteenth century and later the young scholars, as a rule, attended their parish church. Sometimes the college added on an aisle for the accommodation of its members; sometimes it obtained a *licence* to use a room in which Divine Service might be conducted for a time; once the founder of a college erected a collegiate quire in the middle of the parish church, a kind of gigantic *pew*, for the accommodation of his scholars. Downing College has never had a chapel to the present hour.

Of all the developments, however, in the college idea, none has been more remarkable than that of the master's lodge. In the fourteenth century the master of a college was but *primus inter pares*, and the distance between him and his *fellows* or *scholars* was less than that which exists now between the commanding officer of a regiment in barracks and his brother officers. The master had no sinecure; the discipline of the place depended upon him almost entirely, for in those days the monarchical idea was in the ascendant; the king was a real king, the bishop a real bishop, the master a real master. Everything was referred to him, everything originated with him, everything was controlled by him. But as for the accommodation assigned to him in the early colleges, it was very inferior indeed to that which every undergraduate at Trinity or St. John's expects to find in our time. The Provost of Oriel in 1329 was permitted by the statutes to dine apart if he pleased, and to reside outside the precincts of the college if he chose to provide for himself another

residence; but this was clearly an exceptional case, for the master was at this time the actual founder of the college, and Adam de Brune might be presumed to know what was good for his successors in the office for which he himself had made provision. But for generations the master enjoyed no more than a couple of *chambers* at the most, and it was not till the sixteenth century that an official residence was provided, and then such residence consisted only of *lodgings* a little more spacious and convenient than those of any of the fellows, and in no case separated from the main buildings of the college. Even when masters of colleges began to marry (and the earliest instance of this seems to have been Dr. Heynes, Master of Queen's College, in 1529), it was long before the master's wife was so far recognised as to be received within the precincts; and as late as 1576, when the fellows of King's complained of their provost's wife being seen within the college, Dr. Goad replied that she had not been twice in the college 'Quad' in her life, as far as he knew. When the great break-up came in the next century, then the establishment of the master demanded increased accommodation for his family, and the master's lodge began to grow slowly, until university architects of the nineteenth century displayed their exalted sense of what was due to the dignity of a 'head of a house' by erecting two such palaces as the lodges of Pembroke and St. John's Colleges; for the glorification of the artist, it may be, but whether for the advantage of the college, the university, or the occupants of the aforesaid lodges may be reasonably doubted. One master's lodge in Cambridge is at this moment let, presumably for the benefit of the head of the house, whose official residence it is; and, if things go on as they are tending, the day may come—who knows how soon?—when Cambridge shall at last be able to boast of a really good hotel, 'in a central and very desirable situation, commanding a delightful view of'—what shall we say?—'fitted up with every convenience, and formerly known as the Master's Lodge of St. Boniface College.'

I am inclined to think that there is such a thing as architecture run to seed.

If any one imagines that it would be possible within the limits of a single essay to follow Mr. Clark through the exhaustive processes of investigation which he has gone through, or to summarise at all satisfactorily the results which he has arrived at and set forth in so masterly a manner, let such an one spend only a single hour in turning over the leaves of these splendid volumes. The exquisite illustrations alone (which count by hundreds), and the elaborate maps and ground-plans, are full of surprises; they speak with an eloquence of their own to such as have eyes to see and in whom there is a spark of imagination to enlighten the paths along which their accomplished guide can lead them. Do you think that such

a work as this tells us no more than how the stone walls rose and the buildings assumed their present form, and court was added to court, and libraries and museums and lecture-rooms and all the rest of them were constructed by the professional gentlemen who drew the plans, and piled up by the masons and the bricklayers? Then you will do it a grievous injustice.

Horizons rich with trembling spires
On violet twilights, lose their fires

if there be no human element to cast a living glow upon them. The authors of this architectural history knew better than anyone else that they were dealing with the architectural history of a great national institution. They knew that these walls—some so old and crumbling, some so new and hard and unlovely—bear upon them the marks of all the changes and all the progress, the conflicts and the questionings, the birth-throes of the new childhood, the fading out of a perplexed senility, the earnest grappling with error, the painful searching after truth which the spirit of man has gone through in these homes of intellectual activity during the lapse of six hundred years. Do you wish to understand the buildings? Then you must study the life; and the converse is true also. Either explains, and is the indispensable interpreter of, the obscurities of the other. Mr. Clark could not have produced this exhaustive history of university and collegiate fabrics if he had not gained a profound insight into the student life of Cambridge from the earliest times.

How did they live, these young scholars in the early days? Through what whimsical vagaries have the fashions changed? As the centuries have rolled on, have the youth of England become better or wiser than their sires? Neither better nor wiser seems to be the answer. The outer man is not as he was; the real moral and intellectual stamina of Englishmen has at least suffered no deterioration. Our habits are different; our dress, our language, the look of our homes, are all other than they were. Our wants have multiplied immensely; the amount of physical discomfort and downright suffering which our ancestors were called upon to endure sent up the death-rate doubtless to a figure which to us would be appalling. We start from a standing-point in moral, social, and intellectual convictions so far in advance of that of our forefathers that they could not conceive of such a *terminus ad quem* as serves us as a *terminus a quo*. In other words, we *begin* at a point in the line which they never conceived could be reached. Yet the more closely we look into the past the more do we see how history in all essentials is for ever repeating herself—impossible though it may be to put the clock back for ourselves.

How significant is the fact that through all these centuries of building and planting, of pulling down and raising up, the makers of Cambridge—that is, the men who achieved for her her place in

the realms of thought, inquiry, and discovery—never seemed to have thought that Death could play much havoc among them. In the old monasteries there was always a cemetery. The canon or the monk who passed into the cloister came there once for all—to live *and die* within the walls of his monastery. The scholar who came to get all the learning he could, and who settled in some humble hostel or some unpretentious college of the old type, came to spend some few years there, but no more. He came to live his life, and when 'there was no more life in him—no more youthful force, activity, and enthusiasm—there was no place for him at Cambridge. There they wanted men of vigour and energy, not past their work. Die? No! as long as he was verily alive it was well that he should stay and toil. When he was a dying man, better he should go. No college at Cambridge had a cemetery. Let the dead bury their dead!

Indeed, it must have been hard for the weak and sickly—the lad of feeble frame and delicate organisation—to stand that rugged old Cambridge life. 'College rooms' in our time suggest something like the *ne plus ultra* of æsthetic elegance and luxury. We find it hard to realise the fact that for centuries a Fellow of a college was expected to have two or three *chamber fellows* who shared his bed-room with him; and that his *study* was no bigger than a study at the schoolhouse at Rugby, and very much smaller than a fourth-form boy enjoys at many a more modern public school. At the hostels, which were of course much more crowded than the colleges were, a separate bed was the privilege of the few. What must have been the condition of those semi-licensed receptacles for the poorer students in the early times, when we find as late as 1598 that in St. John's College there were no less than seventy members of the college 'accommodated' (!) in twenty-eight chambers. This was before the second court at St. John's was even begun, and yet these seventy Johnians were living in luxury when compared with their predecessors of two hundred years before.

'In the early colleges the windows of the chambers were unglazed and closed with wooden shutters; their floors were either of clay or tiled; and their halls and ceilings were unplastered.' We have express testimony that at Corpus Christi College not even the master's lodge had been glazed and panelled before the beginning of the sixteenth century. By an inventory which Mr. Clark has printed, dated July 3, 1451, it appears that in the master's lodge at King's College, 'the wealthiest lodge of the university, there was then only one chair; that the tables were supported on trestles; and that those who used them sat on forms or stools.' As for the chambers and studies, not only were they destitute of anything in the shape of stoves or fire-places, but their walls were absolutely bare, while in the upper chambers there were not even lath and plaster

between the tiles and the beams of the roof. It is to us almost incomprehensible how vitality could have been kept up in the winter under such conditions. The cold must have been dreadful.

At four only of five earlier and smaller colleges was there any fire-place in the hall, and the barbaric braziers in which first charcoal and afterwards coke was burned, were actually the only heating apparatus known in the immense halls of Trinity and St. John's till within the last twenty years! The magnificent hall of Trinity actually retained till 1866 the brazier *which had been in use for upwards of 160 years!* The clumsy attempt to fight the bitter cold which was usual in our mediæval churches and manor-houses, by strewing the stone floor with rushes, was carried out too in the college halls, and latterly, instead of rushes, sawdust was used, at least in Trinity. 'It was laid on the floor at the beginning of winter, and turned over with a rake as often as the upper surface became dirty. Finally, when warm weather set in, it was removed, the colour of charcoal!' Well might the late Professor Sedgwick, in commenting upon this practice, exclaim:—'The dirt was sublime in former years!'

Yet in the earliest times a lavatory was provided in the college halls, and a towel of eight or nine yards long, which at Trinity as late as 1612 was hung on a hook—the refinement of hanging a towel on a *roller* does not appear to have been thought of. These towels were for use *before* dinner; *at* dinner the fellows of Christ's in 1575 were provided with table-napkins. If they wiped their fingers on the table-cloth they were fined a penny. The temptation must have been strong at times, for *no forks were in use*—not even the iron-pronged forks which some of us remember in hall in our young days. The oldest piece of furniture in the college halls were the stocks set up for the correction of refractory undergraduates who should have been guilty of the enormity of bathing in the Cam or other grave offence and scandal.

Of the amusements indulged in by the undergraduates at Cambridge in the early times we hear but little. The probability seems to be that they had to manage for themselves as best they could. Gradually the bowling-green, the butts for archery, and the tennis-courts were provided by several colleges. Tennis seems to have been the rage at Cambridge during the sixteenth century, and the tennis-courts became sources of revenue in the Elizabethan time. It is clear that by this time the old severity and rigour had become relaxed, the colleges had become richer, and in another hundred years the combination-rooms had become comfortable and almost luxurious before the seventeenth century closed. In Queen's College in 1693 there were actually *flowers* in the combination-room, and at Christ's College in 1716 a card-table was provided 'in the fellows' parlour.'

It may be said that the immense expansion of the University, as distinct from a mere aggregate of colleges, dates from the beginning of the eighteenth century. Up to that time the colleges had for four hundred years been steadily growing into privileged corporations, whose wealth and power had been too great for the Commonwealth, of which they were in idea only members. With the Georgian era the new movement began. When Bishop Moore's vast library was presented by George II. to the *University*, when the first stone of the Senate House was laid in 1722, when the *University* arranged for the reception of Dr. Woodward's fossils in 1735—these events marked the beginning of a new order of things. Whatever confusion may have existed in the minds of our grandfathers, who had a vague conviction that the University meant no more than the aggregate of the colleges, and a suspicion that what the University was the colleges made it—we, in our generation, have been assured that the colleges owed their existence to the sufferance of universities; or, if that be putting the case too strongly, that the colleges exist for the sake of the University. The new view has at any rate gained the approval of the Legislature; the University is in no danger of being predominated over by the colleges in the immediate future; the danger rather is lest the colleges should be starved or at least impoverished for the glorification of the University, the college-fellowships being shorn of their dignity and emoluments in order to ensure that the University officials shall become the exclusive holders of the richest prizes.

For good or evil we have entered upon a new career. The old Cambridge, which some of us knew in our youth, with its solemn ecclesiasticism, its quaint archaisms, its fantastic anomalies, its fascinating picturesqueness, its dear old barbaric unintelligible odds and ends that met us at every turn in street and chapel and hall—that old Cambridge is as dead as the Egypt of the Pharaohs. The new Cambridge, with its bustling syndics for ever on the move—its bewildering complexity of examinations—its 'sweet girl-graduates with their golden hair,' its delightful 'notion of grand and capacious and massive amusement,' its glorious wealth of collections and appliances and facilities for every kind of study and research, is alive with an exuberant vitality.

What form will the new life assume in the time that is coming? Will the Cambridge of six centuries hence be able to produce such a record of her past as that which she can boast of now? Among her *alumni* of the future will there arise again any such loyal and enlightened historians as these who have raised to themselves and their University so noble a monument?

AUGUSTUS JESSOPP.

EUROPE IN THE PACIFIC.

DURING the last half-century our Australasian colonies have been merely spectators in the diplomatic drama of European politics; recent events, however, have caused a change in this respect, and now individually and collectively they are beginning to appear before the world as actors who will probably play important parts in the new political sphere of influence that is rapidly attracting the attention of Europe.—I mean the future policy of the Pacific. Imperial legislators have hitherto acted too much on their own responsibility in their diplomatic dealings with foreign Powers relating to Pacific affairs, and the public opinion of Australasia has not been sufficiently recognised in matters involving the annexation and giving up of islands in the southern hemisphere. True the advice of colonial statesmen and agents-general has frequently been asked, but it is not too much to say that, though generously given, it has seldom been seriously considered. Now it must be distinctly understood that the presence of possibly hostile Powers in the immediate vicinity of our Australasian colonies is fraught with much future danger to the colonists themselves, and, as they, and not the people inhabiting Great Britain and Ireland, are directly affected by the result of such diplomatic arrangements, their interest in questions of this kind demand first consideration. The half-heartedness so long displayed by the home authorities in Pacific policy will have to give place to more vigorous action, in which deeds must be substituted for words, and treaties for understandings.

Spain, France, and Holland long ago saw the advantage of possessing advanced posts in the Pacific—Spain and Holland for commercial reasons, France for naval purposes and the establishment of convict settlements. Germany and the United States have not been long in following suit, and slowly but surely the former Power is gaining a hold upon the trade in these latitudes and endeavouring to provide herself with coaling stations in the immediate vicinity of the maritime highways to Australia. Meanwhile, Great Britain is looking on, content with the passive possession of the Fijis and a small strip of New Guinea, while Australia and New Zealand, con-

stitutionally powerless to prevent or permit annexation, are daily in danger of an increase in the number of foreign convicts already lodged and provided for in islands adjacent to their shores.

I propose to give here some information concerning the more important groups of islands that lie scattered over the surface of the Pacific Ocean. The area with which I am about to deal is so vast, and the islands in question so numerous, that some classification becomes necessary. Several methods of course suggest themselves, but the one adopted will well illustrate the object in view, and show at once not only the relation which these groups of islands bear to each other, but also their individual importance to European Powers, both diplomatically and commercially, for which purpose I have arranged the accompanying chart.

Recent diplomatic arrangements between this country and Germany have settled that for political purposes the Western Pacific shall mean that part of the Pacific Ocean lying between the 15th parallel of N. and the 30th parallel of S. latitude and between the 165th degree of longitude W. and the 130th E. of Greenwich. No corresponding division has hitherto been proposed for the Eastern Pacific, probably because the reasons that prompted the one did not appear to require the other. Now I would venture to suggest that it would be a matter of some convenience if the area of the Eastern Pacific were defined and made to correspond more nearly with that of the Western Pacific. To illustrate my meaning I have drawn on the chart annexed an arbitrary line traversing the 100th degree of longitude west of Greenwich, and would define the Eastern Pacific as that part of the Pacific Ocean lying between the 15th parallel of N. and the 30th parallel of S. latitude, and between the 165th degree of longitude W. and the 100th degree of longitude W. of Greenwich. This division excludes the Galapagos Islands, which belong to the Republic of Ecuador, but takes in Pitcairn Island and Easter Island.

Six months since important declarations were entered into between the Governments of Great Britain and the German Empire relating to a demarcation of the British and German spheres of influence in the Western Pacific and to reciprocal freedom of trade and commerce in the British and German possessions and protectorates¹ in those regions. For these purposes the area of the Western Pacific was revised as above, and a conventional line of demarcation² agreed upon starting from the north-east coast of New Guinea at a point near

¹ The words 'possessions and protectorates in the Western Pacific' do not include the colonies which now have fully constituted governments and legislatures.

² Should further surveys show that any islands now indicated on the British Admiralty charts lying on one side of the conventional line are in reality on the other side, the line is to be modified so that such islands shall appear on the same side of the line shown on the said charts.

Mitre Rock on the 8th parallel of S. latitude, which is the boundary between the British and German possessions on that coast, and following that parallel to point A,¹ and thence continuing to points B, C, D, E, F, and G, as indicated in the accompanying chart. East, south-east, or south of this line Germany has engaged not to acquire land, accept protectorates, or interfere with the extension of British influence, and to give up any acquisitions of territory or protectorates already established in that part of the Western Pacific. Great Britain has entered into similar engagements concerning that part of the Western Pacific lying to the west, north-west, or north of the conventional line.

These engagements, however, do not apply to the Navigator Islands (Samoa), which are affected by treaties with Great Britain, Germany, and the United States; nor to the Friendly Islands (Tonga), also affected by treaties with Great Britain and Germany; nor to the island of Niué (Savage Island), which groups still continue to form a neutral region; nor, of course, are they applicable to any islands or places in the Western Pacific now under the sovereignty or protection of any other civilised Power.

Commercially both nations have agreed that the subjects of either State shall be free to resort to or settle in all the possessions or protectorates belonging to the other, as well as to acquire any kind of property and engage in any description of trade, agricultural or industrial undertakings, subject to the same conditions and laws, and enjoying the same religious freedom, protection, and privileges, as the subjects of the sovereign or protecting State. The ships belonging to both States are in all respects to enjoy reciprocal advantages as well as most-favoured-nation treatment; and merchandise, of whatever origin, imported by the subjects of either State, under whatever flag, is not to be liable to any other or higher duties than that imported by the subject of the other State or of any third Power.

It has been decided too that all disputed claims to land alleged to have been acquired by British subjects in a German possession or protectorate, and *vice versa*, prior to the proclamation of sovereignty or protectorate, shall be settled by a mixed commission; but any such claim may be decided by the local authority alone, provided the claimant to the land makes formal application to that effect. Convicts are not to be transported to, nor penal settlements

¹ A, 8° S. lat., 154° long. E. of Greenwich; B, 7° 15' S. lat., 155° 25' E. long.; C, 7° 15' S. lat., 155° 35' E. long.; D, 7° 25' S. lat., 156° 40' E. long.; E, 8° 50' S. lat., 159° 50' E. long.; F, 6° N. lat., 173° 30' E. long.; G, 15° N. lat., 173° 30' E. long.

The point A is indicated on the British Admiralty chart 780, Pacific Ocean (south-west sheet); the points B, C, D, and E are indicated on the British Admiralty chart 214 (South Pacific, Solomon Islands), and the points F and G on the British Admiralty chart 781, Pacific Ocean (north-west sheet).

established by either Great Britain or Germany in, the Western Pacific.

The table on the following page shows the exact geographical position and nationality of the principal groups and islands in these latitudes, and serves at the same time as an index to the chart annexed.

I will now deal with the groups separately, detailing more at length their diplomatic connection with European Powers, and pointing out some of the advantages they possess for commercial enterprise.

NORTHERN PACIFIC.

The Sandwich Islands, eight in number, and possessing an area of about 6,000 square miles, form the kingdom of Hawaii. The Government is constitutional, consisting of a King and Parliament. In 1843 their independence was formally declared by the French and English Governments; and in 1851 a treaty was entered into between her Majesty and the King relating to commerce and navigation, containing certain clauses granting concessions to whale ships, and regulating import duties and harbour dues. The islands, however, are practically Americanised, and the dollar is the standard coin. Their importance from a European point of view is chiefly owing to the position of Honolulu, which is the only coaling station on the mail route between Auckland and San Francisco and on the direct line between Vancouver and Fiji. Great Britain, Germany, France, Spain, Italy, Russia, Austria, Belgium, Portugal, Sweden, Norway, and America are diplomatically represented.

The Ladrões, a group of about twenty islands, running almost due north and south, have a united area of nearly 1250 square miles, the largest being Guajan, ninety miles in circumference, where the governor resides. As a commercial possession these islands are very important to the Spaniards.

SOUTHERN PACIFIC.

The Kermadec Islands, a scattered group of small rocky islets situated north-east of New Zealand, were annexed by Great Britain on the 1st of August, 1886.

The Chatham Islands, discovered in 1791, consist of three islands and several islets. The soil is fertile, and European fruits grow well.

EASTERN PACIFIC.

Cook Islands are seven in number. The natives, a well-disposed and intelligent people, are Protestant, and adopt European habits.

Rarotonga, the finest and by far the most important of these

NAMES OF GROUPS	BETWEEN			
	Lat.	Long.	Lat.	Long.
<i>Northern Pacific.</i>				
Ladrone Islands ⁴ (S) . . .	12 24 N.	144 24 E.	20 30 N	146 1 E.
Sandwich Islands (I.) . . .	18 54 N.	154 50 W.	28 25 N	178 27 W.
<i>Southern Pacific.</i>				
Kermadec Islands (B.) . . .	29 15 S	177 56 W.	30 36 S	179 0 W.
Chatham Islands (B.) . . .	43 30 S	176 17 W.	44 20 S.	176 61 W.
<i>Eastern Pacific.</i>				
Marquessa Islands (F.) . . .	7 53 S	138 26 W.	10 30 S.	140 48 W.
Low Archipelago (F.) . . .	14 9 S.	124 48 W.	25 3 S	148 44 W.
Society Islands (I. and F.) . . .	15 48 S	148 5 W.	17 53 S.	164 40 W.
Cook's Islands (I.) . . .	18 5 S	157 8 W.	21 55 S.	163 10 W.
Austral Islands (I.) . . .	21 49 S	143 28 W.	27 55 S	154 43 W.
Rapa ⁵ (F) . . .	27 35 S.	144 17 W.		
Pitcairn Island (B.) . . .	25 3 S	130 8 W.		
<i>Western Pacific.</i>				
Pelew Islands (S.) . . .	6 53 N.	134 5 E.	8 45 N.	134 55 E.
Caroline Islands (S.) . . .	1 0 N	137 33 E.	10 6 N.	163 5 E.
Marshall Islands (I.G.) . . .	4 39 N	165 22 E.	11 48 N	171 57 E.
Gilbert Islands (I.B.) . . .	3 21 N	172 55 E.	2 41 S	177 0 E.
Admiralty Islands } Bismarck	1 54 S.	145 54 E.	2 55 S.	148 10 E.
New Ireland } Archipelago	2 46 S.	150 33 E.	4 51 S	153 18 E.
New Britain } (G.)	4 8 S.	148 17 E.	6 30 S	152 15 E.
British } New Guinea				
German } New Guinea	0 19 S.	131 0 E.	10 43 S	150 54 E.
Dutch }				
Louisiade Archipelago (B) . . .	10 58 S	151 3 E.	11 42 S.	154 26 E.
Solomon Islands ⁶ (I.B. & I.G.) . . .	3 27 S	153 55 E.	12 45 S	163 1 E.
Ellice Islands (I.B.) . . .	5 29 S	179 50 E.	10 41 S.	176 6 E.
Santa Cruz Islands ⁷ (I.B.) . . .	9 57 S.	165 41 E.	11 50 S.	167 11 E.
Samoa Islands ⁸ (I.) . . .	12 53 S.	168 6 W.	15 57 S.	178 7 W.
New Hebrides Islands (I.) . . .	13 36 S.	166 40 E.	20 15 S	170 11 E.
Fiji Islands (B.) . . .	12 31 S.	176 51 E.	20 38 S.	178 12 W.
Tonga ⁹ (I.) . . .	18 2 S.	173 40 W.	22 52 S.	176 14 W.
New Caledonia (F) . . .	17 59 S	162 55 E.	22 46 S	167 29 E.
Loyalty Islands (F.) . . .	20 15 S.	166 14 E.	23 38 S	168 56 E.
Nieué ¹⁰ (I) . . .	19 10 S	169 50 W.		

B denotes British possessions.
 S denotes Spanish possessions.
 G. denotes German possessions.
 F. denotes French possessions.
 I denotes independent.

I.G. denotes independent, but within German
 'sphere of influence'
 I.B. denotes independent, but within British
 'sphere of influence.'

ROUTES FROM LONDON TO SYDNEY.

V. & Brindisi & Alexandria & Cairo Rly	10,540 miles, of which 1,490 are land miles
" Suez Canal	11,533 "
" San Francisco	14,895 " of which 3,300 are land miles
" Panama	12,545 " of which 50 are land miles
" Vancouver	12,811 " of which 3,271 are land miles

⁴ Mariana Islands
⁵ Oparo.

⁶ For division, see text, p. 756.
⁷ Charlotte.

⁸ Navigators.
⁹ Friendly Islands.

¹⁰ Savage Island.

islands, lies in the highway between Sydney and Panama. Although mountainous, it is very fertile, and fresh water abounds; while its two small but fairly secure harbours might be made of signal service to us, seeing we have no coaling station in the Eastern Pacific. About the year 1864 the king and his chiefs made a formal application to her Majesty's Government for protection, in the shape of a letter addressed to the then Governor of New Zealand. The same feeling continues, and (July 3, 1886) the New Zealand Government, in a telegraphic despatch, asked that the island should be brought under British protection.

It is not probable that, with the present spirit of annexation, islands possessing so many advantages commercially and diplomatically will remain much longer without an offer of protection from some European Power.

The Society group may be divided into—

(1) Tahiti, a valuable island with a good harbour (Papeète), Moorea, Mactia, and Tetuaroa. They were formally annexed by France in 1880.

(2) Huahine, Raiatea, and Borabora (to the leeward of Tahiti), and the adjacent small islands. Their independence was acknowledged by a treaty entered into between Great Britain and France in 1847, although, strange to say, the French flag has been flying at Raiatea since 1880.

The Austral group consists of five islands—Rapa, Ravaivai, Tubu, Rurutu, and Rimatara, ranging from fifteen to twenty-five miles in circumference and possessing a magnificent climate. The natives, who are Protestants, have little sympathy with the Roman Catholic teaching. These islands, cultivated properly by Europeans, would probably produce fine crops of cotton, coffee, sugar, and indigo, and constitute commercially a very profitable investment.

Rurutu and Rimatara are independent, but the other three belong to the French. Rapa, situated at the extreme south-east, possesses a fine natural harbour, and though it formed part of the 1843 Tahiti protectorate was not formally ceded to France till 1880.

The French possessions in the Eastern Pacific comprise—

(1) The Marquesas, a group of eleven islands, possessing a delightful climate and valuable agricultural land, ceded to France by a treaty with Admiral Dupetit-Thouars in May 1842.

(2) The Tahitian Archipelago, which may be subdivided into—

(a) Tahiti, Moorea, Tetuaroa, Meetia, Tubai, Ravaivai, and Rapa.

Admiral Thouars seized Tahiti in August 1842, and during the following year the island was, at the request of its queen and principal chiefs, placed under French protection. In May 1880 King Pomaré the Fifth handed over the administration of Tahiti and its dependencies to the President of the Republic, and they were formally annexed by France. Tahiti, now a great centre of

commercial activity in the Pacific, was then made, and still is, the seat of government.

(b) The Low Archipelago, or Paumotu group, a vast collection of coral islands, numbering seventy-eight or more, covering an area of 6,000 square kilometres, and chiefly valuable for their pearl fisheries.

(c) The Gambiers, a group of four small islands. The French official resides at Mangareva. The agents of Messrs. Godeffroy some years ago shipped to Europe, in one parcel, pearls to the value of \$20,000, the product of a few months' collection among the Paumotus, and the large pearl now in the possession of her Majesty, and purchased of Messrs. Storr and Mortimer for 6,000*l.*, came from the Gambiers.

The situation in the Eastern Pacific calls for immediate action. The islanders are becoming aware of the growing power of Germany in these latitudes, and, as the greater part of their trade is transacted through agents of that country, there is some reason to expect that Prince Bismarck may before long carry out here his principle of following the German trade with the German flag.

With the diplomatic dealings that led to the establishment of Kaiser Wilhelm Land in the Ireland of Australia still fresh in our memory, it might be politic and not altogether unnecessary to take some preliminary steps in a matter of so great importance to the future welfare of British commercial interests.

I would suggest that the limits of British and French spheres of influence in the Eastern Pacific be more accurately defined, and that declarations be made between the Governments of Great Britain and France similar in effect to those entered into between this country and Germany concerning the Western Pacific. The Panama Canal may or may not be a financial success. That it will be open for navigation in 1889 is more than doubtful, but that it may be *un fait accompli* sooner or later is a possibility which even the Americans cannot gainsay. Our duty is to be prepared for a favourable result of M. Lesseps' undertaking, which, if successful, will not only open a new sea route to Australia and New Zealand, but also bring the Pacific islands into very much closer communication with European Powers than is at the present time possible.

It would of course be necessary to agree to a conventional line of demarcation, and the diplomatic dealings that led to the fixing of this line might materially assist in solving the New Hebrides problem.

Provided that the settlement of the Newfoundland fisheries dispute does not interfere with the carrying out of the declaration entered into between this country and France, in 1847, respecting the independence of the islands of Huahine, Raiatea, and Borabora, and the small islands adjacent thereto, the withdrawal of Great Britain from this engagement in exchange for Rapa, Tubai, and Ravaivai

might be deserving of some consideration at the hands of her Majesty's Government.

A conventional line, as indicated in the chart overleaf, that secured Rapa and Rarotonga on the British side, would not be without its advantages to this country, and yet keep intact the rights of France, and not interfere with her diplomatic or commercial policy in these latitudes.

Tahiti being the great centre of French trade in the Pacific is absolutely necessary to France; but Rapa, which can only be approached from most of the French possessions by a circuitous passage, owing to the nautical dangers that surround the Low Archipelago, has hitherto proved of little service to that nation. In support of my case I would mention the fact that, although this island was included in the 1843 protectorate, it was only in 1867, after the Panama Mail Company had chosen it for a coaling station, that France thought it necessary to send a man-of-war there to reduce it into possession. In the event of the Panama Canal being opened for traffic, Tahiti must, from its geographical position, always be the coaling station for French vessels taking that route to Caledonia or Australia. Rarotonga is independent, and its inhabitants have already invited, and are still ready and willing to accept, British protection, while Tubai and Ravaivai are unimportant islands to France in comparison with the possession of Huahine, Borabora, Raiatea, and the remaining islands of the Society group. The guano islands Fanning, Malden, and Starbuck would, under the suggested arrangement, also go to France.

WESTERN PACIFIC.

The largest and perhaps the most important island in the Western Pacific is New Guinea, or Papua. It lies immediately south of the equator and north of Australia, and is under the control of three European Powers in the following estimated proportions:—

	Square miles
Western New Guinea (Holland)	112,350
Kaiser Wilhelm Land (Germany)	68,390
British Protectorate (Great Britain)	86,800
Total area	267,540

The secrecy and jealousy of the Dutch in relation to their East India possessions, even to a late period, has barred political and geographical information to the outer world. Lord Carnarvon in 1875 endeavoured to get some definite information as to their title, or alleged title, to the western portion of New Guinea, and to trace out the precise boundaries of the territory held by them. No specific information, however, on these points was forthcoming, beyond the fact that they claimed to extend to the 141st degree of longitude east of Greenwich.

The Dutch navigators in the early part of the seventeenth century explored the south-western shores of New Guinea as far east as the Torres Straits, while Le Maire, Schouten, and Abel Tasman (1613-43) traced the northern shores from about the 144° meridian to the westward. The Great Geel Vink Bay was explored in 1705. In 1820 and 1828 more explorations were made, and a settlement founded. In 1835 the Dutch sent out another expedition, which was followed in 1858 by a third to Humboldt Bay. None of these endeavours to colonise the place have, however, been very successful.

NEW GUINEA.



Hence the assumption is their title depends upon the right of discovery and exploration.

Comparatively little too is known concerning German New Guinea, and although recent White Books give some information about the interior of Kaiser Wilhelm Land, the greater part of that territory remains unexplored; but owing to the untiring energy of the late Sir Peter Scratchley, who personally visited eighteen districts, twenty-seven islands, thirty-four inland and sixty coast villages, some definite and reliable information respecting the British territory has been acquired. With the exception of the north-east coast, the entire

littoral of the protectorate is inhabited, and in the west and north-west, from the Fly River to Hall Sound, the tribes are large. The soil there, too, is extremely fertile, and large crops of sago are produced. From Port Moresby to Kerupunu the natives are peaceable and inclined to the adoption of European ideas respecting labour; but at Aroma, Cloudy Bay, Milport Bay, and Toulon Island they are not to be trusted. Further south villages are smaller but more numerous, and the character of the natives is docile. Concerning those on the north-east coast, little is known of their habits or customs. The natives are far superior in physique to the Australian black, but there is no such developed tribal system as existed in Fiji, Java, and New Zealand. Sir Peter Scratchley and his guard only carried arms on rare occasions, but no hostility was ever shown, and even at Mr. Forbes's station, the furthest settlement inland hitherto attempted, a friendly spirit was exhibited.

The discovery of New Guinea is due to the Portuguese. Don Juge de Menenis landed there in 1526, and called the island Papua, which some authorities translate 'black,' while others construe it 'curled hair,' either of which meanings suits the native inhabitants. Thirty years later De Retz, a Spanish mariner, sailed along the northern coast, and rechristened the island Nueva Guinea, from a fancied resemblance it bore to the Guinea coast on the west of Africa. Dampier, in 1699, circumnavigated the island, and on landing met with considerable resistance from the natives. A similar experience befell Captain Cook when he visited the place in 1770.

Twenty-three years ago a company was started in Sydney to colonise that part not taken by Holland; but the idea was abandoned when the promoters of the scheme found they could not form a British colony without the express consent of the Imperial authorities. Since that date the coast-line of New Guinea has been to some extent explored by the missionaries and various Europeans who have visited its shores.

The Bismarck Archipelago consists of the Admiralty group, New Britain, New Ireland, Long, and Rooke islands, and several smaller dependencies round about.

The Louisiade Archipelago, included in the British protectorate, embraces the islands of Adele, Roussel, and St. Aignan, and the groups Rénard, De Boyne, Bonvouloir, D'Entrecasteaux, and Trobriande. Many of the islands are thickly populated, and the natives, mostly cannibals, are less to be trusted than those on the mainland.

I do not propose to deal with either the British or German occupation of New Guinea at any great length, but it may be interesting to give here a short account of the way Germany obtained a footing in the Ireland of Australia and a hold in the Western Pacific.

Like a triangle, the question has three sides—Imperial, German, Colonial. These I will discuss as briefly as possible, and leave my

readers to draw their own conclusions. The Imperial authorities, after much delay and a good deal of outside pressure from the colonies, decided not to annex New Guinea, but to declare a protectorate up to a certain point in the island, and on the 9th of September, 1884, her Majesty's Government announced to the German authorities that it was intended to establish a protectorate over the coast and contiguous islands, excepting that part between the 145th degree of east longitude and the eastern Dutch boundary. Baron von Plessen then made certain representations in London, the outcome of which was that another note was sent to Berlin on the 9th of October, stating that as an act of courtesy we would, pending negotiations with Prince Bismarck, limit the immediate declaration of the protectorate to the south coast and islands, it being understood, of course, that this was done without prejudice to any territorial question beyond that limit, and adding that, in the opinion of her Majesty's Government, any question as to districts lying beyond the limit actually taken should be dealt with diplomatically rather than be referred to a South Sea Committee, as suggested by Baron von Plessen. Germany, however, saw no reason for entering into the negotiations suggested by this country, or waiting for the diplomatic discussion of Baron von Plessen's representations, and proceeded to annex a portion of the territory in question.

This action on the part of a friendly Power naturally caused some amount of irritation at the Foreign Office, and did not tend to allay the anxiety which was rapidly springing up at the Colonial Office in consequence of the alarming nature of the telegrams received from Australia. Much correspondence ensued on all sides, and on the 24th of December an interview took place between Prince Bismarck and Mr. Meade in Berlin, when the matter was personally introduced to the German Chancellor. Six months later it was officially announced in London that an arrangement had been agreed upon between the two Governments. Under this a point was selected on the north-east coast where the eighth parallel of south latitude cuts the sea-shore as the coast boundary, and the inland territories were respectively fixed by a line starting from the coast in the neighbourhood of Mitre Rock, on the eighth parallel of south latitude, and following this parallel to the point where it is cut by the 147th degree of east longitude, then in a straight line in a north-westerly direction to the point where the sixth parallel of south latitude cuts the 144th degree of east longitude, and continuing in a north-westerly direction to the point of intersection of the fifth parallel of south latitude and of the 144th degree of east longitude.

The British possessions lie to the south and the German to the north of the line thus defined. So the matter was settled, and 68,000 square miles of territory passed under German control which

might have formed part of the British Empire, without any additional expense to the British taxpayer, had the mother country but listened to the voice of the Australian colonies.

Prince Bismarck's explanation of the transaction to Mr. Meade, who at the interview in question expressed some surprise at Germany thinking of annexing land which she had just proposed should form the subject of special negotiation, was that the correspondence alluded to above was quite new to him, neither had he any recollection of seeing it. He considered that he was free to take the north shore when we had limited our protectorate to the south side. So it is apparent that Germany considered the matter settled by the second note, and that the only open question was how far the limits of our protectorate should extend so as not to clash with those of Germany on the opposite coast.

We now come to the third and perhaps most important side of the question—I mean the Colonial. On the 4th of April, 1883, Mr. Chester took possession on behalf of her Majesty and the Government of Queensland of all that part of New Guinea and its adjacent islands lying between the 141st and 155th degrees of east longitude. This fact was reported to the Imperial authorities, and the other colonies urged the necessity of the territory being taken under British rule. In spite, however, of the unanimous feeling expressed by Australasia in the matter, the annexation was annulled. Some soreness naturally resulted from so short-sighted a policy on the part of her Majesty's advisers, but upon its becoming known that, on the 2nd of July, 1883, Lord Derby had publicly announced in the House of Lords it would be regarded as 'an unfriendly act' if any country attempted to make a settlement on the coast of New Guinea, confidence was again restored in the colonies; and when this expression was followed up, on the 9th of May, 1884, with the assurance 'that her Majesty's Government are confident that no foreign Power contemplates interference in New Guinea,' Australasia felt secure. Still the Colonial Governments continued to urge the necessity of annexation, and ultimately agreed to pay a subsidy of 15,000*l.* towards the expenses of a New Guinea protectorate. On the 9th of September the announcement stated above was sent to the German Government, and on the 17th of November the late Sir Peter (then General) Scratchley received instructions to proceed as her Majesty's special commissioner to assume jurisdiction over the southern shore of New Guinea and the adjacent country from the 141st meridian of east longitude, as far as East Cape, including any islands near the mainland in Goshen Straits, and southward of these straits as far south and east as to include Kosman Island. These instructions also stated clearly that he was to act as Deputy Commissioner to portions of New Guinea outside the protectorate, a fact that goes far to prove in the result that either Lord Derby misled

the colonies or Prince Bismarck misled Lord Derby. Sir Peter pointed out the absolute absurdity of such a partial protectorate, but, buoyed up with the hope of his powers being extended, left England on the 20th of November for Australia. At Albany the news reached him of the German annexation. Public opinion ran very high in the colonies against the Home Government when they found their confidence had been misplaced, and this feeling of irritation was intensified upon discovering that they were to be asked to increase the subsidy, when half the territory for which they had agreed to pay was already in the possession of a foreign Power. It is not that the Australians dislike the Germans as colonists in the Pacific, but they object to the presence in their midst of a possibly hostile Power. With the example of South Africa before their eyes, the danger of border disputes is ever present, and it would be idle to disguise the fact that Kaiser Wilhelm Land, from its size and position, in the unhappy event of a European war, may prove the basis of awkward complications in that part of the world. The Germans, too, have a peculiar interest in New Guinea, seeing their other neighbours are so nearly allied to them in speech and habits, for the Dutch are in fact really German, who have only in consequence of a separate historical development acquired a special nationality.

There are three well-known routes from New South Wales to China passing eastward of New Guinea; the longest, traversing eastward of New Caledonia and the Solomon Islands, is about 6,000 miles, and the two shortest, westward of those islands, 5,500 and 5,000 miles respectively; while from Brisbane to Hong Kong the distance is only 4,400 miles.

The Caroline Archipelago numbers more than five hundred islands, of which some are uninhabited, others very populous. The western side of the group is comparatively unknown, but the eastern extremity has been to some extent explored. Strong Island, eighty miles round, possesses two good harbours, where the largest vessels may anchor with safety. Timber is the chief export, and large quantities were obtained here for building the ports of China. Ascension, a larger island than Strong, is similar to it in many ways. Westward of Ascension is Hogolu, a vast lagoon about three hundred miles in circumference, while to the south-east are the islands Nugunor and Sugunor, important chiefly from their trade in pearl oysters and *bêche de mer*. Yap, situated at the extreme west, is perhaps the most highly civilised island of the group. Here Messrs. Godeffroy and Co. have a large establishment. Ponapi, in the extreme east, is important only on account of the conditions respecting it contained in the conditional arrangement (between Germany and Spain) respecting the sovereignty of the Caroline group.

The Pelew group was discovered by the Spaniards in 1545, and forms a chain running about a hundred and twenty miles from S.S.W.

to N.N.E. Babelthuap is the principal island. Tropical fruits of all kinds abound, and water is abundant. The natives are of the Malay race, and exhibit much skill in building canoes and in agricultural pursuits.

Last year a dispute arose between Spain and Germany as to the sovereignty of the Caroline and Pelew Islands. The Pope, having undertaken to mediate between the two Governments, proposed that the sovereignty of Spain over these islands should be recognised by Germany in return for the grant of concessions to that Power touching trade, shipping, and the acquisition of land, similar to that recorded in the protocol concluded on the subject of the Sulu Archipelago. Some correspondence ensued between this country and Spain upon the matter, and her Majesty's Government offered to recognise Spanish sovereignty to the same extent as Germany. Señor Moret, however, pointed out to Lord Salisbury that he could not suppose England was in need of a naval establishment in that part of the Pacific Ocean, and so trusted that point would be waived by us when claiming to participate in all the advantages which accrued to Germany under the convention concluded between that Power and Spain; whereupon Lord Salisbury did not urge his demand; and on January 8 last her Majesty's Government agreed to recognise the sovereignty of Spain over the Caroline and Pelew Islands to the same extent as such sovereignty has been or may hereafter be recognised by the German Government; and the Spanish Government in return agreed that whatsoever privileges, advantages, favours, or immunities have been or may hereafter be accorded in these islands to the Government or subjects of the German Empire shall be immediately and unconditionally accorded to the Government or subjects of Great Britain. It was for the purpose of this protocol that the limits of the Caroline and Pelew Archipelagos were fixed as indicated by the ¹⁰ Spanish line in the chart.

The Ellice group, north-west of Samoa, consist of Mitchell Island, where the Peruvian slavers carried on their nefarious trade in 1863; Ellice, Tracy, De Peyster, Netherland, Spëiden, Hudson, and St. Augustine Islands.

The Gilbert group, better known as the Kingsmills, include about fifteen islands, the more important of which are Drummond, Hurd, Rotch, Francis, and Peru. The natives, a degraded race, have suffered much from their acquaintance with low Europeans.

I have already said my say about Samoa in this Review,¹¹ so do not propose to enter again into the internal affairs of these islands.

At the present time, so far as we know, Samoa is in a state of quasi-tranquillity. A commission composed of British, German, and

¹⁰ The equator + 11° north latitude, and 132° + 164° of longitude east of Greenwich.

¹¹ *Nineteenth Century*, February 1886.

American representatives is sitting on the spot with a view of bringing about a final settlement of disputes and arranging some form of government that will be satisfactory to all parties concerned. Their report is to be submitted to a meeting of British, German, and American diplomats, to be held at Washington, where everything will be overhauled and the question of Samoa and her future relations to the Great Powers finally settled. I have, however, good reason for believing that Germany wishes to settle the matter by obtaining possession of Upolu, the most important island of the group, possessing the three fine harbours of Apia, Saluafata, and Safata, and offering America Tutuila, with the splendid harbour of Pagopago (already practically under their control), in which event Great Britain would have to be content with Savaii, the poorest island of the three so far as soil is concerned, and possessing but one small harbour, that of Mataatua, and even this is unsafe from November to February, when the north-westerly gales prevail. The adoption of any such scheme means good-bye to British and Colonial trade in Samoa unless transacted through German and American merchants. The fact that Samoa lies in the direct highway to New Zealand, and is only 630 miles from Suva, the chief port of Fiji, must not be lost sight of in the settlement; and if British commerce is to do any good in Samoa in the event of Apia going to Germany we must endeavour to secure the harbours of Saluafata and Safata, in Upolu. Saluafata is regarded by men of nautical experience as being equal in security to Apia, and although only a few miles apart the nature of the country is not such as to allow much communication by land between the two settlements; but a considerable trade would probably spring up along the sea coast.

The best form of native government that would be able to rule the country and maintain its position with foreign Powers is that which was in existence when Steinberger arrived in Samoa—a house of representatives and a house of nobles, with two kings possessing joint power.

The Solomon Archipelago, now divided by the sphere of influence line existing between this country and Germany, and extending N.W. and S.E. for about 600 miles, is composed of eight or ten principal islands and many others smaller in size and comparatively unknown.

On the German side lie Bougainville, a very mountainous island; Bourka, Choiseul, and Ysabel, valuable chiefly on account of its valuable ebony and satinwood.

On the British side is Treasury Island, called 'the British naval depôt'; Malayta; Guadalcanar; New Georgia; and San Chrisoval Islands.

The Phoenix Islands, seven or eight in number, are composed of the most part of coral and sand, and the vegetation is stunted.

Charlotte or Santa Cruz Islands consist of seven fairly large and several smaller islands. Santa Cruz, about fifteen to sixteen miles in length, is well wooded and watered. The natives, a fine-looking race, are treacherous, but exhibit great ingenuity in building houses, constructing canoes, and making mats.

The Fiji Islands are too well known to call for remark here, and as they are a Crown colony information concerning them is easily obtainable.

New Caledonia was discovered by Captain Cook in 1774, but in 1854 passed into the hands of the French, who use it chiefly as a convict establishment. The island lies about 270 miles E.N.E. of Queensland, and is about 200 miles long and 30 broad. It possesses two secure harbours at Port Balade and Port St. Vincent.

The Loyalty Islands, distant about sixty miles from New Caledonia, consisting of Maré Lefu, Uea, and the dependencies, are also French possessions.

Nieué, called Savage Island by Captain Cook, is about thirty-six miles in circumference, and the land ascends in places to 200 feet. In several places anchorage is to be found, and plenty of fresh water exists near the coast. This island is one of those specially excepted in the declaration between Germany and Great Britain, owing no doubt to the trade carried on with the natives by the Godeffroy firm, who maintain an agent among them.

The New Hebrides Islands and their relations with France and England have lately¹⁹ been discussed by me in these pages, but several months have elapsed since the French authorities, in order to avenge reputed massacres and enforce native obedience to a trading company, deemed it necessary to utilise the services of two men-of-war, land soldiers, and hoist the tricolour flag in these islands.

Since the occurrence of this unconstitutional act on the part of French colonists the negotiations concerning the proposed bargain with France respecting the New Hebrides have come to an end. In spite, however, of remonstrance from the mother country and the Australian colonies, the French troops still continue in possession, a fact which exasperates colonial opinion and continues to call forth severe criticisms from Australian statesmen. In the interests alike of ourselves and Australasia the French soldiers must go, and it is not too much to ask that France should be called upon to give some further assurance that she will assist Great Britain in endeavouring to support the independence of the natives and carry out by deeds as well as words the understanding of 1878.

It is, too, of the utmost importance for the well-being of the natives of these islands, as well as to meet the requirement of British subjects in Australia and New Zealand, that there should exist in the New Hebrides some form of government which can insure pro-

¹⁹ *Nineteenth Century*, July 1886.

tection of life and property and facilitate commercial intercourse in the Pacific, and I would suggest the formation of a government that, while leaving the islands practically independent, would represent native interests as well as those of France, Great Britain, and Australasia.

The Tonga Archipelago consists of about a hundred islands and islets, which may be divided into three groups—Tonga, Ilapai, and Vavao. Like Samoa the formation is volcanic, and Tofoa is merely an active volcano. The group is rich in cocoanuts, and the natives make large quantities of copra, which is exported to Europe by the Hamburg firm of Messrs. Godeffroy and Co., whose headquarters are at Apia, in Samoa. The largest and most important island of the group is Tongatabu, situated in the extreme south. Here is a good harbour, guarded by immense coral reefs. If this island should fall into the hands of a foreign Power the position of the Fijis will indeed be perilous; and in the unhappy event of a European war the little Crown colony will be surrounded by ships of possible hostile Powers, and Great Britain, with valuable possessions in Vancouver and Sydney, will have no island in the 6,830 miles of ocean that separate these two ports wherein to obtain coals or fresh supplies. Surely no time should be lost in securing possession of Tongatabu.

The government, which consists of a king and a parliament of chiefs, is officially recognised by the Great Powers; and our relations with the King of Tonga and his people, both politically and commercially, are fixed by the treaty of friendship concluded between the two Governments in 1879.

On the 19th of February, 1844, the Tongans, through their king, expressed a desire to become British subjects. This memorial remained unanswered for four years, when the request was renewed by the chiefs of the islands, and finally declined by Lord Palmerston.

With very few exceptions the bulk of the trade with the Pacific Islands is carried on by Hamburg merchants and their agents. Messrs. Godeffroy and Co., who have a network of agencies, do a very large trade with the natives. Their method is to trust an agent with goods and expect from him within reasonable time a return at a fixed rate; but they pay no salaries, and are very careful to select men who can not only speak the language of the place but also keep on good terms with the inhabitants and hold their tongues about their masters' business when meeting with white men.

Englishmen are far behindhand in the way of commerce and enterprise. Wherever there is money to be made there you will find the Hamburg merchant, no matter how remote the spot or how unhealthy the region. Why at Guacipeti, through which town all the mining business of that district passes, not a single British house of business exists, and this large and profitable work is carried on solely

by German and Venezuelan firms; and the same is the case at Bolivar. The sooner our system of trading abroad is altered the better; and if we are to do any good in the Pacific we must employ men who know their work and can do it. A German looks before he leaps, but having leaped he remains where he lands until he has got every farthing out of the place and the people. An Englishman leaps without looking, and as soon as he has done his business either goes elsewhere, or remains thinking everything and everybody about him a great bore and acting accordingly.

Then again there is another difference. The German is educated not only commercially but diplomatically; he knows the language of the place he is going to and can always speak English, whereas the Englishman may know a smattering of French and German but is totally ignorant of the commercial or native language of the people among whom he is trying to push his trade.

There is every inducement to our countrymen to extend their commerce in the Pacific. The name of Englishman is associated in the minds of the native races with a feeling of friendship—the Queen of England is looked upon by the native mind as the helper of the defenceless and the avenger of crime, and in Samoa many of the native girls are named 'Victoria,' after her Majesty—while that of Frenchman (Tangata Napoleon) is to many a word of fear. The word Spaniard (Pamoia) expresses a meaning similar to 'fiend,' while Callao might be construed 'hell.' The native feeling is against the Spaniards because of the treachery and violence of the Peruvian shipmasters who were engaged in the labour traffic.

Germans alone are our rivals. Their name at present has not been dragged in the mud, and the natives are willing to give their agents the preference, for the German firms are politic and treat the natives with kindness, while if their pay is small it is at any rate certain.

The German method of mixing up consular and commercial work acts very well from the Bismarck point of view, seeing that Germany does not colonise, but only protects. Prince Bismarck's principle is to follow his traders when they establish themselves in territory under no civilised jurisdiction, and to afford them protection, not against competition by levying differential duties, but against direct aggression from without. The German Chancellor's intention is to adhere to the statement he made last year, that the German flag shall only go where German trade has already established a footing. Hence the German consuls in the Pacific work hand and glove with Hamburg merchants, and together push the commerce of their country and extend the territory of the German Empire.

Our method of procedure is widely different. We leave British commerce to look after itself, and if an enterprising trader goes a-trading, why, he does so at his own risk, and does not carry the British flag

with him. This is all very well if we had no rivals in the field, but while the Germans are pursuing tactics that continue to bring grist to their mill, it is simple folly to allow our consular system to go on in the same old groove, and make no effort to secure some of the crumbs that now go to make up the Hamburg loaf.

If British trade interests are to cope with those of Germany in the Pacific, we must establish agents in the various centres of commercial activity that are rapidly springing up in that hitherto comparatively unknown sphere. The mixed nature of the German consul's duties is no guide to us, inasmuch as our policy is not on all fours with that of Germany. We must, however, do something. Why not start a system of Pacific commercial agents, whose duties would be not only to tell British merchants where to find the best market for their goods, but also to give information of a reliable kind about the natives themselves and their disposition to trade and barter? Make the British consul a diplomatic agent pure and simple, and confine him to his instructions. Care of course must be taken that these commercial agents are men of tact and sound character, and while able and anxious to do their best for the interests of British trade, will at the same time do nothing to imperil the *entente cordiale* at present existing between European Powers in these regions.

In order to cope with the increasing spirit of annexation in the Pacific developed lately by France and Germany, it is a matter of paramount necessity to Australia that she should possess a navy. The present system of naval defence would be quite inadequate to protect her shores, much less secure the coasting trade in the event of a European war. Besides, what guarantee have the colonies that at the first outcry of war the Imperial navy, being entirely out of their control, might not leave them for fields of greater activity. During the late Russian scare there was not a ship on the coast capable of catching a Russian cruiser, and only one able to fight with an armoured vessel. Even the late Sir Peter Scratchley felt it his duty to give up H.M.S. 'Wolverene' for defence purposes, and chartered the 'Governor Blackall' to take him to New Guinea. Under these circumstances it is scarcely a matter of surprise that the proposals made to the Australian Government by Admiral Tryon concerning contributions to the cost of the Imperial navy are not being received with avidity. The colonies are not likely to pay for a navy to be controlled entirely by the mother country, without being first satisfied that their shores will be sufficiently protected at all hazards and at all times; nor are the past proceedings with regard to New Guinea and the present negotiations concerning the New Hebrides likely to inspire confidence.

Besides the Australian shores and coasting trade, there is the highway to India and China from New Zealand to protect, on the

one side, and the trade route from Vancouver to Sydney, in addition to the mail highway to San Francisco and the probable route to Panama, on the other, every one of which passes uncomfortably near islands in the possession or under the control of a foreign Power. In the event of a European war it would not be possible for the Imperial navy, as at present constituted, to protect both the colonies and the Pacific; and as Australia and New Zealand are practically powerless to help themselves, the sooner this important question is settled the better for all parties.

Either the Imperial and colonial navy must be one, the colonies paying their share of the cost and having a voice in the control of the ships, or we must build the colonies' ships to their order, and let them manage their own navy, merely paying a subsidy for use of the vessels in matters where Imperial interests are chiefly concerned.

The necessity for unity in matters affecting Imperial interests cannot be too strongly impressed upon Australasia. If Imperial and colonial authorities are to carry out in unison the future policy of the Pacific, Australasia must speak with one voice. Once allow the rights and wrongs of individual colonies to enter the arena of Pacific politics and hesitation is sure to follow, the amalgamation will become a farce, and instead of a result brought about by a combination of ideas focussed on one point, we shall have a babel of voices but no decisive action, and in the end the allied forces will have to concentrate their attention in solving the problem of how best to shut the stable door after the horse is stolen.

Inter-colonial jealousy is far too prevalent in Australasia. Victoria and New South Wales are the chief offenders in this respect, with New Zealand not far behind. Examples are not wanting. Take for instance the New Guinea question. No sooner did Victoria advocate its annexation by England than New South Wales began to oppose the proposition, notwithstanding the fact that the Government of the latter colony were the first to advise its being annexed by Britain after the refusal of the Imperial Powers to recognise the action of Queensland. Again, while Victoria was striving hard to get the Enabling Bill passed through the House of Commons, New South Wales was apparently indifferent to the result, and now, together with New Zealand, objects to join in the Federal movement. Then take the proposal to establish a parcels post between Great Britain and Australia: while the Postmaster-General of New South Wales thought the project somewhat premature, the corresponding official in Victoria saw that the difficulties standing in the way of its accomplishment, so far as his colony was concerned, could be easily overcome. More lately we have seen New South Wales assenting to a bargain between Great Britain and France concerning the New Hebrides, while the other colonies were

vigorously opposing this transaction. Only three years ago the famous memorandum of the Agents-General to Lord Derby respecting colonial ideas in the policy of the Pacific was prevented from being the unanimous voice of Australasia by the withdrawal at the last moment of South Australia. On the other hand, in the action taken by New South Wales and Victoria during the late Egyptian campaign, we have Victoria as the aggressor. The mother colony had scarcely offered to send troops to the Soudan before Victoria began to throw cold water on Sir Bede Dally's proposition. However, as soon as the offer was accepted by the War Office, that colony veered round, and begged to have a finger in the pie.

The New Zealand House of Representatives, some few months since, after a debate on the question of Federation, passed a resolution 'that in view of the little consideration that has been given to the subject of Federation in the colony, it is undesirable for Parliament in the present session to legislate upon the matter, but at the same time strongly urges the necessity of some form of Imperial Federation.'

It is a well-known fact among men who have practically studied on the spot the internal politics of Australia and New Zealand, that colonial legislators are not in harmony on the subject of Australasian Federation.

Imperial Federation, on the other hand, finds some favour in the eyes of the Colonial Parliaments, because it will give each colony an additional status, greater or less according to the scheme that is yet to be developed, and at the same time not take away from or undermine the value of existing institutions; while Australasian Federation tends to place the colonies upon a more equal footing, and intimates a change in their constitutional powers, a revolutionary proceeding extremely distasteful to the parties directly interested.

New South Wales boldly asserts its intention to work out its country in its own way and in its own time, and refuses to be dictated to by other colonies, whose interests that colony considers to be of less magnitude than her own.

Victoria believes she is the first colony in Australia, and if Federation of the colonies is to take place, her position must be recognised, and Melbourne made the basis of operations. There can be no doubt that Melbourne is a finer city than Sydney, and nearer to England, and that Victoria is a more advanced colony than New South Wales. But then, if we except gold, the resources of New South Wales are greater than those of Victoria, and the mother colony has the advantage of possessing abundance of coal, whereas none has been discovered in Victoria. In my opinion Albany, which is the key to Australia, should, in the event of a capital becoming necessary, be the place chosen.

New Zealand is opposed to Federation, because New Zealand is

of opinion that she is the colony of the future, and that the time is not so very far distant when her importance will be more openly recognised by the civilised world. She is jealous, and justly so, of her individuality, and sees no immediate necessity to federate with colonies that are hundreds of miles distant, while, strange to say, the fact that their interests are to a great extent similar to her own does not appear to act as an incentive in the matter.

Colonial politicians at home and abroad are well aware of the value to the Empire of some scheme of Imperial Federation, but the more thoughtful and practical among them know equally well that as long as we continue to rule our colonies on the present lines Imperial Federation is manifestly impossible. In view, then, of the importance of an Imperial-colonial Pacific policy, it is time to consider the situation, and if, after mature consideration, it should be found advantageous to the Empire to alter the existing mode of administering Australasian affairs, it becomes imperative upon Imperial legislators to consult with the colonies upon the best system to be adopted, and, having sought their advice, to act in concert with them. What the colonies really require is a body of men at home, possessing at once commanding influence and official status, who can speak to the English people with the voice of authorities affecting Australasia. If each colony had such a representative, who could appeal directly to the English people, the result would be beneficial both to us and to them.

the Agents-General exercise this authority.

On paper they certainly have great power, but they do not possess influence, but their power of effecting the execution of their suggestions concerning the question, is practically nil. The area of interests so varied, when compared with Great Britain, that these interests require a Board of Advice that includes representatives of all possessions. It is equally manifestly impossible for the Colonial Office, able though it is, to do the work of the Pacific without more extensive organisation of the Foreign Office. A Board of Advice, satisfactory alike to the colonists and to the Government, requires similar aid. I would suggest the formation of a Colonial Governing Body, in which each colony should be represented in proportion to its area and population, rather than the former; the members to be appointed by the Colonies, and to hold office for a period of three years, to enable the more able of colonial politicians to be represented, and yet only deprive the colonies of their own representatives. These representatives, being in communication with their individual Governments,

could discuss in open debate questions involving Imperial and colonial interests, and so enable the British press to ventilate alike Imperial and colonial opinions upon questions where the interests of the two are so closely connected.

The conclusions come to would be drafted into a Bill, to be taken in charge by the Government official representing the colonies in the Imperial Parliament, and the House of Commons would in the ordinary course of events debate upon the Bill thus introduced, and on its second reading either approve or reject it, or, admitting the principle of the Bill, allow it to proceed to Committee, with a view of amending the clauses which Imperial legislators considered objectionable or unworkable.

C. KINLOCH COOKE.