

State Education.

A Paper Read Before the Otago Schoolmasters' Association.

By Mr. Robert Stout.

MR PRESIDENT,—When, four weeks ago, I consented to introduce for discussion at this meeting, the subject of Free and Compulsory Education, I stated that I had not prepared any paper on the subject and that my other engagements would preclude me, from giving it that time, and consideration, which it deserved. I have found, the more I studied the subject, that I had underrated the difficulties I laboured under, in making remarks on a topic of such magnitude and importance. It appeared to me, however, that there lay at the root of Free and Compulsory Education, the broad question of the duty of the State to educate; and that until this question had been disposed of, there could be little hope of any debate, of much usefulness, for there would be a perpetual recurrence and reference to this question of State Education. I have, therefore, preferred to ask you to discuss this question of State Education, or the duty of the State to educate, before the details of the amount of the State Grant, or the right of compulsion he considered. I may grant at once, what cannot, I think, be denied, namely, if it be the duty of the State to educate gratuitously, the youth in its domains, it is bound to compel attendance at its schools. It is, I know, urged, that it is the duty of the State to compel attendance at school, or as it has been put by Mr Mill, to require a certain proficiency in knowledge from the citizens, notwithstanding that the State does not educate; to this question, however, I shall allude towards the close of my paper.

Before I begin, let me once, and for all, state that I am greatly indebted to the writings of Mr Herbert Spencer for many of my arguments, and that I have consulted several works on Political Economy, History, &c. I make this statement, so that I may not be accused of borrowing other people's ideas without due recognition.

In determining whether it is the duty of the State to educate, the question arises—What is the duty of the State? What limit? ought to be set to Governmental interference? Humboldt, in his 'Sphere and Duties of Government,' has answered "security and protection;" while Spencer, echoing his ideas in his work 'Social Statics,' has earned this statement to its legitimate issue. I thoroughly believe in this definition of a State's function, and indeed, in theory, it is one that is generally granted to be rigid. In practice, however, the philosophers of expediency set right and justice aside, following Burke in his statement, that "politics ought to be adjusted, not to human reasoning, but to human nature; of which the reason is but a part, and by no means the greatest part," and as the same great orator said in his speech on American Taxation "I am not here going into the distinction of rights, nor attempting to mark their boundaries. I do not cuter into these metaphysical distinctions." But what is a State? Is it not a voluntary political association, for mutual protection? Of course individualism must to a certain extent be sacrificed, but sacrificed only to this extent, that the rights of all shall be respected. And the State, by assuming functions, which really are not necessary for the protection of the life and property of the citizens, ceases to be a protector, and becomes a tyrant; and the form of government, under which this wrong is committed, by whatever name it is called, is, so far, despotic and unjust. The surrender of the rights of the individual is often greatly exaggerated, and as has been remarked by an able writer, the more liberty an individual acquires in a State, so much the more is there liberty in that State. We must admit, and keep in remembrance during this discussion, that there is a moral law binding on the State to the individual, as much as one binding on the letter to the former. I speak then not of mere legal rights, of the social rules which at present guide us, but I base my assertion of State duties On what ought to be—on what is morally and theoretically just. I appeal to the higher law of justice and right.

But to come to the question to be discussed, and not forgetting the definition of a State's duty I Have adopted, I ask what is education? For the onus of proving that state education is proper—is right—lies not on the opponents of State education, but on its supporters. Suppose, as an opponent of State education I ask—What is it? Where is the line to be drawn—in age, in learning? How old should a person be before being relieved from the watchful eye of the State educator? How large should be his acquirement's? Where between a dame school, and the most comprehensive University curriculum, is the line to be drawn? At the three R's, answer you? Spencer, using the Socratic method, at once says—"What peculiar quality is there in reading, writing, and arithmetic which gives the embryo citizen a right to have them imparted to him, but which quality

is not shared in geography, and history, and drawing, and the natural sciences? Must calculation be taught because it is useful? Why, so is geometry, as the carpenter and mason will tell you; so is chemistry, as we may gather from dyers and bleachers; so is physiology, as is abundantly proved by the ill-health written on so many faces. . . . Where is the unit of measure, by which we may determine the respective values of different kinds of knowledge?" The three R's are not education; nay, the sciences I have enumerated do not constitute a sound education. If the State were simply to teach even what is termed a [*unclear: souud*] *English education* (whatever that signifies) is its work accomplished? Mazzini states—"You know how to read. What avails this knowledge, if you are unfit to judge between the books containing error, and those containing truth? You have learned to communicate your thoughts to your fellow men in writing. What avails this knowledge if your thoughts are the mere reflex of your own egotism?" So for, then, it see as there is a difficulty, I had almost said an impossibility, in determining what is this education the State ought to provide. And the question of age will just be as difficult. At what age ought the State schoolmaster, to give up his charge? Suppose a man ignorant of political economy, and called upon, not only to exercise the franchise, but to fulfil the honorable duties of a legislator for this State, ought he not, at the expense of the State, to be made acquainted with his duties? nay, to be compelled to study what are the elements of his profession—what are the three R's of a political education? Where are you, I ask, to draw the line? Then again, we witness often in a community agitations arising, demanding laws founded on theories long ago exploded, is it not the duty of the State to step in here, and with judicious instruction, train its citizens in the way they should walk?

But granting that we have determined what this education is, which the State should furnish, and the class to whom it should be given, we may be met by this query: You State educators, who are carefully tending the minds of the embryotic citizens what about their bodies? Is physical health of such small importance that you pass it by as unworthy of notice? Here are citizens poorly clad, poorly fed; citizens who pay no attention Co regimen, who, careless of the change of the seasons, lay themselves open to attacks of many diseases, in spits of your physiological tuition. For instance, I read in a report by Dr Simon, the following:—"Let any person devote an hour to visiting some very poor neighborhood in the metropolis, or in almost any of our large towns. List him breathe its air, taste its water, eat its bread. Let him think of human life struggling there for years. Let him fancy what it would be to himself to live there in that beastly degradation of stink, fed with such bread, drinking such water. Let him enter some house there at hazard, and, heeding where he treads, follow the guidance of his outraged nose to the yard (if there be one) or the cellar. Let him talk to the inmates; let him hear what is thought of the bone boiler next door, or the slaughterhouse behind; what of the sewer grating before the door; what of the Irish basket-makers up-stairs, twelve in a room, who came in after the hopping, and got fever; what of the artisan's dead body, stretched on his widow's one bed beside her living children." And I might quote other dreadful details, but I forbear. I ask then, why are you to stop at education? Is the body not to be cared for? Ought the State not to physic its citizens at fitting; periods? nay, and when they are no more, prepare their bodies for the "city of the silent," and carry out the function laid down by an enthusiast, give every man a decent Christian burial.

But here I may be met by the assertion, education will right all these things. Knowledge is power, say some. It will fit all of us, for our duties to the State, and this is the proper sphere of State Education. Its aim is to make us fit for our social duties, and thus greater security will be given to liberty, and hence the State, by educating, is fulfilling its duty as protector of life and property. Well, what pray is a "good citizen," what is your ideal person fit for social duties and liberties? And who, pray, is to decide what a "good citizen" is? The State, say you. What? The Government to decide on a good citizen, and train all the embryos after this "golden calf"—using its own discretion first as to what a good citizen is, and also as to its method of training. This moulding must, I suppose, admit of no tampering, Ruthlessly must the State wield its power. Liberty of thought, or of action must be silenced. Private schools, except duly licensed, and inspected, will he unknown, us in Holland. Every teacher will be watched, and *quis custodiet eustodias?* Books, except up to the regulation standard, will be banished, and who the Commission are to be who are to frame the "index expurgatorius," I know not. Nay, we will have, as in China, the most, minute regulations. The rules of propriety will be rigidly enforced. The "good citizen" will be guided by rules of sitting, talking, walking, bowing, reading, eating, dressing, etc., as in the Celestial Empire. And what amusements will be permitted, will also have to be decided. I may, however, be charged with exaggeration. Some may still say, dare you deny that education does not fit us for our social duties? I reply not necessarily, Lieber, whom none can accuse of being an anti-State educationalist, says, in his work on Civil Liberty, "Education is not liberty itself, nor does it necessarily lead to it. Prussia is one of the best educated countries (written in 1853), but liberty has not yet found a dwelling place there. The Chinese Government is avowedly based upon general education, and democratic equality in the hierarchy of officers, but China has never made a step in the path of liberty. Education is almost like the alphabet it teaches—it depends upon what we use it for. Many despotic Governments have found it their interest to promote popular education, and the schoolmaster cannot establish or maintain liberty." Must it not be

granted that there is an education of the faculties, which neither books nor schools can impart to a people, but which is necessary for the fulfilment of social duties? And then Mill, who is in favor of free and compulsory education, has to admit that this theory of a model citizen is utterly untenable. He says: "The objections which are urged with reason against State education do not apply to the enforcement of education by the State, *but to the State's taking upon itself to direct that education*— mark that—which is a totally different thing. That the whole, or any large part, of the education of the people should be in the State's hands, I go as far as any one in deprecating. All that has been said of the importance of individuality of character, and diversity of opinions and modes of conduct, involves, as of the same unspeakable importance, diversity of education. A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people *to be exactly like one another*; and, as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the (Government, whether this be a monarch, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation; *in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by a natural tendency to one over the body.*" So much for the good model citizen, trained to his social duties, such moulding being necessary for liberty.

It may, however, be said by some, as it has been said by Mill, "In the matter of education, the intervention of government is justifiable, because the case is one in which the interest and judgment of the consumer, are not sufficient security for the goodness of the commodity." Now, why should education be alone singled out as a subject in which "the interest and judgment of the consumer, independent of the State's interference, shall not be the proper test." If *this assertion* be sufficient to insure the State's interference, clearly the State will be bound in other matters to see that "the interest and judgment of the consumer" are sufficient guides to the citizen. What we eat, do our interest and judgment always lead us to a sound decision? Do we always drink what is good for our health? Are there none in a community ruined by intemperance, and by want of using proper means of sustaining health? On such an assumption, Henry VIII's Statute declaring it penal to sell any pins but such as are "double-headed, and bate their head soldered fast to the shank, and well smoothed: the shank well shaven, the point well and round filed, and sharpened;" and the regulation of James I. fixing the quantity of ale to be sold for a penny, were perhaps justified by the lack of "interest and judgment" in the consumer. This argument, as is well known, is the stock one in favour of State Religion—the masses are not fit to distinguish true from false religion. Indeed, this theory carried out strictly in practice, would justify all the oppression, and all the governmental interference that has, disgraced our historic annals. For instance, a Mr Rugg, (M.R.C.S.) has published "a pamphlet to point out the injury inflicted upon poor ignorant householders by the adulteration of milk," and proposing as a remedy that there shall be government officers to test the milk, and confiscate it when not sound, inspect cow-sheds, &c., &c. And I read in a Melbourne paper, of the 16th of April, an article urging the Parliament of Victoria, to pass a statute to compel all householders to ventilate their buildings according to Mr Arnott's plan, *viz.*, inserting near the ceiling, a valve to open in the chimney flue, when the fires are not lighted: also, see 'Lancet,' October 1868, p. 531, as so State medicine. As to its being said education is peculiar, it is something not so tangible as milk, medicine, &c., it may be answered that every meddling, by a government, has the same excuse to back it. And were I even to admit that the consumer is not a proper judge, government interference would not be justifiable for two reasons, 1st That the race is progressive, and that every gratuitous aid stops progress, *e.g.*, There is a great amount of bad farming in this Province, would the government be justified in superintending all the farms and dictating to the tillers of the soil, what crops to sow, and when? Can we not see we are gradually learning experience, and no forcing process will do us good. No pupil will ever learn to write if the teacher always holds his pen. No, the best teacher will allow the pupil to make mistakes, and blots innumerable, he well knowing that though at first the writing is not good, yet that his pupil will grow in knowledge. And so ought we to allow the masses, if they be incompetent to judge what is good education and what is not, to grow out of their imperfections and incompetency. But, 2nd. It is assumed that the government is a sufficient judge of the "goodness of the commodity." It is asserted that the interest and judgment of the government are sufficient security. Is this so? To whose judgment must we bow? To an intellectual priesthood, the dream of the Positivists? Not so in a democracy, for there the mass govern. And who is the mass? Is it not for its guidance that this interference is deemed necessary? Some one may say, but when a Government is what it should be, then.—True; but this is just, the reason why interference is demanded, it is because people are not what they should be. No, as I said before, the world cannot be reformed in a day. We must allow for its growth—for the gradual evolution that often, despite our efforts to delay progress, is gradually raising humanity. Spencer has illustrated this idea very happily. "Did the reader ever watch a boy in the first heat of a gardening fit? The sight is an amusing, and not uninteresting one. Probably a slice of border—some couple of square yards or so—has been made over to him for his exclusive use. No small accession of dignity, and not a little pride of proprietorship, does he exhibit. So long as the enthusiasm lasts, he never tires of contemplating his territory; and every companion, and every visitor with whom the liberty can be taken, is pretty sure to be met with the request, 'Come and see my garden.' Note chiefly, however, with what anxiety the growth of a few scrubby plants is regarded. Three or four times a day will the little urchin rush out

to look at them. How prorokingly slow their progress seems to him. Each morning, on getting up, he hopes to find some marked change; and lo, every thing appears just as it did before. When *will* the blossoms come out? For nearly a week has some forward bud been flourishing with the triumph of a first flower, and still it remains closed. Surely there must be something wrong! Perhaps the leaves have stuck fast. Ah! that is the reason, no doubt. And so ten to one you shall some day catch our young florist very busily engaged in pulling open the calyx, and, it may be, trying to unfold a few of the petals." Somewhat like this childish impatience is the feeling exhibited by not a few State educationists.

The convenient assumption, that the Government, in education, as was once believed to be the case in religion, is an infallible judge, is the basis of their interference. But one quotation, and I am done on this head; it is to show that the interference does not lead to the results anticipated,—and from Buckle: He says, speaking of the influence of religion, literature, and government:—"The German intellect, stimulated by the French into a sudden growth, has been irregularly developed, and thus hurried into an activity greater than the average civilisation of the country requires. The consequence is, that there is no nation in Europe in which we find so wide an interval between the highest and the lowest minds. The German philosophers possess a learning, and a reach of thought, which places them at the head of the civilised world. The German people are more superstitious, more prejudiced, and, notwithstanding the care which the Government takes of their education, more really ignorant, and more unfit to guide themselves, than are the inhabitants of either France or England." And, in a note, he adds—two points I will refer to:—"1st. The notorious fact, that the German people, notwithstanding their so-called education, are unfit to take any share in political matters, and have no aptitude for the practical and administrative parts of Government. 2nd. The fact, equally notorious to those who have studied the subject, that there are more popular superstitions in Prussia, the most educated part of Germany, than there are in England, and that the tenacity with which men cling to them is greater in Prussia than in England. For illustration of the practical working in individual cases of compulsory education, and of the hardship it causes, see a scandalous occurrence related in Laing's Notes of a Traveller; and as to the physical evils produced by German education, see Phillips on Scrofula." So much for State efforts and the results.

One of the greatest—indeed, it has been termed the greatest—argument for State education is that it prevents crime. Now, I hold this has not been proved. Remember I am keeping to the basis of what is termed "a sound English education." If we were to confine our attention solely to the statistics of the number of ignorant criminals to be found in the gaols, in comparison with the number of educated, and to this *alone*, it could not be proved; but even granting, which need not be granted, that the number of ignorant prisoners exceeds that of educated ones, does that prove that education prevents, and ignorance causes crime? It is, surely, quite possible for ignorance and crime to coexist, and yet the one not be the cause of the other. There is no need that ignorance be the cause and crime the effect. Burke asks, in one of his speeches, "May not a man have enjoyed better health during the time that he walked with an oaken stick, than afterwards, when he changed it for a cane, without supposing like the Druids, that there are occult virtues in oak, and that the stick and health were cause and effect." I fear there has been a too great tendency to overlook the difference between coexistence and Cause and effect. Spencer, on this point, states, "Before any inference can be drawn, it must be shown that these instructed and uninstructed convicts come from the *equal* sections of society—alike in *all other respects* but that of knowledge; similar in rank, occupation, having similar advantages, laboring under similar temptations.* * * The many ignorant criminals belong to a class most unfavorably circumstanced; whilst the few educated ones are from a class comparatively favored." To attribute crime to ignorance is about as wise, and as near the truth, as to blame, as some doctors have done, bad ventilation and want of cleanliness as the cause of theft. I do not intend to quote statistics. I may refer to Mr [*unclear*: Semerville's] Physical Geography, in which it is stated that education prevents crime, and statistics are given to prove such an assertion; but they utterly fail to do so. I may mention, however, the testimony of the author of London Labor and London Poor, and that of Mr Fletcher, an Inspector of Schools. The latter sums up this experience thus:—"Down to this period, therefore, the comparison of the criminal and educational returns of this, any more than of any other country of Europe, has afforded no sound statistical evidence in favor, and as little against, the moral effects associated with instruction as actually disseminated among the people." To which may be added the evidence of Messrs Guirea and Dupin, who have shown that the most highly educated districts in France are the most criminal.

Coleridge has termed a knave, a fool with a circumbendibus. Well, education only widens the circumbendibus; it does not make the knave honest. If education prevented crime, then all educated men would be honest, and all uneducated dishonest Bacon and Napoleon would have been shining moral lights, while some of earth's greatest heroes would have, had they got their merits, ended their days in gaol. What is this education supposed to give us, that it will hinder from crime?—a knowledge of the consequences of crime? Why what drunkard does not know his doom? What convict—once imprisoned—knows not what he has to expect on a repetition of his offence? What dissolute physician knows not that he is hastening his ruin? And, to tread on what is considered more sacred ground, how is it that all those, who have become members of a Christian

Church, do not follow the great injunction—Sin no more? Education alone prevents crime Why has not a priesthood, armed with the terrors of the Church, not; stamped out immorality? backed, as it was, with a superstitious regard, which has existed until the present day. No, crime must be cured, not by State interference alone; there must be an adaptability of the man to the social state: without this, crime will continue; and though among the educated it *may* assume a different phase—though forgery may take the place of robbery, yet it will exist.

But I shall now turn to some objections which may be urged against education by the State And 1st. I hold that the State is violating its functions by becoming the educator, I have stated that the sphere and duty of a State are security and protection. And, keeping to this definition, I shall again make a quotation from Spencer, to prove my contention, because he has illustrated the subject in a more forcible manner than I can do:—

"Your taxes are heavier this year than last,' complains a citizen to the Government' 'How is it?'

'The sums for these new school-houses, and for the salaries of the masters and mistresses, have increased the draught upon our Exchequer,' replies the Government.

'School-houses, masters, and mistresses—what have I to do with these? You are not charging me with the cost of them, are you?'

'Yes.'

'Why I never authorised you to do so.'

'True; but Parliament, or in other words, the majority of the nation, has decided that the education of the young shall be entrusted to us, and has authorised us to raise such funds as may be necessary for fulfilling this trust.'

'But suppose I wish to superintend the education of my children myself?'

'You may do as you please [but this would not be granted by Mill, etc.]; but you must pay for the privilege we offer, whether you avail yourself of it or not. Even if you have no children you must still pay.'

'And what if I refuse?'

'Why, were we to act up to old precedents, we should punish you; but as things now stand, we shall content ourselves with giving notice that you have outlawed yourself.'

'Now, I have no wish to do that. I cannot at present dispense with your protection.'

'Very well, then, you must agree to our terms, and pay your share of the new tax.'

'See, now, what a dilemma you place me in. As I dare not relinquish the protection I entered into political combination to obtain, I must either give you a part of my property for nothing, or, should I make a point of having some equivalent, I must cease to do that which my natural affections prompt. Will you answer me a few questions.'

'Certainly.'

'What is it that you, as a natural executive, have been appointed for? Is it not to maintain the rights of those she employ you; or, in other words, to guarantee to each *the fullest* freedom for the exercise of his faculties, compatible with the equal freedom of all others?'

"It has been so decided"

'And it has been also decided that you are justified in diminishing this freedom, only to such extent, as may be needful for preserving the remainder, has it not?'

'That is evidently a corollary.'

'Exactly. And now, let me ask, what is this property, this money, of which, in the shape of taxes, you are demanding from me, an additional amount? Is it not that which enables me to get food clothing, and better recreation; or, to repeat the original expression, that on which I depend for the exercise of most of my faculties?'

'It is.'

'Therefore to decrease my property, is to decrease my freedom to exercise my faculties, is it not?'

'Clearly.'

'Then this new impost of yours will practically decrease my freedom to exercise my faculties?'

'Yes.'

'Well, do you not now perceive the contradiction? Instead of acting the part of a protector, you are acting the part of an aggressor. What you were appointed to guarantee me and others, you are now taking away. To see that the liberty of each man to pursue the objects of his desires unrestricted, save of the like liberty of all, is your special function. To diminish this liberty by-means of taxes, or civil restraint, more than is absolutely needful for performing such function, is wrong, because adverse to the function itself. Now your new impost does so diminish this liberty more than is absolutely needful, and it is, consequently, unjustifiable."

I do not think I need say any more on this head.

The next objection I urge against State education is, that it tends to destroy parental influence and responsibility, and, therefore, uneducates as much, if not more, than it educates. Before, however, I oiler

arguments in proof of this assertion, it will be necessary to take up what I promised to do at the commencement, namely, the argument that it may be the duty of the State to compel a certain acquirement in knowledge by each citizen. J. 8. Mill defends this in his Essay on Liberty. "Consider, for example," says Mill, "the case of Education. Is it not almost a self-evident axiom, the State should require and compel the education *up to a certain standard* [the model citizen which he himself condemns] of every human being who is born its citizen? Yet who is there that is not afraid to recognise and assert this truth? Hardly anyone, indeed, will deny that it is one of the most sacred duties of the parents (or, as law and usage now stand, the father,) after summoning a human being into the world, to give to that being an education fitting him to perform his part well in life towards others and towards himself. But while this is unanimously declared to be the father's duty, scarcely anybody, in this country, will bear to hear of obliging him to perform it. Instead of his being required to make any exertion or sacrifice for securing this education to his child, it is left to his choice to accept it or not, when it is provided *gratia*! It still remains unrecognised, that *to bring a child into existence, without a fair prospect of being able, not only to provide food for its body, but instruction and training for its mind, is a moral crime, both against the unfortunate offering and against society; and that, if the parent does not fulfill the obligation, the State ought to see it fulfilled at the charge, as far as possible, of the parent.*" Now, most heartily as I agree with the spirit of benevolence in this argument of Mill's, I believe, that had he his idea carried out, it would be productive of far more evil than good. The doctrine at the root of Mill's argument is, that the rights of children are involved as well as the rights of the State. Now I deny that the rights of the child are violated by a denial of education. Education does not prevent the fullest exercise of faculties, it does not diminish liberty. The child is at liberty to do whatsoever it wills in the best way it can, and this is all that can be demanded. "Every aggression, be it remembered," to again quote, "every infraction of rights is necessarily *active*, whilst every neglect, carelessness, omission, is as necessarily *passive*. Consequently, however wrong the non-performance of a parental duty may be,—however much it is condemned by the morality of beneficence—it does not amount to a breach of the law of equal freedom, and cannot, therefore, be taken cognizance of by the State." And Mill's argument, if at all pushed, would lead the State into interference as absurd as that of States in days gone by, to guard, the citizens in all their dealings.

But I go farther and say, that even were it the duty of the State to interfere on behalf of children, Mill's theory would work more evil than good. It tends to destroy parental influence and responsibility, and hence uneducates. If any person is trained up in the belief, that the State is to have a fostering care of himself and offspring, he will lose that stimulus to self-restraint and self-denial, which he would otherwise acquire. And to this want of self-restraint is nine-tenths of the evil, that afflicts this world to be attributed. If there were no improvidence, there would be little poverty and less crime. And how is this self-restraint to be encouraged? Must not experience and pain alone work a cure. Nothing but knowing, and feeling, that a wrong done brings punishment—aye, and without State interference—will improve the man of improvident habits and desires. Why to some men to this day, notwithstanding the knowledge diffused abroad by Combe's Constitution of Man, and kindred works, pain seems an evil instead of a good—Some are so philanthropic that to save an improvident man from punishment, they will place him in artificial and false circumstances. What, I ask, is a greater incentive to self-restraint than parental responsibility,—'and if we diminish the one, we will assuredly diminish the other. If we train up men in the belief that a Government will feed and educate their children, and wilt, in old age, when they are unable to work, and, through their improvidence, they have no resources, give them a place of refuge—a workhouse for an asylum—Can we wonder at the carelessness and improvidence we see in the world? Is it not a fact that the more the State undertakes for the family, the greater becomes the temptation to marry? And hence the greater becomes the number of those moral crimes Mr-Mill so much deplures.

Therefore, I hold State Education is educating one class at the expense of another. It confers knowledge at the expense of character. "It retards the development of a quality universally needed—one, in the absence of which, poverty, and restlessness, and crime, must ever continue; and all that it may give a smattering of information." Nay, it makes men forget their duties; it deadens that parental feeling for progeny, which nature has implanted in the bosom. What are we? What is the State that we should improve on nature? Throughout the universe offspring is cared for and tended. How rarely do parents neglect to feed their children! and these instances do not happen were it not for social laws. Assuredly nature is a better judge than we, and the less we interfere with nature's processes the better.

But I must not detain you longer. There is only one argument to which I shall yet allude. It is one that I know is sure to be used, and it is this—All nations find it expedient to aid education, or have some sort of a national system, and if this has been found necessary in the past, and in the present state of intellectual enlightenment, surely we are justified in following so many precedents. I do not think such a statement of much value were I to apply it in discussing "State Churches," it would, I presume, be equally valid; and I hardly know of any nation that, fifty years ago, held other than the most strong protectionist ideas. But who dare say that Turgot and Adam Smith were wrong? In like manner we may say of State Education that, granting that it may,

as State Churches and protectionist theories are said to have done, sided progress in the state of society which has been in the past, it is no argument for its future continuance.

In conclusion, and to sum up my arguments, I started with showing the proper function of a State "security and protection to life and property. I then showed that before the State could be called on to educate, it was the duty of those in favour of State Education to tell me what it is, and when it is to begin and when to cease. This difficulty, nay impossibility, I have pointed out. I have asserted that once admit this doctrine of State care of minds, and State care of bodies must be enforced, and other absurdities will follow in their train. I stated that the argument that it was for the interest of the State to educate, so as to get good citizens, was utterly untenable. I have proved also that the State cannot interfere on the pretext that the people are not judges of what education is or ought to be, nor, on the other assumption that it makes crime cease. I have, I think, proved that State Education is a violation of the social compact, and unjust. I then showed that the State could not interfere on the plea of doing justice to the young. I have pointed out the evils of State Education by destroying parental responsibility, and uneducating those who need education most. Lastly, I have alluded to the fact, that the universality of a doctrine was no proof of its soundness. So far, my task accomplished. Let me only beseech you not to found your opposition to me on such a shallow ground as that of expediency. It is never expedient to be "unjust" and the assertion that it is so has caused many of the evils under which this world of ours has laboured and still labours. Might I also express a Hope that, independent of the results that may follow our ideas, we will fearlessly discuss this subject, and that that bogie which sometimes affects some amongst us "the fear of meddling with politics," will for once be kept out of sight. May we conceive it to be our duty to fearlessly utter the highest truths conceivable by us, and endeavour to get embodied in fact our purest idealisms, knowing that by these means, and by these only, are we playing our appointed part in this world.

Dunedin: Mills, Dick & Co., General Printers, Stafford Street, November 7, 1870.

The Prussian Land-Tenure Reforms and a Farmer-Proprietary Ireland. Two Papers read at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, held in Belfast, September, 1867. Published By Permission of the Council.

By Henry Dix Hutton,
Barrister-At-Law.

"Landed Property is in its Nature the Firm Base of Every Stable Government."

Edmund Burke.

Dublin: John Falconer, 53, Upper Sackville-Street. London: W. Ridgway, Piccadilly *and Sold by all Booksellers.* 1867.

Price 1s.—by Post, 1s. 1d.

John Falconer, Printer, 53, Upper Sackville-Street, Dublin.

Contents.

Preface.

THE interest expressed in the following papers when read at the recent meeting of the Social Science Association in Belfast, encourages the hope that their publication in a separate form may promote the cause of Order and Progress in Ireland. The investigation—of which the chief results are briefly submitted

I gladly take this opportunity of expressing my grateful thanks for the valuable assistance so kindly and liberally afforded to my inquiries by many German gentlemen, particularly the following:—Dr. Versmann, Senator of Hamburg; Dr. Gneist, Professor of Law, Berlin University; Dr. Lette, Chief Judge of the Prussian Court of Appeal for Land-legislation Causes; Dr. George von Bunsen, Member of the Prussian Parliament; Dr. Meitzen, Privy Councillor; Dr. Thaer, Professor of Agriculture, Berlin University; Dr. Hannsen, Professor of Political Economy, Berlin University; Mr. William Hertz, Publisher, Berlin; Dr. Engel, Director of the Statistical Bureau, Berlin; Dr. Boeckh, of the same office; Dr. Reichensperger, Judge of the Appellate Court, Berlin; Privy Councillor Schumann, of the Prussian Ministry of Agriculture; Privy Councillor Heyder, Director of the Rent-Bank for the Province of Brandenburg; Mr. Kuesel, of the same office: at Dresden, Privy Councillor Kuenzel; and Privy Councillor Leonhardi, Director of the Rent-Bank for the Kingdom of Saxony; at Bonn, Dr Nasse, Professor of Political Economy, University of Bonn; and Dr. Hartstein, Director of the Royal Academy of Agriculture, Popplesdorf, near Bonn. I was also indebted for information as to the Prussian Land-credit Associations of Proprietors to Count zu Eulenburg of the Ministry for Home Affairs, and Mr. Petsch of the Association for the Province of Brandenburg. Their Land Debentures are incidentally referred to,

but any account of these institutions would have been foreign to the immediate scope of my essay. They deserve, however, special mention as institutions which, although founded long before Stein's reforms were commenced, have greatly facilitated the transformation of the feudal nobility into heads of agricultural industry, by furnishing them with the means of carrying out land-improvements, and the floating capital essential for improved agriculture.

—was prompted by the conviction that the accounts hitherto accessible to the English public

While obliged to differ on some points of importance from Mr. D. C. Heron, and Mr. John Levy, I feel pleasure in acknowledging the assistance derived from the "History of Jurisprudence" of the former, and the "Letters on the Prussian Land-Laws" of the latter gentleman.

; while affording much valuable and interesting information, failed to present an accurate, consistent, and complete view of the great Prussian landtenure reforms primarily and most justly associated with the name of Stein. Those reforms may well be deemed great which more than any others transformed the discontent and profound apathy of a large agricultural population into prosperous industry and loyal devotedness. On that ground chiefly, though by no means alone, they struck me as meriting a careful and full examination, in themselves and in their bearings on the Irish land question.

It has been asserted, repeatedly and recently asserted, by authorities whose title to consideration I do not wish to treat with disrespect, that Fenianism has no hold over the tenant-farmers of Ireland. If they meant that farmers who have something to lose will not compromise themselves by an alliance with hopeless insurrection; if they meant that very many, among all classes of Irish society, place their trust and seek the remedy for evils, however real and grievous, in the improved sentiments of their fellow-citizens and the growth of a sounder public opinion, rather than in conspiracy and violence; I should see no ground for dissent. But if they mean to deny the existence in Ireland of wide-spread discontent and profound unbelief in the justice of the governing classes; or to assert that the Irish land-question can be solved by *laissez faire*, diminished competition, and other exaggerations of a spurious political economy; it is well to know that those who, like the writer, reject such views as untrue and unstatesmanlike, can appeal to authorities well acquainted with the condition of Ireland, and to the experience of a great European Kingdom—extending over half a century and continuing down to our own time—the example of whose land-tenure reforms has been followed and emulated throughout almost the entire of Germany. Such an example ought surely to have weight, even with those who insist that every measure which does not fall in with the peculiar conditions of the actual English system must, for that reason alone, be abnormal and exceptional. This disposition, more than any other, prevents a clear insight into the Irish problem. Its gradual disappearance under the influence of a wiser spirit will, therefore, be earnestly desired by all who promote a rational policy, and expect its realization through the growth of an enlightened and sympathetic public opinion in Great Britain and Ireland.

Those who are practically acquainted with the German land-tenure reforms will, doubtless, miss some topics familiar to them, and in particular the important legislation by which the scattered parcels of the peasant proprietors were gradually converted into compact farms. Its practical influence has been very great; but the subject being foreign to our experience, would have called for developments inconsistent with my limits, and even calculated to distract attention from the most essential points for the public of these countries. Should the present publication meet a favourable reception, I may hereafter be able to offer information on these and like matters connected with the Land-question in Germany and other States of Western Europe.

Henry Dix Hutton.

10, Mountjoy-Street, Dublin,

31st October, 1867.

The Stein-Hardenberg Land-Legislation; Its Basis, Development, and Results in Prussia.

"Tenant-Farmers, even such as have long leases, do not constitute, in a genuine sense, heads of

agricultural industry, yet their existence contributes to maintain the equivocal attitude of its ostensible directors—the-Landed Proprietors."—Auguste Comte. *Politique Positive T. 3 (Philosophic d'Histoire)*.

AT the commencement of the nineteenth century the Prussian territory was divided between feudal landlords and peasant farmers, who were either serfs, or, when free, weighed down by every sort of burdensome obligation. Cultivation was at the lowest point, and the population so little attached to existing institutions, that these fell to pieces on the first attack of the invader. At the present time, the land is shared among proprietors, freed from all but public burdens. They own in widely different proportions; but, with few exceptions, both large and small owners cultivate, without the intervention of tenant farmers; the larger under their immediate superintendence, the smaller by their own hands. Agriculture has already made great advances, and is steadily progressive.

A revolution so great and beneficent must excite profound interest, at once philosophic, historical, and practical. We naturally inquire, what was its basis, what its development, and what its results. A residence of five months in Berlin, Dresden, and other parts of Germany, with the valuable assistance kindly afforded by the best living authorities, both legal and agricultural, enables me to submit the following replies. In so large and complicated a subject our limits only permit a brief reference to the essential points.

It is no where denied that the mainspring of this reform lay in the Stein-Hardenberg land-legislation. But English authors generally assume that it involved a setting aside of the rights of property, that its justification consisted in an urgent necessity. This view, however, is an entire misconception. The profound modifications introduced were, doubtless, greatly facilitated by the political crisis, but they were made with due regard, not merely to eternal principles of justice, but to existing, long established, mutual rights.

The situation in 1807 was shortly this—feudal tenures inherited from the Middle Ages modified by the monarchic authority, laws, and magistracy of the Modern State. All large properties comprised demesne land and peasants' land; the first being cultivated for the benefit of the landowner by peasants, who possessed and tilled the second for their own benefit. Each kind of land and each class of persons were in law distinct. The peasants' land was invariably subject to feudal dues and duties, embracing all agricultural operations and products, affecting nearly every human relation and event from the cradle to the grave. The larger peasant farms were, however, frequently the actual property of free cultivators; but the residue were occupied by serfs. The position of the serf-occupier was, nevertheless, totally different from that of a tenant-at-will. The German Common Law established the principle that peasants' land must remain peasants' land. Though the individual, peasant holder died or were dispossessed the landlord was bound to replace him with a tenant of the same class, and could not lawfully change the nature of the peasant's land by absorbing it into his demesne land. Moreover, the landlord was bound, in consideration of the feudal dues and services, to maintain the peasants' farms, and to relieve them in various emergencies of sickness or poverty. The servile holders also, in addition to such class rights, frequently enjoyed individual rights. Thus some held their farms for a term of years or for life; and the tenure of a large number had gradually acquired the stamp of an hereditary right, as fully as in the case of the English copy-holder. To the above mediaeval constitution of the tenure of land, the Modern State added an important element. The gradual disuse of military feudal services, and the formation of standing armies necessitated taxation, and the weight of the taxes was thrown by the privileged aristocracy on the peasants' land. The great proprietors also, were tempted by the increasing value of land to incorporate the peasants' land with their demesnes, in order to cultivate it either by serf labour or by letting to tenant farmers. The German rulers opposed, with varying success, these efforts of the great proprietors, as being at variance both with established law and sound policy. No where were greater efforts made than in Prussia, whose kings steadily pursued the twofold object, protection of the peasants' rights and their maintenance as an important class in the State.

Despite, however, of law and authority, the peasants remained practically insecure, and, at the best, were loaded with feudal burdens which cramped their energies. From such dues and forced labour comparatively little advantage accrued to the proprietors whose situation, as feudal landlords, precluded a proper cultivation of their demesnes. In this state of things a disastrous war hastened what had long been felt as a necessity—the emancipation of the peasantry and creation of a free agriculture. The problem, however, and its solution, were regarded in two widely different lights. On the one hand existed a school much devoted to economic abstractions. Its adherents urged that it was vain to expect good agriculture without large farms and proportionate capital, and that the majority of the peasants did not realize these conditions. It was, therefore, they said, expedient to arrange matters so that only the larger and wealthier class of occupiers could become proprietors. The opponents of this view insisted upon its injustice as a violation of established rights; its superficiality as ignoring historic and existing facts; its impolicy as involving an abandonment of the State's duty and paramount interest in the mass of the people, the improvement of their condition, and, with that, the strengthening of their loyalty. Such were the convictions of the distinguished men whose counsels happily prevailed; foremost among them, Stein. Stein's comprehensive reforms prove that he understood and respected economic truths. He was a sincere disciple of Adam Smith, but he was also a great statesman; a practical

philosopher, imbued with that historic spirit, and guided by those profound instincts, to explain, to complete, and to confirm, which is the highest office of true social science.

The ordinary account given by English writers represents Stein's land legislation not only as a subversion of existing rights, but as having effected the necessary reform at a single blow. The second proposition requires correction as much as the first. The transformation of feudal tenures into an industrial constitution of landed property was effected very gradually. It extended over more than half a century, and embraced three distinct operations, which originated respectively in the years 1807—11, 1821, and 1850: first, the creation of proprietorship; secondly, the redemption of feudal burdens; thirdly, the establishment of a land-credit institution.

Of these three operations the first commenced with the abolition of serfdom by the decree of 1807, which also abrogated the previous legal distinction between nobles' land and peasants' land. After Stein's forced retirement, this initial step of personal enfranchisement was completed by the great reform (already effected under his ministry as to the Crown lands), the transformation of occupation into ownership. The decree of 1807 left the relation of landlord and tenant, as already described, substantially untouched. The decree of 1811, issued under Hardenberg's ministry, substituted for this feudal relation a system of independent ownership. It recognized subsisting and mutual rights, but awarded in lieu thereof compensation. As Dr. Lette, President of the Appeal Court for land-legislation affairs, observes in his standard work, the decree of 1811 "was based on the constitutional quality of the peasants' land as forming independent possessions withdrawn from the disposing power of the landlord." The decree expressly refers to this principle, recognizing the title of the hereditary peasant possessions. It further points out the obligation of the landlords "to leave their tenants sufficient means for their own subsistence and the satisfaction of the claims of the State," and estimates such peasants' proportion at two-thirds of the yearly produce. On this basis the compensation was regulated; a distinction, however, being drawn between the hereditary and the non-hereditary occupiers of peasants' land. The hereditary class by surrendering one-third, and the non-hereditary one-half, of their farms, became absolute owners of the respective residue of two-thirds or one-half; the landlords becoming thereby also discharged from all feudal obligations to the tenants. The parties might also agree that the peasant, instead of surrendering land should become proprietor of his entire farm, compensating the landlord by a fixed money or corn rent, or by paying a lump sum. A commission composed of lawyers and agriculturists was established for each Province, and charged with the execution of the decree of 1811. This commission has continued its important functions from 1817 to the present time, and forms a department of the Prussian Ministry of Agriculture.

The extensive transformation of occupiers into proprietors thus gradually effected was, indeed, a momentous change; but it constituted only the first step in the great land tenure reform. Two other steps were needed to complete the work of emancipation, the existence and working of which have been overlooked or imperfectly understood. These were the transformation of feudal and other burdens into fixed rents, redeemable on specified terms; and the establishment of a land credit institution destined to facilitate the redemption of such fixed rents.

The decree of 1811 did not improve the condition of that large and important class, who, independently of its operation, were peasant proprietors, burdened, nevertheless, with onerous dues and services. Under that decree, the landlords also, had frequently stipulated for the retention of specified services, particularly horse or hand labour for cultivating their demesnes, in lieu of the surrender of land. Rights of pasture, of way, and other easements, very prejudicial to agriculture, continued to subsist between the old and new proprietors. Accordingly, in 1821, decrees were issued authorizing and facilitating the redemption of all such dues, services, and easements. Their redemption could be effected in various ways. Compensation might be given in money or land; the dues, services, or easements might be converted into fixed money or corn rents; and these again were made redeemable by capitalization at specified rates.

The decrees of 1811 and 1821 gradually wrought extensive changes, economic, social, and moral, the advantages of which were generally felt, and at last acknowledged by the descendants of the old feudal proprietary. This progressive movement of public opinion, stimulated by the excitement of 1848, resulted in the comprehensive law of 1850, which consolidated and amended the edicts of 1811 and 1821, and the mass of subsidiary legislation. The decree of 1811 embraced peasants' holdings of every size, but after the peace of Vienna a reaction set in, and the great landowners obtained a royal declaration excluding the smaller class of holdings, and otherwise limiting the operation of the proprietary decree. The principal ground alleged in justification of this unjust and impolitic step was the supposed deficiency of free labour for the cultivation of the demesne or nobles' land. The decree of 1811 also made compensation in land the general rule, thus, in fact, increasing the difficulty of cultivating properties already too large. The terms offered by the decree of 1821 for redemption of burdens by money payments, fixed rents, and their capitalization were found not sufficiently advantageous to induce peasant proprietors to adopt this measure. Experience, however, had proved the comparative worthlessness of forced labour, and, on the other hand, shown that peasant proprietorship was

compatible with the coexistence of a class of day labourers. Large landowners, stimulated by their new situation to pursue improved scientific agriculture with capital and free labour, became convinced of the inconvenience of compensation in land, and the advantage of capitalized payments over fixed rents. Accordingly, the law of 1850 enabled even the smallest occupiers of peasants' land to acquire the proprietorship. The same law instituted, as the general rule, compensation in money payments or fixed rents. The redemption of such rents by capitalization was also authorized on terms more favourable to the occupiers, and sufficiently advantageous to the great proprietors, whose most pressing need was agricultural capital.

The conversion of tenancy into proprietorship and the emancipation of the land from feudal and other burdens, thus constituted the two first steps in this great reform. It remains to mention the third and crowning measure, without which the efficacy of the two first would have been greatly impaired. The immediate payment of compensation and the capitalization of fixed rents equally required resources which the peasant proprietors either did not possess, or could only command by sacrificing their agricultural capital. To meet this special want, a second law of 1850 created the provincial land credit institutions called Rent-Banks. Their principle and working are shortly as follows:—The stipulated purchase money or capitalized amount is advanced by the Bank, and by it paid to the landlord, not in money, but in rent debentures. These are issued in amounts from 30s. to £150, bearing interest at four per cent per annum, payable half-yearly by coupons, and are transferable by delivery. They rank as State securities,

The following quotations are from the *Berliner Fremden-Blatt* of 7th June, 1867:—

The variation in the price of the rent-debentures arises from the circumstance that the banks are provincial and the demand for these securities, to a great extent, local. It is worthy of remark that the market price of the rent debentures stands considerably higher than that of the Prussian mortgage debentures bearing the like interest. These last are securities issued by private societies composed of landowners, and differ from the former in two important respects. The mortgage debentures are not guaranteed by Government, which only exercises a general control over the societies; and there is no obligation, as in the case of the rent-debentures, to pay off at par, some time or other, by a drawing.

furnishing a safe and lawful investment for trust moneys, public and private, and, in ordinary times, stand at, and even above, par. When above par, the holders can gain the benefit, since these debentures are only paid off by the rents received; when below par, the State can come into the market and apply the accumulated rents in purchasing the debentures on sale. Their payment cannot be demanded, but the State is entitled to give six months' notice of their liquidation, which must be in money, and at par. In order to prevent any inequality in the market value of the debentures, their liquidation is effected by a half-yearly drawing, the number drawn, and noticed for payment by public advertisement, being equal in value to the amount of the available surplus rents or redemption fund in bank.

The bank advances in rent debentures no more than twenty years' purchase, the amount which entitles the peasant to redeem his fixed rent.

It may be well to mention that the peasants' rents were frequently much under the letting value; but it was expressly provided that the Rent-Bank might take up all rents not exceeding two-thirds of the net value of the land charged therewith. This net value was found by adding the perpetual rent into which the feudal services were converted to 4 per cent, on the selling value of the lauds, as determined by arbitrators.

The bank thus obtains by receipt of this rent 5 per cent, per annum, of which 4 per cent, is applied to paying interest on the debentures. The remaining one per cent. forms the redemption fund which at compound interest extinguishes the principal debt in forty-one years and one month. At the end of this period the peasant becomes the absolute owner; but he may elect to pay the bank nine-tenths only of the fixed rent, that is four and a-half per cent, on the advance, which equally extinguishes the rent in fifty-six years and one month. The peasant may, in like manner, at the outset, redeem the fixed rent by paying to the bank eighteen years' purchase; the landlord being, however, entitled, at his option, to receive the twenty-fold amount in debentures. The peasant who has elected to pay the full or reduced (9/10ths) rent to the bank may, by giving six months' notice, at any time, pay the balance of the capital which appears from the official printed table to remain due. The stability of the Rent-Banks rests on the system of registration of title,—which in Prussia has also a local character; on the priority given to the rents over all other charges; and on the punctual collection of the rents by the land-tax officials. Their annual expense amounts nominally to about £20,000; but, in fact, they are self-supporting. The collection of rents is monthly, the payment of interest, half-yearly; and the periods of 41 1/12 and 56 1/12 years somewhat exceed what is required for redemption. In a few years the work of redemption had so far advanced that the rent-banks were closed, except for carrying out applications made up to 1858. These institutions exist for the like purpose in all the principal States of Germany. They were introduced in 1832, for the first time, in the Kingdom of Saxony, where their principle and machinery have been recently applied to the very important purpose of advancing capital required for draining, irrigation, and other agricultural exigencies. The Rent-Banks were everywhere established for the furtherance of great public interests, which called for the

intervention of Government. No form of private enterprise could realize the essential conditions of such a financial operation. The State alone possessed the credit necessary for procuring advances at a low rate of interest, and a machinery adequate to secure the punctual payment of rents.

The following statistics may suffice to prove the magnitude of the interests involved in the above operations. They relate to the Prussian territory, as existing before 1866, which contains nearly seventy million English acres of productive land. To the end of 1865, 83, 288 Peasant Proprietors had been created; and more than a million properties, comprising upwards of 36 million acres, relieved from 29,884,900 burdens of various kinds. The compensation awarded for these amounted to £6,736,000 in capital; £823,000 in yearly money rents; in corn rents, 326,224 bushels per annum; and in land, 1,100,000 English acres. The collective operations of the provincial Rent-Banks to the end of 1866 were as follows:—They received rents to the amount of £563,131 per annum; £1,688,771 purchase money at the rate of 18 years paid at the outset; and £362,124 capital in respect of rents redeemed on six months' notice. They have issued rent-debentures amounting to £12,477,316, of which £1,453,573 have been already liquidated.

The results, economic, social, and moral, of the Prussian land-legislation, present a wide and interesting field, while our limits permit only an imperfect view of a few leading features. The lessons taught by the distribution of landed property and its agricultural management in Prussia, possess high practical value. The unquestionable and long experience of that country disproves views currently accepted among the proprietors of Great Britain and Ireland. Among ourselves, cultivation through the intervention of tenant farmers is the prevailing system of management; and primogeniture, with entails, artificially maintain, in comparatively few hands, properties of an exorbitant size. The history of landed property in Prussia, however, demonstrates that laws which, without compelling a division of the land, favour a more equal distribution, do not necessarily produce an excessive sub-division of the soil. The Prussian experience of the last half century also establishes, with increasing evidence, that the direct cultivation of the land by the proprietors, both large and small, is perfectly compatible with good farming and a progressive agriculture. The following statistics, which approximate sufficiently to the truth, may illustrate these general results. One-half, at least, of the Prussian territory (as it existed before 1866) comprises properties exceeding two hundred English acres. A considerable portion of this class, including farms from two hundred to four hundred acres, and even more, belong to peasants, sometimes by purchase, generally by inheritance. The largest proportion, however, constitutes the so called Nobles' land, or Knights' fees. As I am informed, about one moiety of these Knights' fees are subject to family settlements. But whether larger or smaller, entailed or free, management by tenant farmers is quite the exception. As a rule, these Knights' fees are managed by their owners, and cultivated under their direct superintendence, with the help, of course, of competent stewards.

The agricultural management of landed property considered from a social and economic point of view, forms the subject of a distinct treatise, by Professor Thaer, of Berlin; "Die Wirthschafts Direction des Landguts."

Agricultural labourers, instead of diminishing, have increased.

The condition of this important class in Prussia, is becoming the subject of increased attention. See the interesting essay by Professor Thaer, entitled, "Ueber die Stellung der Tagelöhner," Berlin, 1865.

In 1858, this class had more than doubled its numbers in 1816; an increase proportionately much greater than that (67 per cent.) of the entire agricultural population during the same period. The peasant's agricultural properties, generally speaking, are under two hundred acres. They fall, naturally, into two classes—properties cultivated by at least one team of horses or oxen, and those cultivated by hand labour. These latter, forming the smallest class, are, no doubt, very numerous, probably twice as numerous as the team-cultivated properties. But the unfavourable inferences hastily drawn by some English writers require important corrections. A very large proportion of the small properties specified in the statistical returns, are not agricultural holdings, but simply consist of a house and garden, as prevails near great manufacturing cities, and is not seldom the case as to miners, weavers, and even agricultural labourers. The cultivation, also, of vegetables, fruit, and especially of the vine, requires very small properties. When these deductions are fairly made, it will be found that the number of purely agricultural proprietors cultivating by hand labour, is much less than at first estimated. The sub-division existed *before* the land-legislation of Stein, and was not created by the new laws; nor have these materially increased sub-division. The extent of land, also, owned by small proprietors of every class, is not more than one-fifth of the land owned and cultivated by the team-owning class. The history and condition of the team-owning peasant proprietors in the seven eastern provinces of Prussia—that is excluding the Rhine province—has been investigated, and is elaborately shown in a recent report of the Prussian Minister of Agriculture, made with the co-operation of the Director of the Statistical Bureau. It is there demonstrated that during the long period between 1816 and 1859, the number of peasant team-cultivated properties has increased nearly two per cent., their average size remaining unchanged. The movement of property, the effects of free trade and inheritance, during nearly half a century, demonstrate, in the language of this valuable report, "the

entire groundlessness of the bugbear that unrestricted legal divisibility must lead to an excessive sub-division of landed property."

The yearly reports of the Prussian Ministry of Agriculture, in accordance with the testimony of high agricultural authorities, justify the conclusion that agriculture has made great progress towards a system of scientific farming.

See, as to the recent and remarkable progress of Prussian Agriculture, the opinion of a highly competent authority, M. de Laveleye, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1st September, 1867. *L'Allemagne depuis la guerre de 1866*.

It was, natural that this progress should have been much less decided during the first generation after Stein's legislation; a circumstance the oversight of which has led some English writers into very serious mistakes. The advance made since about 1840 has been steady and marked; and I believe that the development of her manufacturing intelligence and practical skill within the last ten years, as now fully admitted, has its counterpart in the progress of the agriculture of the seven eastern provinces of Prussia. Owing to a variety of causes, the Rhine province does not present an equal degree of progress; but its condition is by no means stationary, and affords reasonable prospect of more rapid improvement in agriculture. In the provinces of Westphalia, Brandenburg, Saxony, Posen, Silesia, Pomerania, and Prussia, the larger proprietors naturally lead the way, and their increasing demand for capital is one proof, among many, that modern resources—drainage, machinery, &c., are appreciated. The example thus set is not lost upon the peasant proprietors, who are steadily advancing in skill and general intelligence. For their special instruction twenty agricultural schools exist in Prussia, educating 300 pupils yearly, besides many farmers above the school age. Four agricultural academies of a higher class also educate about 200 pupils yearly.

The well-being of the population has steadily advanced under the system of proprietorship. Already in 1842 the consumption per head had doubled that in 1805, the increase being chiefly in clothing, coffee, sugar, and other articles of comfort, and even luxury. That the subsequent progress in general well-being has been equally satisfactory admits of no doubt. It would be out of place to discuss the events of 1866. This much, however, is certain, and may be said: What gave the victory to Prussia was not a mere mechanical invention, but the force of her social institutions, and not least, of her reformed land-legislation. Sixty years ago her agricultural population was divided into two hostile classes; one class exclusively representing property and exercising dominion, the other, submissive without respect; everywhere practical insecurity with its attendant evils, poverty, mistrust, and if not disloyalty, yet profound indifference towards the monarchy and its institutions. The Prussian statesmen of that day had the courage to be just and wise, setting a noble example which has since been followed throughout nearly the whole of Germany. Their successors, in our day, have reaped the advantage of that policy in the dispositions of a population, among whom a wide diffusion of landed property has softened social antagonism, fostered material prosperity, and inspired a sincere and loyal attachment to their institutions and their rulers.

Plan for the Gradual Creation of a Farmer-Proprietary in Ireland.

"It is vain to expect that any care of deep-seated social disorders can be, at the same time, radical in its nature and rapid in its operation."—Auguste Comte.

EVERY practical contribution to the Irish land question must satisfy two conditions—it must be sound in principle, and adapted to the special circumstances of Ireland. Some will demand, as a third condition, entire conformability with the laws of England. "Exceptional legislation" is, in itself, doubtless, a disadvantage with reference to countries which, though differing widely in their history and circumstances, are, nevertheless, united under one general government. But it is unjust and impolitic to press this view to extreme conclusions. Those who urge it, to the exclusion of other considerations, overlook or underestimate qualifying facts of great importance. The English tenure of land, and its management, as compared with that of all the other States of Western Europe, is itself highly exceptional. Again, the Parliament of the United Kingdom has, within the last twenty years, in spite of a strong assimilating tendency, established various public institutions, unsupported by English precedent, but deemed suitable and necessary for Ireland. Among such institutions I would especially recall two, as having a direct bearing on our subject:—the Board of Works; and the Incumbered, now the Landed Estates' Court.

Uniformity of legislation is, therefore, of subordinate importance to soundness of principle and suitability to special circumstances. Agreeably to this view, I submit that there exists an urgent need for means calculated to promote the gradual formation of a Farmer-Proprietary in Ireland. The legislative sanction of such a

proprietary is, however, opposed by misconceptions which it is necessary to meet and remove.

The example of Prussia, as pointed out in a previous paper, proves how groundless is the view which identifies a proprietary cultivating their own farms (without the intervention of tenant-farmers), with exclusively small holdings, and inferior agriculture; and how equally groundless is the apprehension that the absence of artificial restrictions on alienation, a genuine free trade in land ownership, produces rapid or excessive subdivision. The application of these results to the Irish land question requires some explanations.

English agriculture essentially rests upon a system of indirect cultivation through tenant-farmers, who, for the most part, have no *legal* security, being tenants-at-will merely. The moral disadvantages of arrangements which thus separate the labourer from the proprietor, throwing the natural responsibility of the owner on a class of tenant-farmers inferior in social position and education, are very great, and have recently attracted public attention. The economic success of the English system depends entirely on the realization, in a greater or less degree, of two conditions. First, a quasi-partnership subsists between the landlord and tenant; one supplying the fixed capital—land, buildings, permanent improvements; the other furnishing the agricultural, or floating capital, which is to some extent protected, in defect of special agreement, by legalized customs. Secondly, there exists in England a kind of mercantile understanding, the result, partly of a high degree of hereditary mutual confidence, partly of the strong interest which landlords have in well treating capitalist holders of large farms. To make a system of land tenure so peculiar the universal standard is surely neither scientific nor practical. Its indefinite continuance, even in England, is open to serious doubt; and that on mere economic grounds, apart from higher social and moral considerations. A recent authority on English agriculture

Agriculture. By "The Old Norfolk Farmer" (Samuel Copland). 2 Vols. 1866.

writes as follows:—"Steam cultivation the writer considers the great agricultural question of the day, the turning point on which hangs that of profit or loss by the occupier of the land. If the landlords knew their own interest, and cared for that of their tenants, they would not neglect making permanent improvements. But the indifference they display, as a body, in availing themselves of the facility offered by the Government for draining their lands, affords little prospect of their laying down the land with rails at an expense of £18 or £20 per acre, and it would be madness for a tenant-farmer to do so, without a tenant-right guaranteeing to him remuneration at the expiry of his lease." The progress, and even the existence, of agriculture in England, will, I believe, more and more depend on its gradually attaining a genuine industrial constitution, as contrasted with its existing abnormal, semi-feudal constitution. Such a transformation can be effected in various ways. The proprietor may superintend or direct cultivation; the tenant-farmer may himself become a proprietor. Writers of eminence, both English and foreign, have, very unwisely, I think, identified farming by proprietors themselves with small holdings. No doubt the disadvantages incident to tenancies-at-will, or short leases, are more easily and generally palliated where the holdings are large. On the other hand, where such palliations do not exist, even small farms tilled by their owners produce more, and certainly ensure, in a far higher degree, general well-being. But without disregarding such considerations, I think it is important to grasp the broad principle of a Farmer-Proprietary. Such a body includes, indeed, peasant proprietors, but it embraces also—as we see in Prussia, Saxony, and other German States, I believe also in Belgium and France—a class who, in education, capital, and skill, occupy the highest position, and set an example of the greatest practical value.

The English land tenure, therefore, does not furnish a universal standard, and its adoption as such causes serious misconceptions. Writers imbued with the English system habitually exaggerate the sub-division of agricultural land on the Continent. They identify the number of registered parcels with that of proprietors which is much smaller; they confound with ordinary agriculture the fruit and vegetable cultivation so prevalent in the neighbourhood of cities, and admirably adapted to spade labour; they take no sufficient account of the multitude of city workmen, and even country labourers, who simply own a house and garden. Again, under the influence of our peculiar system, we frequently overlook the essential difference between the farmer proprietor and the tenant-farmer, although its appreciation is more necessary in proportion as the size of the holding decreases. For example, the condition of certain districts in Belgium has been recently cited as a warning; the fact being that, in those localities, the peasants are not proprietors, but tenant-farmers holding by short leases, and paying high rents, which are increased from time to time. It is, also, constantly assumed that the greater sub-division of landed property on the Continent has been *caused* by modern legislation. As a general rule this is not the case. The transformation which, during the last three or four centuries in England, gradually consolidated the smaller holdings and yeoman properties into large farms rented by tenant-farmers, had, with few exceptions, no counterpart in France, Belgium, or Germany. The causes which produced this movement were connected with the historic development and peculiar situation of England, and did not exist in the other States of Western Europe. There an extensive sub-division of agricultural holdings continued to exist, and the continental legislation of the 19th century simply took things as it found them, transforming a class of feudal tenants into free proprietors. Generally speaking the size of the holdings was not seriously affected; nor have the subsequent changes been such as to warrant alarm. The economic and social success of that transformation

of tenants into proprietors cannot be fairly tested by comparing it with a system so widely different as the English tenure. Even thus tested, the modern proprietary system of France, Belgium, and Germany, will bear an advantageous comparison; but the true criterion is afforded by contrasting the wretched cultivation and poverty of former days in those countries, with the present greatly improved and progressive condition of their agriculture and population.

How do these views bear upon the Irish land question? There is no country to which the English tenure, considered as an *absolute* test, is less applicable than Ireland; none, I am convinced, where the creation of a Farmer-Proprietary, in its broadest sense, is more needed; none whose antecedents and circumstances would ensure better results from the gradual introduction of a peasant-proprietorship. Economic principles must assuredly be respected. But it is, I submit, a grave mistake to erect results due to special conditions into absolute truths. General laws, though never arbitrary, are relative; and their application demands a careful attention to the modifying influences of social existence and material situation. For example, assuming that, as alleged by Lord Dufferin, under the system of large farms and capitalist landlords and tenants, which prevails in the Lowlands of Scotland, 18 men suffice to cultivate 500 acres; it surely does not follow that agricultural improvement is impossible under other conditions. Such conclusions, I confess, appear to me to agree neither with true science nor with sound practice. They are unscientific, because they substitute hasty generalization for careful induction; unpractical, since they ignore those realities which can alone inspire wise organic reforms.

What are the facts as regards Ireland? Twenty years ago a Royal Commission, composed of landed proprietors, with Lord Devon for their chairman, reported that, contrary to the English and Scotch practice, permanent improvements—houses, offices, fences, &c.—were here, as a rule, made, not by the owner, but by the occupier. They also reported that the universal complaint of Irish tenant-farmers was want of tenure. Since that time considerable progress has, doubtless, been made; but in the two respects just mentioned—improvements and tenure—the situation remains essentially unchanged. Some 3 millions sterling, advanced by Government to the proprietors, have been expended, chiefly in drainage. The former insolvent proprietary has been largely replaced, and, doubtless, considerable sums have been expended on land improvements out of the private resources of landowners. Yet of these, both old and new, a large proportion are mere rent receivers, and how much remains to be done! At the close of the last century Arthur Young computed that 86 millions sterling were needed to place the land of Ireland on the same agricultural footing as that of England. A high contemporary authority (Lavergne), having regard to subsequent progress, estimates the like amount at 160 millions sterling. Yet we know now that Ireland is not so deficient in capital, as was formerly supposed. The sales in the Incumbered and Landed Estates' Court to the middle classes prove this; and the large accumulation of deposits in Banks, and investments in the Funds and Railways by tenant-farmers, show that this class also possesses resources which are only diverted from land improvements by the want of legal security. The peasant-proprietor of France, Belgium, and Germany employs his savings in improving his house and farm; the Irish tenant-farmer, large and small, would do the like were he a landowner.

In confirmation of these statements I beg to refer to the section of Dr. Hancock's "Report on the Supposed Progressive Decline of Irish Prosperity," (1863), entitled "Deposits in Joint-Stock Banks," and especially to the concluding remarks (p. 52).—"These deposits indicate that any neglect in executing the more lasting agricultural improvements cannot arise from a general want of capital amongst those connected with land in Ireland; and it is a matter of grave inquiry why the farmers of Ireland should lend such large sums to the different Banks, at an average of 2 per cent., to be employed in the large towns, and much of it in London, instead of expending it in agricultural improvements in Ireland."

Nor does the size of farms in Ireland at present furnish any sufficient reason against such a policy. The extraordinary and, as I believe, most injurious subdivision which existed previously to 1846, and was only compatible with the pre-dominance of potato cultivation, was swept away in that calamitous year and those immediately succeeding it. The painful but necessary consolidation thus effected has not, however, proceeded at the same rapid rate; and even the large continuing emigration does not produce any proportionate diminution in the number of holdings. The present condition is one of comparative stability; and the subdivision of land in Ireland, though great relatively to England and Scotland, no longer forbids legislation calculated to give security to the Irish farmer. True it is that one-half of the holdings are under 15 English acres. But a large proportion of these are situated in a province which ranks among the most prosperous and contented. The aggregate of such holdings includes but one-tenth of the total acreage of Ireland. Again, holdings exceeding 30 acres constitute one-fourth of the entire number, and include three-fourths of the entire acreage. In every county farms between 50 and 100 acres, and even larger, exist side by side with the smaller farms.

See Appendix A., and "Agricultural Statistics," 1867.

It is well known that holdings even of the smaller size enable industrious farmers to save, and sometimes largely. By a recent Parliamentary Return (Agricultural Holdings in Ireland, moved for by Lord Mayo, 19th March, 1867, No. 144,) I find that out of 608,864 purely agricultural holdings, the annual value of 45,979 is

estimated by the Public Valuation at between £15 and £20; of 83,259 at between £20 and £50; and of 35,955 at £50 and upwards.

See Appendix B.

It seems, therefore, that the distribution of land in Ireland, while incompatible with English and Scotch management, is well suited to a mixed proprietary system of larger and small farms.

The gradual creation of a Farmer-Proprietary in Ireland is then, I submit, a matter of vital importance. How can it be effected? The Prussian land-tenure reforms described in a previous paper, taken as a whole, are, I think, inapplicable to our circumstances. The Prussian tenants, individually or as a class, had rights in the soil which justified the course pursued. Irish tenants-at-will have no such rights. Even the "gracious customs" of Ulster, ancient and honourable as they are, afford the tenant no *legal* protection; give the maker or purchaser of permanent improvements no claim for compensation, when the estate is sold in the Landed Estates' Court to the highest] bidder. It is therefore difficult, consistently with justice or sound policy, to make laws for the *compulsory* conversion of tenants into landowners, or the *compulsory* redemption of rents. Nevertheless, the great land-tenure reform of Prussia does, I am convinced, furnish an invaluable pre-cedent. It enforces a principle, and presents an institution eminently applicable to Irish circumstances. The principle is that of encouraging the transformation of occupiers, large and small, into owners; the institution that of the Rent-Bank.

As is more fully explained below (p. 34 and Note), I do not refer to the machinery of the Rent-Bank, but to its *principle*.

To effect such gradual creation of a Farmer-Proprietary, we need simply develop a policy which has already taken strong hold and effected much good in Ireland—I mean that of *facilitating the sale of land*. We require only to extend the operation of the Landed Estates' Court and the Record of Title in such a way that their benefits shall *practically* reach to the occupiers and tillers of the soil. It seems to me that the Landed Estates' Court, as completed by the Record of Title, occupies in our social development a position analogous to that of the Stein-Hardenberg legislation. The two earlier reforms received in Prussia, as before explained, their final development through the Rent-Bank. The same institution can, I am convinced, be applied with the greatest advantage to facilitate the sale of their holdings to the tenant-farmers of Ireland.

The soundness and feasibility of a policy which enables occupiers to become proprietors by purchase of their holdings is illustrated by a recent English Act (14 & 15 Vict., c. 104), authorizing the sale of Church-Estates to their lessees and copy-holding tenants. Under that Act, in the space of ten years (1851-61), property to the value of £7,357,000 has been enfranchised, the lessees' interest amounting to 52 per cent., that of the copy-holders to 48 per cent. Landowners also in England, Scotland, and Ireland have for many years obtained large advances of public money, repayable by instalments for making permanent improvements; and recent Acts of Parliament (29 & 30 Vict., c. 72 and c. 73) have placed this Public Loan system on a permanent footing. The Secretary of State for Ireland introduced this year a Bill for extending the benefit of such loans to Irish tenants-at-will. I submit that the principle of Public Loans applies with greater advantage and less difficulty to the purchase than to the improvement of their farms by occupiers, especially where these are tenants-at-will only. The same high authority, however, appears to consider that any such assistance is needless, since, as he states, the Landed Estates' Court now not unfrequently sells in lots of 100 acres; and the subdivision on sales would, he urges, be carried to a still greater extent if a desire really existed for smaller lots. Lord Mayo, however, in the same speech made some remarks which, as it seems to me, indicate the true reason why, at present, such a demand does not arise among the tenant-farmers. The occupiers are by no means indifferent to becoming proprietors, but either the required money is not at their command, or its investment in the purchase of the land would leave them without the necessary farming capital, a consideration to which, as Lord Mayo observes, they are fully alive. These, I believe, are the general and serious difficulties which have hitherto hindered the purchase of land, by occupiers, in the Landed Estates' Court. How to meet them is the problem; and this, I submit, can be solved by instituting a Land-Purchase Public-Loan for Ireland.

As stated in a previous paper, Prussia, Saxony, and, in fact, all the principal German States, possess Rent-Banks. They were instituted by the State in consideration of their great public importance, and because no private association could afford the guarantees essential for their financial success and social efficacy. The establishment in Ireland of a system analogous to, and in substance essentially the same with the Rent-Banks of Germany, simply involves the extension and further application of a principle already sanctioned, and largely used, by our system of public loans for drainage and other land improvements. Advances are made by the State, repayable by instalments, calculated to refund principal, with intermediate interest, in a given period. The advances of the Kent-Banks, however, are, generally speaking, made, not in specie, but in paper-money; the credit of the State being pledged for the payment of a specified rate of interest, and the principal in full on giving six months' notice, according as the collection of the rents allows of such liquidation. The system of Rent-Debentures seems to have real advantages, being well adapted for the gradual discharge of the liability incurred by the State, and affording a ready and safe investment for local savings, as well as trust and other

moneys of larger amount. It has worked well on the Continent, but its adoption here, or the adherence to the method of direct advances, is only a question of machinery. The essential problem involves two conditions—the maximum of accommodation to industrious and saving tenants desirous of purchasing their farms, compatible with entire security to the State against loss. I venture to submit the following plan as one which, on a careful consideration, appears to me to meet these requisites of a system of Public Loans for Ireland, intended to assist occupying tenants to purchase their farms.

I wish to add a few words in order to prevent misapprehension as to the facts and my meaning, both of which have been mistaken—in part, I assume, owing to the necessary imperfections of the newspaper abstract of my papers—by an authority generally so well informed and careful as the *Economist*. I acknowledge with pleasure the friendly tone of their criticism (see *Economist*, 5th October), and have considered the article in question with the attention due to their recognized position, as a financial organ. First—the Rent-Banks were not established in Prussia until the recent date of 1850, and the issue of Rent-Debentures was contemporaneous with loans, raised by the Prussian Government in the way usual in England. Thus, the Rent-Debentures were not part of an obsolete financial system; and the facts stated seem to justify the inference that, while, for ordinary State purposes, the ordinary method of raising money was employed, the Government advisedly adopted the issue of Rent-Debentures, as being the method *lest adapted to meet the special object*. The preference given by most other German States to Rent-Debentures *for the like purpose*, and the favour they enjoy with the public (see ante, p. 16), I think, confirms this conclusion. Secondly—the essence of my proposal was not the issue of Rent-Debentures, but the creation of a Rent-Rank; that is, of an institution which should, as far as could safely be done, assist the occupying tenant to purchase his farm, and at the same time extinguish his debt to the State after the lapse of a specified number of years. This end might be effected in several different ways, the choice of which, no doubt, would require careful consideration. But, whether the State were to help directly, by borrowing and advancing, or indirectly, by pledging its credit for principal and interest, this difference *in the means employed* would not affect the application of the *principle* of the Rent-Bank to Ireland as the natural supplement to the Landed Estates' Court and the Record of Title.

At the same time, it is very desirable to follow, as nearly as practicable, the analogy of our own institutions. For this reason, and after considering the views expressed by the *Economist* and other financial authorities, whom I have been able to consult since my return from Germany, I have somewhat modified the *form* of my proposal. Instead of the term Rent-Debenture I have adopted that of Land-purchase Loan, corresponding to drainage or land-improvement loan; and in place of the term Rent-Bank, I propose the extended agency of the Board of Works, which is already entrusted with the management of the existing public-loan system in Ireland. Assuming that the occupying tenant has agreed with his landlord for the purchase of his farm, or been declared the purchaser in the Landed Estates' Court, the State might make advances, through the Board of Works, to the amount of twenty years' purchase on the yearly value, as estimated by the Public Valuation of Ireland. The tenant would have to supply the balance of the purchase-money. On the completion of the purchase, the farm should be charged in favour of the State with a Kent-annuity equal to the public valuation, which, capitalized at the above rate of twenty years, would yield 5 per cent per annum. Of this, 3½ per cent. might be applied to pay interest on the loan and the expenses of management, and the residue of £1 10s. per cent, would remain for redemption of principal. The period required for this purpose, placing £1 10s. per cent, at compound interest, I estimate at 35 years.

I am informed that this rate of annual payment, and period of redemption, are those now adopted by the Government in respect of drainage and other land-improvement loans, managed by the Board of Public Works in Ireland. The chief reason which induced me at first to propose the employment of Kent-Debentures (instead of advances in money) was the belief that, if issued at 4 per cent, the tenant purchasing would be thus enabled to obtain in the market a price considerably greater than the amount which the State could safely advance (20 years' purchase). It seems, however, very doubtful whether a security of the kind, liable to be paid off at par, either at a fixed period or some time by a drawing (as in Germany), could ever stand much above par; and in the absence of any such decided advantage to the tenant it would be undesirable to deviate from the financial plan of Public Loans already worked by the Board of Works in Ireland, and the Copyhold Commissioners for England and Scotland.

At the expiration of that period the annuity would cease, and the tenant become the absolute proprietor of his farm. He might also be permitted to shorten the redemption period by paying, from the outset, a higher rent-annuity, or by discharging the balance of capital at any time, on giving six months' notice. It is evident that the payment of the Rent-annuity to the State must be rendered perfectly secure. The rent-annuity, therefore, should be declared the first charge, with a summary power of enforcing payment by distraint and sale. The collection might be made quarterly, and through the poor-rate collectors. The title, also, ought to be unquestionable, and for this reason advances should only be made on indefeasible or parliamentary titles. The Landed Estates' Court, and its new department, the Record of Title Office, would serve this end, and in other

respects facilitate the working of the system, supplying the machinery by which the advances by the Government could be safely made,

The Rent-Banks of Germany only issue and hand over the debentures on receiving a warrant in writing from the Land-Legislation Commissioners, which directs the mode of doing so. This measure is plainly necessary for the protection of the rights of creditors, and generally of third parties interested in the application of the purchase money, and the like exigency would be met in Ireland by the Landed Estates' Court. and the purchase recorded subject to the rent-annuity. The Landed Estates' Court, also, frequently carries out sales, not by public auction, but by sanctioning private offers,

I am informed that the entire head rents reserved on the perpetuity leases under which the town of Belfast was held, have been sold by private agreement through the Landed Estates' Court to the lessees. and this process might be usefully applied to assist the grouping of contiguous farms whose occupiers combined to purchase. The restriction of State advances to parliamentary titles is, I consider, indispensable, and involves no real hardship; especially since the passing of the Record of Title Act has given such additional facilities for passing estates through the Landed Estates' Court, and for dealings with recorded estates.

See "Explanatory Statement," by H. D. Hutton.

The establishment of local registries of title, though not essential to the Public-loan system of land purchase would unquestionably facilitate its working, and in other ways promote dealings with land.

The plan thus submitted might be tried on a limited scale, and as an experimental measure, say for five years, the advances not exceeding one million sterling per annum. It appears to me to offer the following advantages. The State would assume no commercial function, nor enter into any speculative purchases, but simply facilitate the completion of transactions arising in the natural course of business. With due care the administration of such system of Land-purchase Loans would involve neither loss nor ultimate cost of management. Twenty years' purchase even on the low public valuation rental may seem too high a standard for perfect safety. But any apparent risk will disappear if we duly weigh three considerations, which, I would observe, have been specially verified by the experience of the German Rent-Banks. First, the purchase could not be completed unless the credit given by the State were supplemented by private resources—Secondly, the stimulus of proprietorship would induce an outlay on permanent improvements which must, year by year, give the State an enhanced security for payment of the low rent-annuity far exceeding that which the landlord now enjoys for his rent.

I would add my belief that the actual rents in Ireland are, very generally, high only in a *relative* sense; that is, they form a large proportion of a yearly produce which is kept far below its natural level by the want of the legal security essential to induce agricultural outlay. My conviction is that, at the present time, Ireland suffers not from over-population, but from under-cultivation. This under-cultivation is mainly caused by the insufficiency of drainage, want of proper fences, outbuildings, and, I will add, good dwelling houses. The last is a moral element of incalculable importance, even in an economic point of view. The other conditions are essential, because modern agriculture depends upon the perfecting and use of agricultural instruments; the chief of these instruments being the farm itself, that is the land, not left in a mere state of nature, but transformed by the application of knowledge, skill, and capital, into a real engine of agricultural production.

Lastly, the security of the State must constantly increase in proportion as the payment of the rent-annuity reduces the liabilities represented by the amount of loan undischarged. The interests of the tenant-farmers would be no less promoted. I estimate that the advances of Government, to the amount above proposed, would enable the occupier purchasing to obtain, on an average, from one-half to two-thirds of the selling value, estimating this at twenty-five years' purchase. But even a considerably lower proportion would, I believe, afford that class great assistance without unduly encroaching on their agricultural capital. Moreover, if this plan were adopted and proved successful, the proposal recently made by the Government to extend the benefit of Public Loans for land improvement to farmers would rest on a solid basis, and acquire a much deeper significance.

As before stated (p. 18), the Rent Bank of the Kingdom of Saxony has already been applied to this important purpose.

The limitation proposed as to the amount advanced by the State seems to me preferable to fixing any major or minor limit with reference to the size of farms. The small farmer, if he be industrious, skilful, and saving, would thus be encouraged and aided; while the middle and larger class of farmers, becoming purchasers without prejudice to their floating capital, would afford useful examples of agricultural progress. It is sometimes alleged that proprietorship would not induce farmers to invest capital in their land, or practice improved farming, and that the best results are attainable under a system of short leases or tenancies-at-will with smart rents. The experience of France, Belgium, Germany, not to mention our own colonies and the United States, is quite at variance with this theory; and I believe the experience of Ireland, rightly understood, is equally so. As one proof, among many, of its incorrectness, I will quote the following recent statement respecting the property of the Earl of Portsmouth, in the County of Wexford:—"The rule upon these estates has

been for several years to grant long leases at moderate rents, to abolish the system of rack-renting, and to allow tenants for their improvements. Under this rule the tenantry have invested their capital in buildings and permanent improvements on the land to a surprising extent—in fact, their outlay in this manner has exceeded in value the fee-simple of the estates."

I am deeply convinced that a system of Land-purchase Loans for occupying tenants in Ireland would promote the progress of agriculture, improve the relations of the classes interested in land, give an impulse to the general well-being of the entire population. Without legal security there can be no application of capital; without capital applied to land improvement no agricultural industry; and without such industry no peace in Ireland. No real peace, I mean; for surely we ought not to confound the symptoms with the disease, and suppose that the suppression of armed revolt, however needful, is equivalent to the establishment of confidence and genuine political tranquillity. Where the social basis for such confidence is wanting, it can only be created by needful reforms and suitable institutions. Permit me to quote the recent observation of a careful observer. The special correspondent of the *Times* remarks—"The conduct of the jurors and witnesses during the trials at the Special Commissions in Dublin, Cork, and Limerick, proves that the heart of society is not so unsound as might be supposed; and, with few exceptions, *the classes who possess property* might be relied on to discharge their duties to the Constitution fairly, and in a legal spirit." This statement is, doubtless, reassuring, but the qualifying *limitation* it contains is an essential condition of its truth and practical value. What proportion of the Irish population can, with justice, be ranked among the "classes who possess property?" In this essentially agricultural country, certainly a small proportion of the cultivators of the soil. Yet there is no sufficient reason why this should continue to be the case. Within the last twenty years landed property has been sold through the Incumbered and Landed Estates' Courts to the value of 40 millions sterling, embracing about one-fifth of the land of Ireland. If during this period the purchase of farms by their occupiers had been facilitated by a system of Land-purchase Loans to occupying tenant-farmers analogous to the Rent-Banks, I think it is hardly too much to say that we should have heard nothing of Fenianism; at least we should have had no reason to dread its consequences. The earlier opportunity was lost, but the utility of this institution would still be very great. Five-sixths of the land of Ireland (much of it still heavily incumbered), remains unsold. Many properties also heretofore passed through the Incumbered and Landed Estates' Courts, will again be brought into the market, or disposed of by private sale. The moral and political value of such an institution would consist not merely in helping to create a new class of proprietors, but in diffusing a spirit of hope through the entire body of industrious tenant-farmers. The time seems opportune for considering a proposition which directly grasps the old Irish problem of "fixity of tenure;" offering a solution of it which, I venture to think, is accordant with sound principle and experience, and suited to the circumstances of Ireland.

Appendixes.

(APPENDIX A.)

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS OF IRELAND FOR THE YEAR 1865.

Number of Holdings Classified according to the TOTAL extent of Land held by each Person, and the entire extent of Land under each Class of Landholders.

Classification of Holdings	No. of Holdings	Proportion per cent.	Extent of Land held by each class of Landholders	Average extent of Holdings in each Class
Holdings not exceeding 1 acre	48,769	8.1	25,405 0 2 3	Do.
Do. above 1 5 acres	80,972	13.5	285,616 3 2 4	"
" 5 15 "	175,723	29.3	1,827,934 10 1 24	"
" 15 30 "	136,773	22.8	3,053,258 22 1 12	"
" 30 50 "	71,761	11.9	2,896,484 40 1 18	"
" 50 100 "	54,504	9.1	4,001,751 73 1 27	"
" 100 "a 200 "	21,856	3.6	3,280,480 150 0 15	"
" 200 500 "	8,373	1.4	2,886,506 344 2 38	"
" 500 1,554 0-3	2,062,490	1,327 0 34	Total	600,285 100 20,319,924

Size and Number of Holdings in Ireland compared in 1841 and 1865.

Size of Holdings	Total Number of Holdings	Above 1 to 5 acres, 1841, 1865, Decrease in number between 1841 and 1865, Rate per cent.,	Above 5 to 15 acres, 1841, " 1865, Decrease in number between 1841 and 1865, Rate per cent.,	Above 15 to 30 acres, 1841, " 1865, Increase in numbers between 1841 and 1865, Rate per cent.,	Above 30 acres, 1841, " 1865, Increase in numbers between 1841 and 1865, Rate per cent.,	TOTAL, 1841, " 1865, Decrease in numbers between 1841 and 1865, Rate per cent.,
	310,436	80,972	229,464	73.9	252,799	175,723
	77,076	30.5	79,342	136,773	57,431	72.4
	48,625	158,048	* 109,423	225.0	691,202	551,516
	139,686	20.2				

(APPENDIX B.)

Return showing the Number of AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS, with the AREA and (PUBLIC) VALUATION of each County in Ireland, together with the POPULATION according to the Census of 1861. Name of Purarely Agricultural Hold-in Valued at £4 and Under Over £5 1 £10 £\5 £20 £50 1. " .Valuation Prepration ‡ Countries £4 and and anil and and and Total Area † 1861 under under ueder ueder uwdct up

General Valuation Office,

Dublin,

Richard Griffith,

14th March, 1867

Commissioner of Valuation.

BY HENRY DIX HUTTON,

BARRISTER-AT-LAW,

Price 6d.; by Post, 7d.

The Record of Title in Ireland,

Its Working and Advantages,

Illustrated by Practical Examples.

A Paper read at the Meeting of the Social Science Association, Belfast, September, 1867.

Dublin: HODGES, SMITH, & CO., 104, Grafton-street, Booksellers to the Hon. Society of King's Inns.

London: W. RIDGWAY, Piccadilly.

Price 3d.; by Post, 4d.

Explanatory Statement,

Showing the chief reasons for placing land in Ireland on the Record of Title, printed pursuant to a Resolution of the Committee of the REGISTRATION OF TITLE ASSOCIATION, dated the 2nd of December, 1865; revised October, 1867.

Dublin: HODGES, SMITH, & CO., 104, Grafton-street, Booksellers to the Hon. Society of King's Inns.

2nd Edition. Price 5s.; by Post, 5s. 3d.

Land-Transfer

And

Land-Securities in Ireland,

Under the Provisions of the "Record of Title Act, 1865," and the "Land Debentures Act, 1865," with the Acts and Rules, Court Fees, Solicitors' Costs, Landed Estates' Court Act, 1866, and a copious Index. A Handbook for the Public and the Profession.

Dublin: HODGES, SMITH, & Co., 104, Grafton-street, Booksellers to the Hon. Society of King's Inns.

The Contagious Diseases Act, Shall the Contagious Diseases Act be Applied to the Civil Population? Being a Paper Bead Before the Association of the Medical Officers of Health, on Saturday, December 18th, 1869.

By William Acton, M.R.C.S.,

Formerly Externe to the L'ourcine Hospital, Paris; Fellow of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, Etc., Etc.

Medicina Literis

London: John Churchill & Sons, New Burlington Street. 1870.

[*Price One Shilling.*]

By the same Author,

Prostitution: considered in its Moral, Social, and Sanitary Aspects, in London and other large Cities and Garrison Towns. With Proposals for the Control and Prevention of its attendant evils. Second Edition, entirely rewritten, 8vo. cloth, 12s.

- Prostitution defined.
- Prostitution in England.
- Diseases the Result of Prostitution.
- Existing Provision for the Control of Prostitutes.
- Prostitution abroad.
- Causes of Prostitution.
- Recognition and Regulation of Prostitution, as regards the British Army and Navy.
- Recognition and Regulation of Prostitution in Civil Life in England.
- Amelioration of Prostitution.
- Prevention of Prostitution.

The Contagious Diseases Act.

Part I.

Precis of Author's Views.

IT will be in the recollection of persons interested in the subject of this paper that both branches of the Legislature have recently appointed Committees to investigate the results of the Contagious Diseases Act.

Favourable Report of the House of Commons.

These Committees have reported favourably of the measure, especially the Committee appointed by the House of Commons, in July, 1889, which states among other things that—

"Although the Act has only been in operation two years and a half, and at some stations only seven months, strong testimony is borne to the benefits, both in a moral and sanitary point of view, which have already resulted from it.

"Prostitution appears to have diminished—its worst features to have been softened—and its physical evils abated."

—P. iii.

The Committee close the report by saying—

"Your Committee would remark, in conclusion, that whilst, for the reasons stated at the commencement of their Report, they have confined their investigations to the object of securing greater efficiency in the treatment of these diseases at Military and Naval stations, they recommend that further inquiry, by a Committee appointed early in the next session, should be instituted with the view of ascertaining whether it would be practicable to extend to the civil population the benefits of an Act which has already done so much to diminish prostitution, decrease disease, and reclaim the abandoned.

"Your Committee have examined Mr. Simon, the medical officer of the Privy Council, as to the nature of the evidence which should be prepared before this question is referred to a Parliamentary Committee, and they recommend that his suggestions on this head should be adopted by Her Majesty's Government."

In consequence of these strong recommendations, it is probable that another session will not pass without the Legislature enacting some measure for the extension of the Contagious Diseases Act to the civil population. In the face of this possibility, it seems of the highest importance that the question, how far such an extension is desirable or possible, should receive very careful and accurate consideration at the hands of the profession and the public, and I am anxious to assist the progress of the discussion to the utmost of my power.

The passing of the Contagious Diseases Act is a step in the right direction; it is an effort, and, as the parliamentary reports, to which I have alluded, show, a successful effort to mitigate a great physical mischief. In considering the attitude which a civilized community should assume towards prostitution, the nature of the evil must not be lost sight of.

Would that we Could Eradicate Prostitution.

I wish that I could believe with some of our opponents, that we could do away with prostitution altogether. If I thought it possible or probable, I would most willingly assist in eradicating the evil, but I believe, that by aiming at the possible and the practical, we shall do more good than by seeking to attain a state which, however

desirable, is beyond our reach. Prostitution we cannot prevent, but we can mitigate the misery entailed by it, and can do much if we will to prevent women becoming prostitutes. The evil cannot be done away, but it may be lessened, and that to a very great extent. We cannot do all we wish: is that a reason for doing nothing? Let us do what we can. A mischief that must always exist will have more or less intensity according as we regulate it or leave it to itself. The women will become more or less depraved according as good and healing influences are brought to bear upon or withheld from them.

Prostitution an Inseparable Condition of Society.

It is useless to shut our eyes to facts. Prostitution is no passing evil, but one that has existed from the first ages of the world's history down to the present time, and differs but little, and in minor particulars, in this the nineteenth century, from what it was in the earliest times. The records of the human race, from the Book of Genesis downwards, through the whole range of ancient and medieval literature to the writings of our own day, bear witness to the perpetual presence among men of the daughters of shame. Kings, philosophers, and priests, the learned and the noble, no less than the ignorant and simple, have drunk without stint in every age and every clime of Circe's cup; nor is it reasonable to suppose that in the years to come the world will prove more virtuous than it has shown itself in ages past. From time to time men's purer instincts, revolting from the sin, have striven to repress it; but such efforts have too often ended in failure, and entailed disasters more terrible than those from which relief was sought.

As one among many other instances of the futility of repressive measures, I may cite the example of the city of *Berlin*. This capital has on three separate occasions, since the Reformation, been purged of prostitutes, but has as often immediately fallen a prey to desertion of infants, adultery, abortions, and clandestine prostitution. Hence the present public recognition of that which the Government could neither suppress nor ignore with public advantage, has been forced upon the authorities. It is evident that it would be unreasonable to expect any other result. Equally irrational is it to imagine that this irrepressible evil can exist without entailing upon society serious mischief, which, though incapable of extinction, yet admits of mitigation. To ignore an ever-present evil appears a mistake as fatal as the attempt to repress it.

Were Prostitution Unattended by Contagious Diseases we should not Advocate Government Interference.

I must here admit that if prostitution carried moral mischiefs only in its train, it would be to a great extent, if not entirely, outside the proper sphere of legislation. Failure must always be the fate of any attempt to make people virtuous by Act of Parliament. The evils produced by prostitution are two-fold, moral and physical. The remedies adopted must be in like manner twofold—the moral mischief must be left to the influences of religion and civilization, and to the care of those who from their special position are peculiarly fitted for grappling with moral evil. The physical mischiefs on the other hand must be met by physical measures; the same thing which is true of the results is true of the causes of prostitution. These also are two-fold, moral and physical—the moral causes must be met in the same way as the moral results—the physical causes in the same way as the physical results, that is to say, the means adapted to dealing with moral evil must be applied to the one; the means of grappling with physical evil to the other. It will be at once apparent that the question how to deal with prostitution is a very wide one.

Other Mischiefs Connected with Prostitution.

That the mischiefs which result and will result from it are various, and therefore that the machinery for dealing with it must be as various as the evils sought to be remedied. I may allude to Infanticide Illegitimacy, and Inadequate Lodging Accommodation for the Poor It as evils already connected with prostitution, which ought to be the objects of legislation.

For the present, I will deal only with contagious disease that results from prostitution, and here I may repeat that contagious disease is inseparable from it, and will merely premise that any efforts to grapple with this result ought to be accompanied by measures dealing with the other cognate evils to which I have referred.

Summary of the Effects of Contagious Disease.

Doubts have recently been expressed as to the magnitude of the evil occasioned by venereal disease, it being imagined by some that not only is the disease comparatively infrequent but productive of mere ephemeral mischief; it has moreover been hinted by the medical officer of the Privy Council, and asserted in the protest

issued by the Ladies' Association that the object of those who advocate the extension of the Contagious Diseases Acts to the civil population is simply to enable men to indulge their sexual passions with impunity.

In consequence of these grave misconceptions it seems necessary to say a few words as to the extent, the rigour, and the insidious character of the venereal disease, also as to the mortality occasioned by it.

I.—AS TO THE EXTENT.—In my treatise on syphilis I have shown that in our leading public hospitals in London, one-half or fifty per cent of the surgical outpatients came there in consequence of being affected with venereal diseases, *page 52*.

Captain Harris has kindly placed the following data at my disposal, which are even more alarming than those referred to by Dr. Stewart with reference to Greenwich, see p. 28. They are most valuable as showing the amount of disease discovered in the newly protected districts immediately on their being brought within the provisions of the act, and as furnishing us with authentic evidence of the enormous amount of disease that must be existing in all the unprotected districts, *i.e.* throughout by far the greater part of the United Kingdom.

"The first 250 women brought up for examination in the Plymouth district were found to be diseased without a single exception."

"Return of the number of women examined in the Winchester District since the acts came into operation there (Thursday, Jan. 6 to Feb. 1, 1870), shewing the number found diseased, number free, and also the nature of the diseases, whether syphilis or gonorrhœa. Number examined, 76. Number found diseased, 50. Number found free 20. Nature of disease: syphilis, 28; gonorrhœa, 28."

I have proved that at the time my statistics were taken at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, about one in every five surgical out-patients was a woman or child, *Loc. Cit. p.54*. Before the Contagious Diseases Act was put in force in the British Army, 325 per 1000 soldiers were annually affected with venereal disease,

It is instructive to compare these returns with those showing the freedom from venereal disease among soldiers in foreign armies. "In Paris 40 per 1000 men only were affected with venereal disease in the garrison of Paris in the years 1858 to 1880."—*Acton on Prostitution, p. 125*. "At Brussels when I visited that city, only 1 men were laid up out of a garrison of 3500 soldiers."—*Loc. Cit., p. 131*. "In the Prussian army the proportion of venereal was 62 per 1000."—*Loc. Cit., p. 143*.

Loc. Cit. p.8. At page (S3, evidence is given that 35 per cent, per annum of sailors were rendered unfit for service by this scourge of our seaport towns.

During the discussion which followed the reading of this paper, Dr. Kidd, Staff-Surgeon of the Army Medical Service, said the last report of the Army Medical Department was for 1867, and was published in September. The returns for the United Kingdom show that from 1860 to 1866, even before the application of the Contagious Diseases Act, there had been a progressive decrease in the cases of venereal diseases. In 1860 the proportion of admissions per 1000 of the strength was 369, in 1866 it was 258. In 1860 the proportion constantly sick from venereal disease was 23-69 per 1000, in 1866 16.19 per thousand. In 1867 an increase had occurred. The proportion of admissions was 291 and of constantly sick 17-13. Dr. Kidd quoted statistics from Dr. Parke's work on hygiene as to the relative number of soldiers attacked with primary venereal sores in 1868, at "protected" and at "unprotected" stations "In the protected stations, the number attacked in 1868 is not only below the mean in the previous four years in every station, but is, in every case, lower than the minimum of any former year, whereas, in two out of the four non-protected stations, the number of attacks in 1868 is above the mean of the previous four years; in one station is only-just below, and in only one station is lower in 1868 than in any of the preceding years. The mean number of attacks in the five protected stations in 1864 was 108-98, and in 1868 was 67-63. In the four unprotected stations the corresponding numbers were 115-13 and 101-08." "On the whole, considering how imperfectly, and for how short a time, the Act has been applied, I think there is every reason to hope that the lessening of syphilis at all the protected stations in 1868 (though it is inconsiderable in the ease of Aldershot) is really owing; to the influence of the Act." Dr. Kidd thought the recruiting returns would furnish some means of comparing the civil population with the army in respect to the prevalence of venereal diseases. The returns from 1860 to 1866 showed that the proportion of recruits rejected for venereal diseases was about 16 per 1000 annually, or very nearly the same as the proportion of soldiers constantly sick from the same causes during the last few years. While, however, there has been a marked diminution in the number of soldiers constantly sick, there has been no corresponding diminution in the proportion of rejected recruits for venereal diseases."

I have also shown that in the merchant service, 1 out of every 3 patients who applied to the Dreadnought Hospital suffered from venereal disease, *page 67*.

II.—AS TO THE RIGOUR.—There is no doubt that the disease, though quite as frequent, is less virulent now than it was a few years ago. The decrease in its virulence is attributable, of course, to the improved method of treatment, to the altered and more regular habit of living, and better hygienic conditions of the population, and shows how much may be done in the way of mitigating the syphilitic poison, where the opportunity of exercising his skill is afforded to the medical man. This decrease of the activity of the disease seems to me a

strong reason for giving to the profession increased facilities for dealing with it. It must not be imagined that because the poison is now followed by less serious consequences than formerly, that the mischief produced by syphilis is not of very great magnitude; it is true that, if taken in time, and if the patient have a strong constitution, permanently injurious results are generally avoided; but wherever these conditions are not fulfilled—and, in many cases, even, where they are—broken constitutions and a poisoned state of the blood, which make the procreation of healthy offspring a physical impossibility, are the results.

III.—THE INSIDIOUS NATURE OF THE DISEASE.—I will now say a few words on the insidious nature of syphilis. It is generally assumed that the sufferer from syphilis is necessarily an immoral person. This is a great mistake; the disease doubtless comes in every case primarily from an immoral source. In the present day it never arises spontaneously, it does not follow, however, that the individual sufferer is the guilty party. For instance, the drunken husband, waylaid in his cups by the harlot, contracts the disease syphilis. Would that the complaint stopped here! We have the innocent mother becoming infected, and the babe that she conceives inherits the taint, which it may communicate to a stranger suckling it—who, again, may contaminate her own child, and the chain of contagion may thus be indefinitely lengthened out. Again, in the case of a trade, such as glass-blowing, a diseased man

For many years the medical school in which I was educated in Paris was reluctant to admit that contamination could be spread in these ways. Private practice during the last thirty years, and the facilities for accurate observation among the middle and upper classes of society, now enable me to assert that syphilis may be thus communicated. In making this statement, let me not be understood as admitting that all the published cases of asserted contagion by spoons, drinking-cups, or other vehicles, are true. The medical man has many appeals made on his credulity, and experience can alone sift the true from the false evidence.

may communicate his complaint to any of his fellow workmen who may use the same mouthpiece with himself, and they, of course, in their turn infect their wives. Cases, moreover, like the following are far from uncommon. A single man consorts with prostitutes, and, as a consequence, becomes infected, is treated for the complaint, supposes himself cured—vain delusion!—marries a virtuous girl, when, sad to relate, the disease breaks out in the wife, the offspring becomes tainted, and the contagion may be further indefinitely spread, as I have already stated.

IV.—MORTALITY ARISING FROM SYPHILIS.—The weekly average of deaths from syphilis in London, within the last ten years, (1860-9 inclusive) varies from 4.9 to 9.0.

The Registrar-General has kindly supplied me with the following most important tables, showing the mortality arising from syphilis, and my readers will not fail to remark the appalling but incontrovertible fact that the greatest mortality exists among infants under 1 year of age. What a sad commentary do they furnish on Scripture, "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children."

I think I have now disposed of the notion suggested by the medical officer of the Privy Council "that very exaggerated opinions are current as to the diffusion and malignity of contagious diseases (p. 13), and have shown conclusively that syphilis is an evil too great to be left to work its fatal course unchecked, and may now proceed to indicate the means by which it can be most efficiently contended with.

How Contagious Disease can be Controlled.

It appears to me, that the only effectual way of dealing with the disorder, is to detect early, to seclude effectually, and place under medical treatment, as many affected persons as possible. It is as vain to hope to reach all, as it is to deny that there are many upon whom the healing hand can be laid. Only those utterly ignorant of what has been achieved, will be so bold as to deny the excellent effects produced by the Contagious Diseases Act in the protected districts. The reasonable conclusion seems to be that what is good for the few will be good for the many, and that the provisions of this Act should be extended to the whole population.

Who Shall Come Under the Control of the Act.

I may at once state that there are many women whose lives are immoral, whom it will be impossible—perhaps even undesirable—to bring within the provisions of the Act, on account of the secrecy and reserve with which they pursue their calling.

Many of these women are doubtless diseased, but the very secrecy which places them beyond the reach of legislation, at the same time limits their sphere of mischief, and the men infected by them, are for the most part able to obtain prompt and efficient medical advice, so that the mischief caused by such women as, these, is comparatively slight. The lower we descend in the social scale, the more mischievous does syphilis become,

See the enormous authentic proportions, page 7.

for it is among the poorer classes that neglect of the disease, inability to obtain proper medical treatment,

and feeble constitutions, are at present most frequently met with.

The Common Prostitute is the Person We Wish to Control.

I am, I think, not saying too much when I affirm, that if we could only lay our hands upon the notoriously vicious women, upon all, in short, who can be fairly included in the term "common prostitute" we should get rid of the greater, and most dangerous part of the mischief. Now, this is the very thing that is done by the Contagious Diseases Act.

The principle of this Act is, that every woman known to the police as a common prostitute, who fails, on notice, to submit herself to a voluntary examination, is liable to be summoned before a magistrate, and subjected by his order, if he shall think fit, to medical examination and supervision, and on the certificate of the medical officer, that she is diseased, subjected to treatment in hospital until cured. It is perhaps unfortunate that no attempt was made by the framers of this Act to define accurately the persons to whom they intended to apply this term "common prostitute." As might be expected, much capital has been made by opponents of the measure, out of this omission, though I believe that no practical evil has hitherto resulted from it. To guard against all possibility of misconception in future, it may, perhaps, be wise for the legislature to supply this omission in any act dealing with the population at large.

Definition of a Common Prostitute.

I am, however, far from considering the insertion of any such clause a necessity, as it is a most remote possibility that any woman should be charged with being a common prostitute, unless her conduct was notoriously and openly bad, and it is obvious that any distinct statement of the acts that shall render a woman liable to be included in the class supplies, by the definition, the means of evasion. It is worthy of remark, that the number of women, returned by the police, as common prostitutes, reaches to little more than 5000, though the metropolis is believed to contain an infinitely greater number of vicious women. This shows the strong reluctance that exists on the part of the police, to include in such a category any but the most abandoned. It also shows that there are certain women, whose number is far from inconsiderable, whose profligate mode of life is open and undisguised, and admits of no reasonable doubt. These at least may be dealt with by this act, and we may, I think, lay it down as a general rule, that it is reasonable to treat as a common prostitute every woman who can be shown to be an habitual street walker, or frequenter of casinos and similar places of resort, or in the habit of hiring herself out to different men, and every woman known to resort to houses of accommodation, and whom no respectable man will acknowledge as either wife or mistress.

How the Act Affects the Common Prostitute.

To show how considerably, and with what little hardship to the women subject to the existing Act, its regulations can be carried out, I may quote the evidence of Inspector Smith, the efficient officer of the Aldershot district, given before the committee of the House of Lords in 1869.

His examination, so far as material to this point, was as follows:—

976. Will you tell the Committee what your duties are with regard to the Contagious Diseases Act?—I will. The duties consist in watching for women who are supposed to be prostitutes, women who are not residing in brothels, and women who are practising clandestine prostitution; and warning them to attend for medical examination, and conveying them to and from the hospital, or to their homes; in fact, every duty connected with the carrying out of the Act.

977. You have spoken of clandestine prostitution, and do you believe that there is much clandestine prostitution within the camp at Aldershot?—I do.

978. Have you any power over clandestine prostitutes?—We have no power; but I satisfy myself always either by myself or from some good information that I obtain, and I always make it a point to see those people. I see them and tell them what I have seen or heard, and in most cases they do not deny it, and I warn them to attend for medical examination. That is my practice.

979. In what class of life are those clandestine prostitutes?—Various classes. As a rule, they are of the lower order; I could not say that any person who is practising as a clandestine prostitute is moving in what I might call a respectable sphere of life. They are as a rule labourers' daughters, and people of that class.

980. Shop girls?—I think not.

981. Servants?—Servants occasionally.

982. Under the present Act, what power would you have over a servant who you had reason to believe was practising clandestine prostitution?—First of all, I should warn her to attend for examination under the 17th section of the Act. If she did not attend for examination, and I had good reason to suppose that she was

diseased, and was conducting herself as a common prostitute, I should then lay information before a magistrate in the usual way, and get her summoned before him; and if she did not appear by herself, or by some person on her part, then I should ask the magistrate to be good enough to make an order for her examination, which of course would depend upon the magistrate. If the evidence was sufficient to justify him in making the order, he would do so; and if he did, I should then serve a copy on her; and in the event of her not attending, I should then apply to a magistrate for a warrant to apprehend her; she would then be apprehended and brought before the magistrates in the usual way, and charged with the offence.

983. What nature of evidence could you offer with regard to a woman in service in a house?—For instance, if I went to the military hospital, and a man was in his bed and he told me that So-and-so had given him the disease, I should then make some inquiries; I should very likely ask the hospital serjeant or some person about, if the man's statement was to be relied upon, and if he was likely to tell me the truth or not; I should be very cautious not to interfere in any way with any person in service or living in any respectable place, or anything of that sort, without good foundation. If I found that the man's statement was to be relied upon, I should keep observation upon this party for some time, and if I found out that the woman went out to public-houses, and was seen in company with various men, and that kind of thing, then I should take upon myself to warn her; but if I saw nothing of the kind whatever beyond the man's mere assertion that such was the case, I should not take any notice of it.

Even if the police employed in carrying out this Act are occasionally guilty of tyrannical or vexatious interference with the liberty of the subject, little mischief can result so long as the medical officer retains the discretionary power, at present exercised by him, of refusing to examine any woman who can suggest to his mind a reasonable doubt as to the justice of her apprehension, until such time as the doubt shall be removed. It must also be remembered that no woman can be brought to the surgeon for examination, except by her own submission, until a magistrate has been satisfied that such a proceeding is justifiable.

Reasons for Compulsory Confinement.

Were the plan feasible, I should agree with the proposal, that in preference to this compulsory legislation, large hospitals should be opened for the treatment of diseased women on their own voluntary application, but experience teaches us that they will not come. At the present moment, notwithstanding the inadequate accommodation in proportion to the disease existing among prostitutes, provided by the London hospitals, numbers of the beds at these institutions remain unoccupied, owing to the disinclination of those women to enter the wards of their own accord, therefore the adoption of compulsory measures seems unavoidable.

It is now many years ago since I called public attention to the error committed by philanthropists and medical men in treating prostitutes as out-patients. I regret to say that what I wrote and published, regarding our civil hospital arrangements, twelve years ago, applies equally at the present day. I, however, now go farther, and venture to question whether it is desirable for our civil hospitals to treat prostitutes as out-patients at all.

Every man who frequents the street, after nightfall, must meet many a woman, apparently sound and healthy, who, patched up by voluntary charity in the morning, knows no other way—nay, whose only possible resource—to get her necessary food, or bed at night, is to sally forth into the streets. The ministers of charity may have eased her pain in the morning, dressed her sores and given her drugs, but in a month she will be no nearer soundness than had she been taken care of by the State within the walls of the hospital for one week; and within that month what a scourge upon society will the surgeons not have kept afoot by their exertions? Here is the power of charity again working to waste.

We have seen, that, to confer any permanent benefit on society, and on sanitary grounds, when a woman is diseased, an early detection of her complaint is necessary, and that when discovered she should at once be placed in confinement, so as to prevent her disseminating the plague. Moreover, she should not be allowed to leave the hospital till perfectly well and unable to contaminate any one she may have relations with. Our existing civil hospitals fulfil few of these conditions. The diseased prostitute is not sought after; she applies only when the mischief she can cause is done, and many men have been diseased, and she finds herself unable any longer to carry on her trade. If there be room in the wards to take the patient in, she occupies a bed say for many months, and even then society has no guarantee that she will remain till cured and do no more mischief. On the contrary, as soon as she pleases, the girl of her own free will (and many do so) can quit the hospital long before the surgeon gives his sanction; hence society and sanitary laws are baffled, and instead of the hospital benefiting the girl and the plague of syphilis becoming checked, the propagation of the disease is aided by both the in-and out-patient hospital system of treating our sick prostitutes.

It may be in the recollection of my readers, that some years ago it was given in evidence that prostitutes who were lying in hospitals suffering from venereal diseases, at Portsmouth, (on being sent for by the brothel-keepers) on the occasion of a ship being paid off, one and all left their beds to participate in the drinking

and rioting that was a necessary consequence, to the no small detriment of Her Majesty's jolly tars, who of course became affected with the most serious forms of disease. This, I may add, took place before the existing Contagious Diseases Act came into force, and compulsory residence in hospital (as now enforced) was carried out.

If the British public could only once conceive the idea that the treatment, cure, and temporary segregation of the syphilitic, was as much a matter of public interest as that of the lunatic, whose seclusion all counties, towns, and parishes provide for with such remarkable alacrity, not so much out of love or respect for the patient as because it is a dangerous thing to leave him at large, I think I should not long be without followers in wishing for equally public recognition of both complaints.

In another twelve months those who follow me may, I hope, have to chronicle that no prostitute in civil life will be treated week after week as an out-patient; but that she, like her sister in garrison towns and ten miles round, will, on the discovery of her diseased condition, be confined in hospital and restrained from infecting alike soldiers and civilians.

Beneficial Effects on the Women Themselves.

We have now had sufficient experience of the Act to test the effect the Contagious Diseases Act has had on the women themselves, and I see around me gentlemen

In the discussion which followed this paper, Mr. Gascoyen stated "that he was confident that the majority of the women admitted to the Lock Hospital regarded the Act favourably. He had never heard complaints about being subject to examination, although there were some of being detained in the Hospital; but even these were few, and proceeded from women of the worst character. In proof of this, he stated that fully 10 per cent, of the women admitted to the Lock Hospital during the past year had sought inspection voluntarily, some of them coming from distant places not under the Act, in order to place themselves under treatment. Mr. Gascoyen fully endorsed Mr. Acton's statements as to the marked improvement noticeable in the women since the application of the Act. Many had taken advantage of the opportunity to enter the Lock Asylum alone; some had gone to other institutions, and some again had been returned to their friends when cured." Dr. Stuart said "the women uniformly acknowledge the benefits they derive from the working of the Act, and that they had never made any complaint of oppression on the part of the police, or of any others engaged in enforcing it."—*Medical Times*, January 15, 1870.

this evening who will, I am sure, corroborate the following statement:—

The women are at least taught to respect themselves, and they are already less dirty and less disreputable. If care be taken in the selection of the health inspectors, every prostitute who comes within the scope of the Act, will every week find herself brought face to face with a man who disapproves and stands aloof from her life of sin, she will have the necessity of cleanliness impressed upon her, she will have the filthiness of her life imperceptibly brought to her notice. I have suggested that at the inspector's office papers should be kept, to be had on application, showing how those who desire to turn from a life of prostitution can have the means placed before them of doing so, and a notice should be fixed up in the office that such papers are there, and may be had on application. This would at least prevent the women who came for inspection, from supposing that their calling was either allowed, or tolerated, or considered necessary. But the weekly inspections will lead to something more, they will lead to the detention of numbers of these women; the life in the hospital will give to all the very opportunities that now penitentiaries give to some, and give them in a far more judicious and salutary manner. It may be that many weeks of inspection will be undergone, and more than one visit made to the hospital, before the desired change is produced. But I have said that the method that I propose is gradual, and that the change to be real must be gradual.

Average Number of Beds Required, and the Probable Expense.

I may be told, perhaps, that the number of beds required, and the expense of their maintenance would be so great, that my plan would become impracticable. I have met this objection in my recent work on "Prostitution." There I state that if we wish to provide accommodation in proportion to the number of beds devoted to females in Paris and Berlin, we should require 800 beds, if in proportion to the five great capitals or Europe, we should require 1,400. The expense of maintaining them is estimated at £24 10s. per bed: thus we could maintain the 800 beds for £20,000, or the 1,400 beds for £34,000. Let my readers recollect that if economists should grumble at such an expenditure, statistics show us that we spend upwards of this sum annually in curing the men among the 40,000 quartered in the eight garrison towns, independently of the subsequent injury to the health of and invaliding in the army.

If we try to form some estimate of what venereal disease is at present costing the community or what the

individual would save by the introduction of the Contagious Diseases Act among the civil population, so as to protect our adult male population from the effects of syphilis, we may arrive at a serious, but, I believe, approximate estimate.

Dr. Farr is my authority for stating that, in the year 1868, there were 474,500 men in the metropolis between the ages of twenty and forty. If, therefore, it costs £56,000 to cure the venereal patients among 46,000 soldiers, it must at present be costing £577,670, or upwards of *half-a-million*, to cure the venereal cases among the 474,500 men liable to be affected in the metropolis, supposing that the venereal disease is as common among the adult civil population, as it is among Our soldiers.

Part II.

Objections to the Extension of the Contagious Diseases Act to the Civil Population Considered.

I shall now briefly consider some of the more prominent objections urged against the proposed extension of the Contagious Diseases Act to the civil population. These objections are based mainly on religious and moral grounds—the risk of encouraging sin,—and the injustice of Curtailing individual freedom.

From the language held by our opponents, one would imagine that they enjoyed a monopoly of love of liberty and regard for religion, but that we who desire to check disease, care for neither of these things. Now I desire the utmost freedom for all, except freedom to injure the community, and I reverence religion too much not to grieve when it degenerates into mere sentiment, and I repudiate the sensational and disingenuous arguments so freely used by our opponents in discussing these social questions. Among the many pamphlets recently circulated against the extension of the Contagious Diseases Act, I may notice, as a type of the class to which it belongs, one recently published by a provincial member of my own profession, Dr. Taylor. Its sensational character sufficiently appears from its title—

*"On the Contagious Diseases Act—
(Women, Not Animals.)*

"Showing how the New Law debases Women, debauches Men, destroys the Liberty of the Subject, and tends to "increase Disease."

How strangely do these frantic sentences compare with the extract I have already quoted from the last report of the House of Commons, which states—

"Although the Act has only been in operation two years and a-half, and, at some stations] only seven months, strong testimony is borne to the benefits both in a moral and sanitary point of view, which have already resulted from it.

"Prostitution appears to have diminished, its worst features to have been softened, and its physical evils abated."

I may at least pay Dr. Taylor the compliment of saying that the subsequent pages of his pamphlet will sustain the character gained for it by its title page.

Is it true, I have been asked, that, as stated in this pamphlet—

"Under the provisions of the Contagious Diseases Act, any "woman whom a policeman may choose to designate, or affect to believe, to be a prostitute, without proof, without evidence, trial, or conviction, is liable to be arrested, taken before a magistrate, and condemned to three months' imprisonment with hard labour, which may be repeated indefinitely, that is for life, if she decline to submit for at least a year in company with the vilest prostitutes, to a frequently repeated violation of her person with a surgical instrument. The policeman is disguised in plain clothes, and his functions are those of a spy. When he has spied out a woman, he informs her in the language of the force, that 'he shall run her in that is, take her before a magistrate, unless she consents to the operation I have described. In the middle ages, when our forefathers employed the rack, thumb-screw, fire, and other forms of torture, such exposure and violation was one of the 'peincs fortes et dures,' occasionally offered with others for selection to female criminals, but it was always the last chosen.

"It is now offered with the alternative of imprisonment for life to those, who at the very worst are not criminals, and who may be entirely innocent."

At page 6 it is stated—

"The spies have nothing to guide them in their selection of victims, and I am informed that one of these officials recently told a girl, that his reason for arresting her was that he had seen her twice at a concert No proof is required.

"Suspicious—just, or unjust, aroused by worthy or unworthy motives, are all that is necessary to condemn

the best woman in the land, and if she happens to be penniless and friendless, so much the worse for her."

At page 10, he goes on—

"Indeed it is a well-known fact, that wherever this Act is enforced, no respectable woman is safe. In fact, in Paris, it is not safe for a young lady to walk abroad; if she do so, she is almost certain to be arrested and accused of prostitution."

It is difficult to answer such loose assertions. So far as they come within the region of reason, I will endeavour to deal with them, but, I here quote them rather to show what extraordinary things some men will say, and some others, I presume, believe, than with a view to serious argument. Any one who will take the trouble to compare the clauses of the Contagious Diseases Act with these statements of Dr. Taylor's, will be at a loss to discover what foundation any one outside St. Luke's could have found for such wild and startling propositions. What, for, instance, are we to do with a man who actually believes, or at least asserts, that "one of these officials recently told a girl that his reason for arresting her was that he had seen her twice at a concert"—that "suspicions just or unjust are all that is necessary to condemn the best woman in the land," that "wherever this act is in force, no respectable woman is safe, and that in fact, in Paris, it is not safe for a young lady to walk abroad. Such notions, as they have found a propagator, may also find adherents. It is some comfort to believe that such persons are never likely to exercise much influence on the course of legislation. The dark allusion to the *peines fortes et dures* of the middle ages, is even more incomprehensible to persons of ordinary minds than the other grotesque statements by which it is surrounded. Were it not for the proneness of mankind to believe that where there is smoke there must be fire, these random sentences might be left to refute themselves; but lest any one should imagine that this Act does really open the door to, if not actually introduce something very bad indeed, I will now proceed to discover, if possible, and then to deal with the objections hidden under this cloud of words. They appear to be two: First, that this Act puts the virtue of the women of England in the hands of the police. Secondly, that the medical examination of a prostitute is an unjustifiable outrage, and is as painful to her as the worst form of torture. The first proposition is obviously untrue, and on examination must resolve itself into the milder, yet serious objection—that under this Act, it is possible for the police to be guilty of arbitrary and capricious conduct. If this be so, Dr. Taylor has doubtless succeeded in hitting a blot, for it is impossible to exaggerate the serious consequences to an innocent woman of being falsely accused of leading an immoral life. This, however, seems to be an objection to the particular Act, rather than to the principle embodied in it, and, if it can be substantiated, shows the necessity of guarding in future legislation against the possibility of any modest woman being treated as a prostitute, through the mistake or malice of a policeman. It seems to me that this can be done without much difficulty. I am aware that Mr. Mill

Mr. Mill's Avignon Letter, *Echo* January 17, 1870.

is of a contrary opinion, "he does not think the abuses of power by the police mere accidents, which could be prevented. He thinks them the necessary consequences of any attempt to carry out such a plan thoroughly." This observation of Mr. Mill's would be undeniably true, if it were proposed to bring under supervision all the women of loose habits in the country; but I, at least, suggest no such enterprise. I shall be satisfied, if we can subject to the provisions of this sanitary law all the open and notorious prostitutes. As I have already shown, it is from these women that the mischief principally, if not altogether, proceeds, and whatever danger there may be, that women of good repute should from exceptional circumstances become the objects of undeserved suspicion, it is absurd to suggest that they could ever be mistaken for, or accused of being professional prostitutes, to whom alone it is proposed to extend the Act. If it be said that in dealing only with the notorious prostitute, we reach but a small part of the evil, and the experience of clandestine prostitution in France be advanced in support of this position, I reply, that there is no analogy between the *fille clandestine* of the continent and the secretly dissolute woman in England. The clandestine prostitute and the public prostitute belong to precisely the same class, the only difference being, that the one evades, and the other submits to medical inspection; the result being, that the one exhibits disease in the proportion of about 1 in 5, the other of about 1 in 200. In England all prostitutes living outside the protected districts are in the sense in which the term is used in France of being uninspected, clandestine, and may be reasonably supposed to be diseased in the same proportion as women similarly circumstanced in other countries. It is, therefore, perfectly accurate to speak of clandestine prostitution on the continent as the great source of danger to the public health; but such a statement with regard to prostitution in England is absolutely meaningless; and if by clandestine, the intention is to allude to the more reserved class of prostitutes, or rather to women who, though not prostitutes, are guilty of immorality, it is positively false.

If it be objected that the proposed legislation will create the clandestine class in this country—that is, that the same repugnance will be exhibited by prostitutes in England to the proposed means of checking the disease by which they are afflicted, as is exhibited in France to being subjected to the police regulations in vogue there,—I reply, that this is jumping to a conclusion most unwarrantably. The places from which we should draw our inferences as to the possibility of effectually carrying out a Contagious Diseases Act, are not foreign

countries subjected to an entirely different system, but the protected districts at home, where the plan is already in successful operation. The first objection then is not to the principle of the Contagious Diseases Act, but to the supposed absence from it of sufficiently careful provisions; these, if the objection can be substantiated, may be supplied. I may further remark, that so far as this objection is countenanced by Mr. Mill, it appears to be on account of his misapprehension of what is really proposed to be done, and the amount of good that can thereby be accomplished. The second objection goes undoubtedly to the principles of the measure, but appears to be one of little weight. The charge conveyed by it is, that we are proposing to submit unfortunate women to a system worse than the worst torture. Can serious trifling be carried further, and can we be expected to believe, that women whose bodies are free to all the world, will, if examined by a surgeon, feel misery akin to that which drove modest women to prefer torture to violation? It is wonderful that a man professing so much regard for what is due to women should so travesty their most sacred feelings.

The public should be made fully aware of the fact that we are not legislating for "soiled doves" but for a class of women that we may almost call unsexed, who, I have elsewhere shown, have so far lost womanly feelings, that they will consort with as many as from eight to twelve different men in the same night. *Acton on Prostitution*, p. 25.

Objections Against Instrumental Examination.

Dr. Taylor alleges that disease is communicated by the speculum. This is a question of fact. I may observe, that Dr. Taylor has given no instance that has come under his own knowledge. During the last thirty years I have had some personal experience, and I fearlessly assert that if ordinary and proper precautions be taken, no qualified medical man will thus spread contagion.

In the discussion which followed the reading of this paper, the possibility of spreading contagion by means of the instrument was denied/ Dr. Stuart, the examining surgeon at Woolwich, stated "that he had examined thousands, and he had never known a case of any woman accusing him of having contaminated her with the speculum. Dr. Letheby, the Medical Officer of Health for the city of London, and Professor of Chemistry in the College of the London Hospital, said in reply to the above hypothetical statement, "that he did not believe it to be true—that one drop of pus would communicate infectious properties to a pint of water; for, according to his experience, hardly anything was so powerful as water in destroying the contagium of pus, and such like cell structures which exist naturally in a dense albuminous liquid, for the water quickly enters them by endosmose and destroys their vitality by overdistention, or even by bursting them. But even if it were true, it is not of any serious importance, seeing how easy it is to destroy the contagious matter by immersing the speculum for a minute or two in boiling water, which might be always at hand in a vessel with a small gas jet under it. Another vessel of cold water might be used to cool the speculum, and thus with a couple of instruments, the examining surges might continue his examinations with absolute safety, and without unnecessary delay."

I have personally seen all the classes of registered and unregistered *filles clandestines* and public women examined in Paris on several occasions, and I may refer the sceptical to page 119 of my last edition on Prostitution, where I state that I recently assisted at the examination of at least fifty registered prostitutes, brought promiscuously from different parts of Paris, and not a single one was found diseased—this arising from the efficiency of the police regulations in that city; similar visits have corroborated these views. How contagion can be spread where precautions are taken to cleanse the instruments, I am at a loss to conceive.

The officers of the different Lock Hospitals will, I am sure, bear me out in saying that contagion ought not to, and, in fact, does not take place in this manner. Dr. Taylor further objects that in a large proportion of cases it is impossible to say with certainty whether a woman is diseased or not. This, again, is a question of fact. If this assertion proves anything, it shows only that incompetent men must not be appointed to these responsible situations. I think men conversant with the subject will agree with me that if a woman presents to the practised eye no recognizable traces of disease, the instances are rare indeed in which she will prove a source of contagion.

Another statement in the above-quoted pamphlet, which will not bear investigation, is one made at p. 11:—

"That the Rev. Dr. Hooppell, Principal of the Marine College at South Shields, proved by the tables given in the Parliamentary reports that contagious diseases have increased at every station where this Act had been applied."

It is worthy of remark that Dr. Taylor does not assert that he believes in these statistics, or has authenticated them, but quotes a clergyman, who believes he has proved by tables—which he gives us no means of referring to—that disease had increased;

Since the discussion took place on my paper I have been at some trouble to discover where this Reverend gentleman could have obtained his information, as the latest official returns of the army only come down to 1867, although published in 1860. I obtained my latest statistics from the valuable treatise of Dr. Parks on

Hygiene, prepared especially for the army. At page 503, that accurate observer remarks—"Taking all the stations, namely, Aldershot, Chatham, Plymouth, Devonport, Portsmouth and Woolwich, the mean admissions for Syphilis were, in the year 1867, 84.98 per 1000 men, and in the year 1868, 65.95 per 1000 men. It seems therefore clear that a good effect has been produced, and I think in the stations where it would have been anticipated."

if this is not disingenuous conduct, I know not what is. I take upon myself to deny *in toto* the assertion, and my medical opponent ought, I think, to have discovered that he was misquoting the Parliamentary reports.

All the evidence I have read contradicts this statement of the Reverend observer, as all the figures prove that the disease is, on the contrary, rapidly diminishing. I may subjoin the following, which I have already published (page 243) in my work on Prostitution.—

"The real fact is, that it is precisely these forms of disease in which society is most interested—namely, syphilis—which have been most beneficially influenced by the system of inspection now in practice, and that it is on the slighter and less important forms that the least impression has been made. The percentage of syphilis has steadily diminished. In the first period the proportion of syphilitic cases was 57-45. The percentage of syphilis decreased gradually during the succeeding periods, till it reached the number of 17-72 per cent, in the half-year ending March 31, 1869—Letter of the Devonport Surgeons to the Lords of the Admiralty, p. 9.

"In the London Lock Hospital, Mr. Lane reports that in 1867 42 per cent, and in 1868 only 35 per cent, of the prostitutes admitted laboured under syphilis, thus showing that the working of the Contagious Diseases Act has very considerably diminished the syphilitic average."

Those who maintain that the Contagious Diseases Act has not been attended with satisfactory results, forget to state that many of the soldiers said to be diseased, and who swell the statistics, are merely instances of relapse, and in other cases the diseases from which they suffer have been contracted beyond the protected district.

The *Westminster Review*, one of our most logical and powerful opponents, objects that the English Contagious Diseases Act confounds all prostitutes of every grade into one indistinguishable crowd of common prostitutes, and forces all the prostitutes to become inhabitants of brothels, in order that the hold upon them may be more secure.

The answer I have to make to this objection is, that the Contagious Diseases Act, as at present carried out at Aldershot and Woolwich, has no such tendency as this. Those who will read my description of these garrison towns, will see that the brothel proper is a house almost unknown in London! and in the above-named garrison towns the women live in lodgings, for which they pay a rent like any other lodger. My object—as the following extract from a letter I have recently written will show—is to abolish the brothel proper.

"I have so recently pointed out the objections to tolerated brothels in London, particularly if modelled on the French system, that I will not now repeat my objections to them. I may, however, remind my readers that a brothel (proper) is a house almost unknown in London, the police returns only giving two for the whole metropolis, thus showing that the institution is alien to English feelings. In any future legislation, therefore, society must consider how we are to deal with clandestine prostitutes—that is, girls living in their own lodgings—as no one desires to introduce the French system or allow man or woman to profit by the prostitution of another. A further fundamental difference between the present system in France and that which I desire to see introduced into England is that, whereas in France it is the object of the police to register and confine in a brothel every woman gaining her livelihood by prostitution, all that is proposed for England is to give authority to medical men by the Contagious Diseases Act to examine periodically all women who are known to be common prostitutes, and, if they find that they are diseased, to confine them in hospital as long as they are capable of communicating venereal complaints to those who may have relations with them. This interference with the liberty of the subject in England seems necessary, not only for the prevention of disease in the soldier or civilian, but even for the sake of the woman herself, who will in a few years give up a life of profligacy, and gain her livelihood by some other means.

"The English plan will not use up the prostitute, as must necessarily be the case if she enters a brothel; for, as I have shown elsewhere, girls once inmates of these dens of iniquity in Paris gradually descend from a higher to a lower grade of house, until they are useless for even the vilest of them. Under the foreign system there is no hope for the amelioration of the prostitute, we in England profess to believe that we can assist the girl in redeeming her position at the same time that we do so on purely sanitary grounds, without legalising vice."—*Medical Times*, January 15th, 1870.

As our opponents reiterate in different forms these assertions, I think I cannot give the reader too many authentic statements proving the contrary.

Dr. Stuart in the discussion before the Association of Medical Officers of Health of the Metropolis, said "that in the inspected districts, the proportion of disease found was less than one in ten, and of a very mild character, while in the new district of Greenwich the cases of disease bore a proportion of from one-third to

one-half of the women examined, one-third of these being cases of syphilis, mostly of a severe character, and many evidently of long standing."

Mr. Lane, Assistant Surgeon Grenadier Guards, writes to the *Lancet* on January 8th, 1870, and says, "I send you a few facts which may prove not only interesting, but instructive, as to its efficient working in one of our garrison towns. The battalion to which I belong left London for Windsor on the 1st of March, 1869, and as the Contagious Diseases Act was in force in that town, the men were carefully examined immediately after their arrival, and those found affected were sent to hospital for treatment. The admissions for venereal during the first four months of our stay were only of; nearly all the cases were of a mild form, and readily amenable to simple treatment. Upon the 1st of September the battalion re-turned to town, and was quartered at Chelsea barracks; the number under treatment was then only 7. From that date to the present, venereal disease has been greatly on the increase; as many as 108 cases have been admitted into hospital during the last four months,

"I may add that formerly, before the Contagious Diseases Act was put in force at Windsor, the number of cases admitted, and the severity of the disease, were greater at that station than at any other."

Venereal Disease Asserted to be More Common in Paris than in London.

In a recent discussion I listened to at the Medical Society of London, the opponents to the introduction of the Contagious Diseases Act to the Civil Population, asserted that in foreign countries, where prostitutes are supervised, venereal disease was more prevalent than in England.

These gentlemen did not condescend to give us any data on which these opinions are formed. Several of those who made the assertions, had travelled on the Continent—had seen the magnificent institutions in Paris given up to the treatment of syphilitic patients—the hospital for males alone containing 336 beds, and as many as 140 out-patients being treated every morning. The conclusion they came to was that syphilis is very rife in Paris, much more so than in England. I admit that these special hospitals present almost every variety of syphilitic complaint, as the system in France is to consign all venereal patients to these special institutions. If, however, the student will enquire a little further, he will find that among the registered women in Paris, syphilis is almost unknown, as I have stated in my recent work on Prostitution, *p.* 157.

The women who spread syphilis broadcast, are found among the clandestine prostitutes, whom the police regulations cannot reach, or who have resided or do reside beyond what we should call the protected districts. The police authorities will tell you if you push your enquiries further, that much syphilis is imported into French ports from unprotected countries; and in the last international meeting of medical men in Paris, in 1867, England was pointed to, as being one of those unprotected countries that had contributed to prevent the disease being stamped out—in those countries that without such importations would have nearly freed themselves from the plague.

If, however, we consult the reliable statistics of the army, we shall find that venereal disease among the French troops quartered in Paris, is only 66 per 1000, instead of, as shown in report of the Medical Department for 1867, 263 per 1000 as among our Foot Guards quartered in London; yet it is on such casual observations as these that the false conclusion is arrived at that venereal disease is much more common in Paris than in London.

Having then shown that the Act, whose extension I advocate, does not, as asserted, place respectable women at the mercy of the police, and that the medical objections attempted to be urged against it, have really no weight at all, I may glance for a moment at the objections made on the score of interfering with the liberty of the subject.

Danger of Infringing the Liberty of the Subject.

I have no hesitation in admitting that the private life of the individual, so far as it does not affect society at large, is the concern of the individual alone, and in no way whatever of the state, and that any attempt on the part of the legislature to control the moral conduct of the individual, whether man or woman, is incompatible with the freedom which is the birthright of every person born in this country. This, however, is a very different case from that with which it is proposed to deal. The title of the Act sufficiently indicates that no infringement of individual freedom is intended, except so far as such freedom infringes on the public health. We desire to check the spread of contagious disease, and claim the right to interfere with the pursuits that produce the mischief. This principle is not a new one, as Mr. Simon, with strange inconsistency, suggests in his Report to which I have already alluded, when he tells us at *page* 13 that "*prima facie* the true policy of Government is to regard the prevention of venereal diseases as matter of exclusively private concern," but is in accordance with the principle so well enunciated by the same gentleman at *page* 21 of his Report, when dealing with a question that he could consider without prejudice. He there says that "it is the almost completely expressed intention of

our law that all such states of property, and all such modes of personal action or inaction as may be of danger to the public health should be brought within scope of summary procedure and prevention" It is also untrue as Mr. Simon conceives, "that the principle at stake is whether the civil fornicant may reasonably look to constituted authorities to protect him in his commerce with prostitutes," (*page 18*); if it were, there might perhaps be some force in the argument that to interfere with women, in order to prevent their infecting men who can at their own option visit or abstain from visiting them, would be an unjustifiable interference with their liberty, though even this would seem to savour somewhat of a sacrifice of common sense to sentiment. With such a question, however, I am not called upon to deal. What we have to consider is, whether to prevent the spread of a contagious disorder, the effects of which are not confined to the person first infected, or whose own act entailed the suffering, but which recoil to an infinite extent upon innocent persons, is justifiable or not. Is it, I ask with some confidence, possible to distinguish that last case in principle from the other cases of preventable disease with which the legislature interferes? An attempt has been made to do so by the Ladies National Association for the repeal of the Contagious Acts.

We are told that "unlike all other laws for the repression of contagious diseases to which both men and women are liable, these two apply to women only, men being wholly exempt from their penalties." I may remark, by the way, that this idea of penalty and punishment, which runs through the whole of the ladies' appeal, is most unfounded. The provisions of the Act are sanitary and merciful; those only are obnoxious to penalties under the Act who offend against its provisions. In any case where it is possible for men to offend, they are included in the penalties. It is evident that the law cannot deal with remote causes; it can only deal with those that are immediate. Whether man's vice or woman's is the cause that prostitution exists, is a very wide question to enter upon, and one not easily answered—one calculated, moreover, to gratify curiosity rather than to serve any useful practical end. Let the original cause be what it may, the fact remains that there is a certain class of women productive of the greatest injury to the community. There is no corresponding class among men; if there were, we would attempt to deal with it. Prostitutes are the direct, visible cause of the prevalence of syphilis; it is among them that we find "such modes of personal action as may be of danger to the public health," and we propose to extend these Acts on the principle lying at the very root of the existence of society, that, for the common good and for the advantages obtainable by this means only, each member of the state must be content to be deprived of the power to do exactly as he pleases—that is, must surrender for the sake of social order a portion of his freedom. So much for the arguments adduced against the proposed legislation on the ground of interfering with the liberty of the subject. But, after all, what is this liberty? It is not liberty, but wanton licence. It is not freedom, but, lawless indulgence.

"They talk, sir," says Dr. Guthrie, "of the liberty of the subject. Let no man confound the liberty of the subject with licence and licentiousness, and I hold that the worst enemy of liberty is he who does so confound them. Why, the liberty is all on the side of evil-doers."

I now turn to the

Religious Objections.

The *Saturday Review* for January 1st, 1870, has so well answered the charge brought against the Contagious Diseases Act, that it is an interference with what is called the Providential punishment of vice, that I am tempted here to reproduce it. "The' poison does not arise from promiscuous or illicit intercourse, but only from intercourse with affected persons. A man may lead an immoral life for fifty years, and never experience the 'retribution' which yet may fall on the first lad who, half from silliness and half from passion, gets momentarily entrapped into a vicious course. To the worst form of English vice—the seduction of the innocent,—it can never, from the nature of things, be a punishment; rather, the fear of such a retribution tends to spread wide the tendency to seduce, and thus becomes in itself a source of more evil than the 'retribution' ever could by any possibility cure."

On this point I may further cite the opinion of the Rev. F. D. Maurice, who

"believes that the argument respecting retribution for sin, which has had most weight with clergymen, is an untenable one. I believe that I should be guilty of a pious fraud if I told any young man that he would inevitably incur the punishment if he yielded to the temptation. I believe that I should be injuring his conscience both by the falsehood and by setting before him a low motive for abstinence; and I know not where the application of such a maxim could stop. Is gout not to be treated medically when it is proved to be the result of gluttony. Or madness, when it can be traced directly to drunkenness. Strike at the cause by all the moral influences you can use; but the effects ought to come under the cognizance of the physician."

Daily News, Jan. 19, 1870.

Having cited Mr. Maurice as a witness in my favour, it is only fair to remind my readers that he has not only ceased to advocate the extension of the Contagious Diseases Act, but that he has actually passed over to

the opposite ranks. This conversion appears to have been wrought by the ladies' appeal, and the Reverend gentleman considers that such acts are objectionable, because the question that now ought to be considered is, how can prostitution be extirpated? I say, in reply, I shall be delighted to discuss with him this question, if he will also consider with me how can diseases be abated; neither the questions nor the objects are repugnant. It is not to be expected that a disease of nearly 6,000 years' duration will yield to slight pressure, or in a short time, I ask but this, that for the interval that must elapse between the present day and that on which its extirpation shall be accomplished, all the necessary means for dealing with the evil which, so long as it continues to exist, will also endure, may be provided. If Mr. Maurice will believe me, we are both labourers in the same vineyard; we both desire to improve the social, moral, and sanitary condition of unfortunate women, and all I ask of him is, not to neglect the fallen, while he is considering how they shall be made to cease from falling. As I have already said, the Contagious Diseases Act is only one of many measures that I desire to see in operation for checking prostitution, and the mischiefs arising from it. Surely the healing the prostitute's body, and reducing the amount of the suffering by her inflicted on the rest of the community, is no obstacle, but rather a help to the extirpation that he desires. I pass from Mr. Maurice, to the appeal that wrought his conversion, and here I cannot forbear to express my surprise, that a mind so logical should have been changed in its opinion by an appeal that contains so little reason.

Objections Made in the Ladies' Protest.

It is professedly of two parts, descriptive and argumentative—the first part affects to describe the state of things introduced by the Acts, the second part to give eight reasons against that state of things. Unfortunately the description is wholly drawn from imagination and sentiment, and is as argumentative as the second part; it is not therefore surprising that the eight reasons are mostly fallacious, and none of them weighty, and I must frankly say that the impression left on my mind after perusing their Appeal, was that the Ladies had composed and signed it without having read the Act of which they complain, and that they were proceeding to pass judgment in a controversy, as to the terms of which, they were in a state of the most positive ignorance. For an obvious reason, I shall not attempt to argue with these ladies. I will merely observe that any objection contained in their protest that requires an answer, has already received one in the refutation given to other objections.

Apart from their pardonable want of logic, I must, however, thank the 130 ladies who signed this protest, for having come forward in defence of their sex. Now that they have taken up the cause of their fallen sisterhood, no doubt can exist that the future of the woman called "Unfortunate," will command that attention which hitherto has been denied to her.

I beg to assure these ladies that the medical profession has ever treated these unfortunate women with the most signal and marked tenderness and sympathy. I have during the last thirty years seen some thousands of women examined by different medical men, and I venture to say that their womanly feelings were respected, and as much deference paid to decency as is shown in private practice.

If I may venture to direct the Ladies' Association to a very necessary reform, I would suggest that the Association carry out those excellent suggestions made by Miss Muloch in her chapter on "Fallen Women." The Ladies could, indeed, aid the cause if they would urge the mistresses of households not to turn out into the streets at a moment's notice, and this in spite of their husbands' remonstrances, a good and faithful female servant, but who had been seduced by one of those handsome fellows ladies retain in their service. I shall doubtless be told that it would be inconsistent with a woman's matronly duties to suffer such a hussey to remain in her establishment. I do not ask her to do this, but I have proposed an alternative;

See *Acton on Prostitution*, p. 276.

and as a medical man, I often blush for the inconsistency of the sex, when I find that the identical Fanny A., who has been dismissed from the service of Mrs. B., is taken into the service of Lady C. as wet nurse, her ladyship knowing that the single woman has been just confined of an illegitimate child. Surely these are reforms well adapted to be carried out by a Ladies' Association; and I think I may venture to say, if the Ladies will leave the care of the health of these women to the medical profession, and will call upon the public, and Members of Parliament to agitate for a change in the laws relating to seduction, a more healthy state of public opinion will arise, and they will be instrumental in conferring on their sex an inestimable benefit.

If surgeons are left to deal with questions, and to remove evils, the cognizance of which comes peculiarly within their province—if the ladies, and the clergy, and all who have at heart the well-being of the race, will deal with those evils which they can severally remedy—and if all will unite in the common cause, not magnifying their own peculiar province, nor depreciating that of others, but gaining and giving mutually all the help and strength they can, we may hope to see, not the extirpation of prostitution, for this can only come to pass when poor humanity ceases to be frail and sinful—but a considerable diminution of the number of prostitutes, and a great amelioration of their condition.

Postscript.

I have much satisfaction in stating that the Association of Officers of Health met on Wednesday, February 2, 1870, to consider the subject, and unanimously came to the conclusion that—"Supposing the Legislature should determine to recommend the introduction of a Contagious Diseases Act among the civil population, it would be possible and feasible, under a well-organized system, to carry out its enactments in the Metropolis."

The End.

Billing, Printer, Guildford.

Held at the Gallery of the Architectural Society in Conduit Street, Saturday, July 17th, 1869.

Upon the motion of MR. JOHN STUART MILL, the chair was taken by

MRS. P. A. TAYLOR.

Mrs. Taylor.— Before entering upon the business of the Meeting, our Secretary will read two or three letters which we have received from friends who are unfortunately unable to attend.

1, SUSSEX SQUARE, W.

June 17th, 1869.

DEAR MADAM,

My engagements are such as to make it impossible for me to undertake to be present at your meeting on the 17th July.

I am sure you will not attribute my absence, if I am obliged to stay away, to any want of interest in a cause I have deeply at heart.

Faithfully yours,

J. D. Coleridge.

Mrs. Taylor.

Friday, July 16th.

DEAR MADAM,

There is no conviction which I am more deeply impressed with, than with the necessity for the political representation of women to secure their equal treatment by the legislature, and the abrogation of the monstrous laws affecting their property and industry I greatly lament the loss of an opportunity of stating publicly some of the grounds on which that conviction rests.

I remain, dear Madam,

Truly yours,

T. G. Cliffe Leslie.

Mrs. Taylor,

Aubrey House.

KESWICK, SMITH'S LODGINGS, SOUTHEY STREET.

DEAR MRS. TAYLOR,

It will be a token of wonderful change for the better in the English Parliament if they alter the existing law, for a reason which generally seems to them weak, *vis.* that it is abstractedly unjust, and that the repeal will in the long run do good. They are so beset by the need of repealing laws which make daily martyrs, that they generally demand proofs of daily martyrdom before they give way.

Happily there is no *vested interest* to oppose Women's Suffrage.

This fact may give victory at the moment when it is least expected.

Believe me, very sincerely yours,
F. W. Newman.

Mrs. Taylor.—Gentlemen and Ladies, I feel very much and very deeply honoured in being chosen to preside over this meeting, but I also feel great diffidence in occupying this position. I should feel still greater diffidence if it was expected of me to make a speech: fortunately I am not expected to do that. Before, however, calling upon our Secretary to read the Report, I will, if you will allow me, very briefly mention a few of the most important facts connected with this Society. Our Society has been in existence now exactly two years, and I think we may congratulate ourselves upon the rapid progress that our cause has made during that time. Before Mr. Mill brought forward his Bill for Women's Suffrage, in June 1867, our question was either ignored altogether or treated with ridicule. This is no longer the case—it has now reached such importance that the world can no longer ignore it, and it is recognised as one of the questions of the day. This rapid progress is chiefly owing to the fearless and eloquent advocacy of Mr. Mill, for whose spoken and written words, every woman in Great Britain owes a large debt of gratitude. During the Session of 1868 we had seventy-five petitions presented, with nearly 50,000 signatures. Mr. Chisholm Anstoy having stated, in his Notes on the New Reform Act that, according to that Act, every woman householder was entitled to vote for members of Parliament, several thousand women householders sent in their claims. Many were accepted, but very many rejected, and the question of appeal was taken to the Court of Common Fleas. We did not anticipate success, and therefore can scarcely be said to have been disappointed at the decision which was given against us. But, unfortunately, that adverse decision has operated rather injuriously. It has prevented a great many from signing the petition this year who signed it last year, and some friends have been so disheartened that they have advised us to give up our work and keep quiet for the next few years. That advice we have not followed, for we felt that by so doing we should have to do all our work over again which we had accomplished. In the month of November the general election took place, when, as you know, Westminster disgraced itself by the rejection of Mr. Mill. A great many women householders, whose names were left on the Register, determined to exercise their right of voting. This is not very important, except as an answer to those who assert that the polling booths are unfit places for women. As far as I can ascertain, at the places where women voted, not only was there no disturbance whatever, but order and quietude prevailed. At Finsbury, where fifteen women went to record their votes, the lady who accompanied them to the poll said that not only was there no disturbance, but she did not hear a remark made upon the fact that they were there to give their votes, and the women themselves expressed great surprise that it was so very easy a thing to vote; that it occupied so short a time, and did not interfere with their domestic duties. I took one woman to the poll at Leicester whose vote was rejected, but no disturbance took place, and no comment was made. Some seven years before that, during an election at Leicester, where there was a very sharp contest and great excitement, upon the polling day I visited several of the booths, and I neither saw nor heard anything which made me think them unfit places for women. During this Session we have pelted Parliament with petitions; to some of the boroughs where we failed to get petitions signed we have sent our pamphlets to prepare the ground for future action. Many of our friends have expressed disappointment, not to say dissatisfaction, that our question has not been brought before Parliament this Session, but we have not thought it right to do so during the agitation upon the Irish Church question; yet the Session has not been entirely barren, for two important questions, 'The Married Women's Property Bill,' and 'The Municipal Franchise Bill,' have been introduced. And this reminds me that we have to regret the absence of Mr. Jacob Bright, who has not been able to attend our meeting. Women have been accused of acting from impulse, not from principle; of taking up a cause hastily, working at it enthusiastically for a time, but, when the novelty is over, ceasing to work. That will not be our case. We are earnest, and we will prove to the world that when women are in earnest they are capable of persistent energy. No delay, no obstacle, will daunt us; we do not expect to win easily or soon; we may have to work for five, ten, or fifteen years; we know that in the end we shall be successful; and we will not put off our armour until the battle is won. And we have this satisfaction, that whilst we are working and waiting for the victory, we are educating the women of England for the franchise. We are educating them to form an opinion, and to give expression to that opinion; for, as one of the most eloquent speakers in America said, at a meeting that was held not long ago at Boston, 'A vote is only the expression of an opinion.' It has been said, I do not know how truly, that no mischief, no crime, even, whether it be the murder of an individual or war on an extended scale, ever took place in which a woman had not something to do with it. But there is a reverse to the shield. I believe no moral progress, no great or permanent good to humanity was ever achieved in which women have not had some share. I will now call upon Miss Caroline Biggs, the Secretary, to read the Report. The Report was then read as follows:—

Report.

Your Committee, in resuming their labours this year, resolved on again petitioning Parliament, as they had done last session; but, instead of a general petition from the whole country as before, it was thought better that every large town and locality should, if possible, express its opinion, and this has been extensively done. 220 petitions have been already presented to Parliament by the London, Edinburgh, Manchester, and Dublin Societies, containing an aggregate of 41,000 names; and many more are in course of signature. Of this number, the London Committee has presented 111, including one with 12,000 names, which was presented by the Member for Finsbury; and another petition from London will follow next week, which we shall entrust to the care of Sir Charles Dilke.

During the past year our Society has circulated 18,500 pamphlets, written by Mr. Mill, Miss Cobbe, Mrs. Bodichon, Professor Newman, and other writers of eminence.

Our expenses have been necessarily heavy. The crises tried in the Appeal Courts last November entailed an expense of £272. Our general expenses besides, have amounted to £251. We began our financial year, July 14, 1868, with a balance in your Treasurer's hands of £155, whereas we have now, at the commencement of another year, only a balance of £9 5s. 3d.

On the whole, your Committee have abundant reason to be satisfied with the result of their exertions—in the wide and increasing interest the question has awakened—and a conviction that, ere long, our labours will be crowned by success.

Mr. Thomas Hare.—Mrs. Taylor, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have now to move the adoption of this Report, and I think the statements in it, as well as the explanation of what has been done, which has been given, Madam, by yourself, will convince all who have taken an interest in the matter, that the conduct of the movement is in the hands of those who will not allow themselves to be diverted from it by any discouragements. I think we must take into consideration the great question that has been agitating the public mind during the year, and the difficulty there is in bringing the general feeling and sense of the nation to apply itself to more than one thing at a time. I think we ought to be well satisfied with the progress that has been made, and I cheerfully move the adoption of the Report.

Mr. Boyd Kinnear.—I have great pleasure, indeed, in seconding the adoption of the Report that has now been read, which records in few words a great deal of very hard work that has been done in the course of the year, in the good cause which we have met to-day to support. I think we can all understand that those ladies who undertook the duty of bringing and keeping this question before the public mind, have undertaken a duty which is very laborious, and which requires very great patience and energy, which is exposed to some degree of misconstruction, and which nothing but a strong sense of public duty enables them to carry forward. As regards my own share in it, I feel that I am to a certain degree a testimony, in however small an extent, to the work which the Committee is doing, for I am myself a convert to this cause—a convert made by the efforts which the Committee of this Society has carried out in distributing pamphlets explaining the motives, principles, and purposes of this Association. I hope I shall not be understood as having required much to convert me. I always recognised that many women were at least the equals of men in intellect and sense, and that it was most important that the influence of such as these should be felt in politics; but I had some practical difficulty as to the method by which we could discriminate those women who were fitted to have influence upon political questions from those who were not. But I owe it to the perusal, a couple of years ago, of the pamphlets of one of the members of this Association, Madame Bodichon, that I was brought to see clearly that these difficulties ought not to be allowed to forbid the extension of the franchise to women, and that in fact they are best overcome by precisely those methods which we apply to those who are at present in possession of the franchise. I think, Madam, that one of the greatest necessities for this Society, is not so much to enforce the rights of women and what they want, as it is to explain what it is that women do not want. When our opponents are called upon to argue the question; when they are fairly driven into a corner and obliged to give their reasons, we hear the most absurd assertions as to what it is women really require and wish in asking for the franchise. We are told that women would be compelled to leave their domestic avocations, to break through all the retiring modesty of their nature, and, driven up in the midst of shouting crowds, to give their votes in public. Madam, what you have said today sufficiently shows that this is all a delusion, that there is no such difficulty, if only the right be conceded. And, one of the main things which this Society has to do, in addition, is to explain that women do not want the suffrage on any other qualification than that on which it is given to men, and do not want a law to compel them to vote, any more than men, if they are not disposed to exercise their suffrage. With regard to the other objections that are taken against such a movement as this, we may say that we have heard them all before. We have heard, in the case of every movement for Reform, the objection that the individuals upon whose behalf the movement takes place are not fitted for the exercise of the franchise, and that, if admitted, they would come in such numbers as to swamp the electors of the kingdom. These are familiar sounds to us, and it is but the other day that they were pleaded in resistance to the enfranchisement of the working classes. But already experience has proved them to be entirely fallacious and without foundation. And

I have no doubt experience will prove the same in regard to the movement in which we are now engaged. We have to satisfy the public mind that such is the case; that the object we have in view is not the absurd and excessive object imputed to us; that we merely desire what is fair and reasonable: that women who have intellect and capacity to understand great political questions, should not be excluded from them merely upon the ground of their sex. And although you have spoken of a considerable period being necessary to enlighten the public mind upon the question, I feel convinced that such a long period as you look forward to will not elapse. Public opinion, when it once fairly comprehends the real nature of the demand made, comes, in this age, very rapidly to a conclusion; and I have no doubt that in less time than you have anticipated, this great act of public justice, which will crown our edifice of political equality, will be carried into effect with the approval of the conscience and intellect of the whole nation. For these reasons I have the greatest pleasure in seconding the adoption of the Report.

The Resolution was then put and carried.

Mr. John Stuart Mill.—The first thing that presents itself for us men who have joined this Society—a Society instituted by ladies to procure the protection of the franchise for women—is to congratulate them on the success of this, their first effort in political organisation. The admission of women to the suffrage is now a practical question. What was, not very long ago, a mere protest in behalf of abstract right, has grown into a definite political aim, seriously pursued by many thousands of active adherents. No sooner did a few ladies of talent and influence, fostered in those principles of justice, and believing in those elements of progress, which are now renewing the life of every country of the world—no sooner did a few of these ladies give the signal that the time was come to claim for women their share in those blessings of freedom, which are the passion and the glory of every noble nation, than (here rallied round them unexpected thousands of women, eager to find expression for aspirations and wishes which we now learn that multitudes of our countrywomen have long cherished in silence. The thousands who have signed the petitions for women's Suffrage, year after year, are evidence that I am not exaggerating when I say this. For my part, I have all my life held the opinion, that women have the same right to the suffrage as men; and it has been my good fortune to know many ladies very much fitter to exercise it than the majority of the men of my acquaintance. I may flay, too, to the credit of my own perspicacity, that I have long been of opinion that most of the disclaimers of all wish for political or any other equality with men, which, until quite lately, have been almost universal among women, are merely a form of that graceful and amiable way of making a virtue of necessity, which always distinguishes women. Nevertheless, I must acknowledge, I did not expect the amount of sympathy, nay of more than sympathy, of ardent and zealous support, which this movement has called forth among women, and men also, of all ranks and all parties. We have had a success quite out of proportion to our apparent means, and which would be unaccountable, were it not for some potent allies that have been working for us.

First of these precious auxiliaries is the sense of justice. When not stifled by custom or prejudice, the natural feeling of justice is on our side. We are fighting against privilege on one side, disabilities and disqualifications on the other. We are protesting against arbitrary-preferences; against making favourites of some, and shutting the door against others. We are claiming equal chances, equal opportunities, equal means of self-protection for both halves of mankind. The political suffrage, which men are everywhere demanding as the sole means by which their other rights can be secured to them, we, for the same reason, and in the name of the same principles, demand for women too. We take our stand, therefore, on natural justice; and to appeal to that, is to invoke a mighty power.

The other auxiliary which is working for us, with ever increasing force, is the progress of the age; what we may call the modern spirit. All the tendencies which are the boast of the time—all those which are the characteristic features and animating principles of modern improvement, are on our side. There is, first, the growing ascendancy of moral force over physical—of social influences over brute strength—of the idea of right over the law of might. Then there is the philanthropic spirit; that which seeks to raise the weak, the lowly, the oppressed. There is the democratic spirit; the disposition to extend political rights, and to deem any class insufficiently protected unless it has a voice in choosing the persons by whom the laws are made and administered. There is the free trade spirit; the desire to take off restrictions—to break down barriers—to leave people free to make their own circumstances, instead of chaining them down by law or custom to circumstances made for them. Then there is the force of what, to the shame of past history, I am obliged to call the new conception of human improvement and happiness—that they do not consist in being passively ministered to, but in active self-development. And, over and above these specific practical forces, actively at work in society, we have with us one of the strongest and best modern characteristics—not pointing, as those do, to a particular line of outward action, but consisting in a general disposition of our own minds: the habit of estimating human beings by their intrinsic worth—by what they are, and by what they do: not by what they are born to, nor by the place in which accident or the law has classed them. Those who are fully penetrated with this spirit cannot help feeling rich and poor, women and men, to be equals before the State, as from the time of the Christian era they

have been proclaimed equal in the sight of God. And this feeling is giving us powerful aid in our attempt to convert that Christian ideal into a human reality.

To show how unequivocally and emphatically the spirit of the age is on our side, we need only think of the different social improvements which are in course of being attempted, or which the age has fully made up its mind to attempt. There is not one of those improvements which would not help the enfranchisement of women; and there is not one of them which the enfranchisement of women would not help. Not one of them can be literally realised unless women, with their moral and intellectual capabilities properly developed, are associated in the work. From the moment when society takes upon itself the duties required of it by the present state of civilisation, it cannot do without the intelligent co-operation of women; and the pedantic nonsense now talked, about the sphere of women, will appear thoroughly ridiculous when pleaded as an excuse for excluding women from the minor matters of politics, when their assistance cannot be dispensed with in the most arduous. Look at education, for example. That is almost the one great cry of the day. Statesmen, scholars, public writers, all join in it: great and small, rich and poor, Tories, Whigs, and Radicals, the higher, the middle, and the working classes, with one voice declare, that the country cannot get of without a good, national education, descending to the very bottom of society, and (give me leave to add) ascending also to the top. The best people have said this for generations; but after the political changes recently made, and with the prospect we have of more, the necessity has become evident to all. We say, then, to rich and poor, Tories, Whigs, and Radicals,—Are you going to educate a nation without women? Let alone the equal right of women to their share of the benefit; I ask—Can it be given to the rest of us without women's direct help? When we set about really teaching the children of all ranks of the people—it will not be like the nominal teaching they mostly receive now—we shall need a vastly greater number of schoolmasters than we can afford to pay, if we reject the assistance of half, or much more than half, the available force. Women are the acknowledged best teachers of young children; and numbers of them are eager, both as professionals and as volunteers, to put their hand to the work. The only hindrance to their being equally capable instructors of more advanced pupils, is that they cannot teach what they have not been allowed to learn. They will have to be taught all the more valuable branches of knowledge, if only that they may teach them to others. In the country where there is the widest diffusion of popular education, the Northern States of America, a large majority of the teachers are already women, and that not exclusively in the elementary schools; and they are found to be particularly efficient teachers of male pupils. Is it likely, then, that when women find themselves, side by side with the men of the present, teaching and training the men of the future, they will believe in any right of their pupils to political supremacy over them? Will they feel themselves less worthy of a vote, think you, or less entitled to it, than the men who have been taught by them how to use their vote? And I should like to see the face of the man, so taught, who would stand up and refuse it to them.

Let us turn next to the management of the poor: and by the poor I mean those in receipt of public relief—the pauper population. That formidable difficulty is weighing upon the spirits of all our thinkers, and of all conscientious public administrators; and the more they think, the more they seem to be overwhelmed with its arduousness, I venture to predict that this great national, and more than national, this human concern, will never be successfully treated until women take their share, perhaps the principal share, in the management of it. A wide experience has taught to thoughtful men that the right principle of a poor-law, is to give relief, except of a very temporary kind, to adults, nowhere but in public establishments—workhouses, and, for those who need them, hospitals. And this method has been tried: but the workhouses and the workhouse hospitals have been so execrably managed, the pillage has been so profligate, and the unhappy inmates so brutally neglected and ill-used, that the system has broken down, and public feeling shrinks from enforcing it. If this is ever remedied, it will be when pauper establishments are looked after by capable women. As mere visitors, it is to them we in great part owe the discovery of the enormities by which the public have been sickened, and which had escaped the watchfulness of men specially selected as fit to be inspectors of poorhouses. The fittest person to manage a workhouse is the person who best knows how to manage a house. The woman who has learnt to govern her own servants, will know how to do the same with workhouse servants. Few are the male guardians and inspectors sufficiently conversant with details, to be competent to check the dishonesty, to stimulate the zeal, or to overcome the indolence, of all the people concerned in administering to the wants of any large agglomeration of human beings. Every experienced traveller knows that there are few comfortable inns where there is no hostess. And the gigantic peculation of the commissariats of armies, as well as the dreadful sufferings of the wounded soldiers from the insufficiency of the medical and nursing staff, all bear testimony to the fact that men do not possess the heaven-born faculty they arrogate to themselves for doing well on a large scale what they disdain to serve an apprenticeship to doing on a small scale. If home is a woman's natural sphere (and I am not at all called upon to contradict the assertion) those departments of politics which need the faculties that can only be acquired at home, are a woman's natural sphere 600. But there are great spheres and little spheres; and some people want women to be always content with the little spheres. T don't.

In the same manner, in all that concerns the details of public expenditure: what superintendence and control would be equal to that of an experienced mother of a family, who knows, or has learnt to find out, what things ought to cost, and whose daily business it has been to discover and check malversation or waste in every department of a large household? Very few men have had much of this sort of practice; multitudes of women have had it. If we are to meet the demand of the age for a government at once cheap and efficient, which shall cost little, but shall give us all we ought to have for the money, the most vigilant and capable agents for making the money go as far as it can will generally be found among women.

One important public function, at least, has devolved on women from the commencement. Nursing the sick is a privilege which men have seldom denied to women. The nursing of the sick in most public establishments is, from the necessity of the case, mainly carried on by women; and it is now understood that they ought to be educated women. No ignorant person can be a good nurse. A nurse requires to know enough of the laws of health and the treatment of disease, to be at least able to observe sanitary rules, and to understand the meaning of symptoms. But much more than this will be required when the prevention and cure of disease become a branch of public administration; and to this things are rapidly tending. There are many difficulties in dealing with the poor—many hindrances, both moral and economical, to our doing for them what most of us would like to do: but one thing the nation is, I think, making up its mind that it will not grudge them, and that is, the care of their health. In this one respect it is felt that our poor-law, instead of doing too much, does not do nearly enough. The medical staff of our unions is wretchedly underpaid, and nothing like so numerous as it ought to be. And how is it to be made efficient—how can the localities afford the expense necessary for providing a sufficient number of persons with the required qualifications, if we persist in shutting the door upon those women who claim from us medical education, to fit them for such duties as these? Until the medical profession is opened to women, there will never be an adequate supply of educated medical practitioners for any but the rich. And independently of regular practitioners, there are numbers of women who, from their domestic occupations, cannot give all their time, but would willingly give part of it, either as volunteers or at a small remuneration, for work which would be too costly if paid for at the value of the time of medical men in good private practice. But when women are entrusted with public functions like these, and educated for them, will they be content to be excluded from the common privileges of citizenship? and how long will it be possible to exclude them?

Society is feeling every day more and more, that the services of women are wanted for other uses than 'to suckle fools and chronicle small beer.' Many are now saying that women should be better educated, in order that they may be able to educate men; and truly if they are to educate men, the education of a well-educated man can hardly be denied to them. But these very moderate reformers fall into the mistake about women that was made about the working classes. People were willing to educate the working men, but expected them, after being educated, to content themselves with the same treatment which they had met with before. They would be quite happy, it was thought, when their improved faculties qualified them to be more useful servants, and would not think of claiming their share of mastership, or a voice in the choosing of masters. It has not so turned out with the working classes, neither will it so turn out with women. Those who are fit to train men for their work will think themselves fit to share in the work; or, at the lowest, in the choice of those who are to direct it. The higher education of women, and their political emancipation, are sure to go forward together.

We may safely affirm, then, that our cause has a powerful backing; since it has for its allies the great forces which are at work everywhere, striving to improve the world. Our success would greatly strengthen all these forces: and they, by their increasing strength, help to accelerate our success; illustrating the truth, that improvements aid one another. All good causes are allied; whoever helps forward one beneficial object, proves in the end to have promoted many more. In the assurance that it will be so with us, our business is to go on doing what, as a Society, we have hitherto done—to strive for the suffrage, and for the suffrage only. The suffrage, while it is the road to other progress, commits no one as to what other things progress consists of. Let us but gain the suffrage, and whatever is desirable for women must ultimately follow, without its being necessary at present to decide, or indeed possible to foresee, all that is desirable. The mere fact of claiming the suffrage is giving an impulse, such as never has been given before, to all proposals for doing away with injustice to women. Since the suffrage has been claimed a bill for allowing married women to be the owners of their own property, which had been laid on the shelf for ten years with other uninteresting trifles, has been reintroduced into Parliament with good prospect of success; and the movement for the higher education of women is spreading in all directions, with a considerable diversity of means, insomuch that women have a chance of obtaining a really good education almost as soon as men. We of this Society shall best promote these important movements by taking no part in them as a Society, whatever any of us may think it right to do as individuals; but pressing forward with all our efforts what virtually includes them all, the suffrage. With it, we shall in time obtain what is needed, whatever that may be; but till the suffrage is gained, we have obtained nothing that may not be resumed any day at the caprice of our rulers. In these days, the great practical

distinction the line of separation between those who can protect themselves and those who are at the mercy of others, is the political franchise. All who have rights to protect now look to that as the only effectual means of protecting them. Even in America it was found that to abolish slavery was not enough; the negroes could not be really free until they had the suffrage. Representative assemblies, in the election of which they had no voice, inflicted or permitted treatment which would have brought them back to a servitude almost worse than their previous state. In a political age, such as the present is, let the laws in other respects be what they may, women will never be of equal account with men, will never be felt to be entitled to equal consideration, so long as men have votes and women have not. The great extension of the suffrage to others, so long as women are excluded from it, is a positive injury to them, since it is rapidly making them the only excluded class; the only persons whom the law either deems unworthy of a voice in choosing their rulers, or does not sufficiently care for to give them that protection. The suffrage is the turning point of women's cause; it alone will ensure them an equal hearing and fair play. With it, they cannot long be denied any just right, or excluded from any fair advantage: without it, their interests and feelings will always be a secondary consideration, and it will be thought of little consequence how much their sphere is circumscribed, or how many modes of using their faculties are denied to them. Let us, then, continue to concentrate our exertions on the suffrage; inviting all who wish for the better education of women, all who desire justice to them in respect of property and earnings, all who desire their admission to any profession or career now closed to them, to aid our enterprise, as the surest means of accelerating the particular improvement in which they feel a special interest.

Mr. Mill then moved the 1st Resolution:

'That this Society declares its strong conviction that it is in the highest degree unjust and impolitic to make sex the ground of exclusion from the exercise of political rights.'

The Rev, Charles Kingsley— Ladies and Gentlemen, I have considerable difficulty in saying anything towards seconding this Resolution; because everything that can be said upon the point, seems to me to have been said already by Mr. John Stuart Mill; not merely in the speech which we have just heard, but in his recent book upon the subject of women, a book, which for its matter, as well as for its style, I trust to see handed down to posterity as one of the standard works of the English language, I have to thank him very deeply for that book, not because by it he converted me to this cause—I did not need that—but because he did for me, what he has done for so many upon so many different subjects, put his readers thoughts and beliefs into coherent and logical shape. He has, I think, exhausted the subject, as far as I can see; and therefore I shall keep you but a very few moments with any words of mine; only saying, what is the out-come of twenty-five years' thought and feeling upon this point, that I have been led to something more than a suspicion, I may almost say, to a conclusion, that one principal cause of the failure of so many magnificent schemes, social, political, religious, which have followed each other, age after age, has been this: that in almost every case they have ignored—very often utterly, all of them too much—the rights and the powers of one-half of the human race, namely, woman. I believe that nothing will go right; that politics will not go right; that society will not go right; that religion will not go right; that nothing human ever will go right, except in as far as woman goes right; and to make woman go right she must be put in her place, and she must have her rights; and as to what those rights are, I have very definite opinions, which I shall not give up for any arguments which I seem likely to meet with in this present generation.

This Resolution says, that 'it is unjust and impolitic' to exclude women from the suffrage. I think those are the words. If they are, I shall only speak to the first epithet 'unjust;' for if that be granted, the second must follow. Whatsoever is unjust must be impolitic, because it is contrary to the moral and physical laws of the universe, and, I hold, to the mind and will of the Maker thereof; and whatsoever is unjust, must cause one impolicy, that again another, that a third, and ultimately a fourth or a fifth, very often most unexpected—for injustice is like a fungus, which not only grows and spreads rapidly, but comes up under the most unexpected and protean forms. Thus every injustice is an act of folly, which becomes, if persevered in, dangerous; if persevered in still more, ruinous, to every individual family, class, or nation which practises it. But that the present political status of woman is an injustice, I do not see how it is possible to deny. It began in injustice. It began historically, in barbarous times, out of man's wish to keep woman as his slave. It was carried on in mediaeval times by an anthropology—I will not disgrace the sacred name of theology by calling it that—backed by a whole literature of unreason, and backed also by very practical methods of persecution and torture, until it succeeded, as Michelet has well observed, in really persuading women to distrust and despise themselves, and to look upon themselves as inferior, and half accursed beings. It was perpetuated (in spite of some noble outbursts in opposite directions, in Italy, France, and England in the 15th and 16th centuries), it was perpetuated, I say, although not under such gross forms, by that great moral collapse which happened in the latter half of the 17th century; by the growing disbelief in justice and mercy, as practically useful virtues; and by the growing dependence upon statecraft and expediency, both in England and on the Continent, till the fool's paradise into which man had fallen, was rudely interrupted by the French Revolution. But one advantage

accrues from the position in which the political status of woman was left at the end of the 18th century; and it is this, that it now stands as it is, simply I think, because no one has had the courage or perseverance to thrust it down. The exclusion of women from the suffrage, and from public life, rests no longer in the mind of any cultivated person, upon any fancied principles of nature or morals, or of the will of the Maker and ruler of the world, as it did in the middle ages. It rests simply upon custom and permission. I have been unable to find any arguments against admitting women to the suffrage, save such as are derived merely from fear of change, from fondness for established habit, and from a vague dread that anything new will not work well; as if anything on this earth ever did work well, or ever could work well, in the sense of perfection. We must disregard any argument drawn from an improvement not working well. The question is not whether it will work well, but whether it will not work better than that which exists already; and I cannot say that our present representative system works so perfectly, and is to be considered so spotless, that we are to be afraid of tainting its immaculate purity by admitting a few women to a share in it. I have never troubled myself much about contested elections; but I should not think that a contested election would be made much more violent, much more venal, much more drunken, by the interference in it of a few dozen, or even a few hundred women; even such women as I have been accustomed to meet with, plain women of the labouring class, who work out ah the fields. I think they would, at least, bring their husbands home all the soberer, and perhaps keep them all the truthfuller, at the poll. But we have not to look to expediency. We have not to look to results. I hold that the truly wise man is the man that looks not-so much to results as to what is right. The question, Ladies and Gentlemen, which we have to press upon the people of England is, I believe, simply this. Is the present state of things right? And if it is not right, then set it right, and let the right take care of itself, as I believe the right has always the power of doing. We shall have to ask continually, again and again, in the course of the next few years, of very reasonable and kindly folk, as our fellow countrymen and countrywomen are—is it right that an educated man, who is able independently to earn his own livelihood, should have a vote, and that an equally educated woman, equally able to earn her own livelihood, should not? Answer that, people of England; is it right or just? We have to ask again, Is it right that a man owning a certain quantity of property should have a vote in respect of that property; and that a woman owning not only the same quantity of property, but perhaps a hundred or a thousand times more, should have no vote, simply because she is a woman? Answer that—Is it right, people of England, or not? And even in the much more delicate case—I agree that it is a delicate case—in which married women hold property in their own right, we must ask, Is it right that because the woman is married, the vote which is due to her property, should be transferred to her husband, even against her will? You must have one of two cases. Either the husband and wife agree in opinion, or not; if they agree in opinion, are you not committing a superfluous injustice in robbing the woman of a vote, which she would after all use in the same sense as her husband would use it: and if they do not agree in opinion, are you not committing an injustice in robbing the woman of her right to her own independent opinion, by transferring her vote to her husband, to be used against her opinion and will. People of England, is it right? we have to ask. I have found but one answer—that in my conscience—for many years. We have to press these questions as simple questions of right and wrong, and to leave all practical consequences (as I said) to take care of themselves. As for ridicule, of which there has been a little too much employed upon this question lately, I suppose that it is used because there are no other arguments to be found, and that people find it necessary, as Plato forewarned us they would, a good many years ago, to 'pluck against us laughter, the unripe fruit of wisdom.' So said old Socrates, talking of this very matter. Let us tell these people who have been 'plucking against us the unripe fruit of wisdom'—let us tell them, gently and kindly, 'My good friends, take care that fifty years hence the laugh is not against you.' Bear in mind that every injustice is not merely, as we said just now, impolitic: but it is also certain to be more or Jess absurd and ridiculous, when we come to look into the reason, beauty, and fitness of things—and I do hold that there is an eternal reason, beauty, and fitness in everything that is morally just; and then trust that we shall be able fifty years, perhaps fifteen years hence, to turn round and ask the gentlemen who laugh at this movement, 'Who were the absurd people? Who were the ridiculous people?—we who have tried to reform the present state of things, or you who have supported the present state of things'—a state of things in which the franchise is considered as something so important and so sacred, that the most virtuous, the most pious, the most highly-educated, the most learned, the most wealthy, the most benevolent, the most justly powerful woman, is refused it, as something too precious for her—and yet it is to be entrusted, freely and hopefully, to the hands of any illiterate, drunken, wife-beating ruffian, who can contrive to keep a house over his head? Answer us, people of England, who were the absurd persons—those who wished to alter that, or those who did not? I beg to second the Resolution which Mr. Mill has so ably moved.

Professor Fawcett, M.P.—I trust, Mrs. Taylor, you will not think me unduly critical if I venture to differ from one small point in your speech. I think, if you will allow me to say so, that you took a somewhat gloomy view of the time when our victory is to be achieved. The principles laid down in this Resolution seem to me to be so self-evidently true, the arguments which have been adduced in its favour have been so conclusive, and

experience has shown that they are so absolutely unanswerable, that I venture to think we shall not have to wait, at any rate, the longer time to which you have alluded. Nothing is more extraordinary than to watch the growth of public opinion upon certain questions. A subject remains dormant and actually at a standstill for years—some incident occurs—a speech is made, a book is written, such, for instance, as the one to which Professor Kingsley has referred, and the subject becomes at once, as it were, animated with life, and in three or four years, what before had seemed hopeless, becomes a reality and is achieved. This is particularly the case with regard to a subject to which Mr. Mill has alluded. I refer to education. I well remember the time when it was considered almost an extravagance to advocate upon a public platform compulsory national education. You were told that it was anti-English, that it was a Continental eccentricity. Now, I can only say, from my experience of the last few years, that whether you go to Manchester, whether you speak in London, whether even you speak in the country, there is no political, no social statement, which is received with half as much enthusiasm and popular favour as a strong unmistakeable avowal of your determination to do everything in your power to get national compulsory education. So, I believe, will it be with regard to the female franchise question. For years this subject was looked upon simply as the dream of philosophers, and you must remember that there are some persons (I shall not more particularly describe their local habitation or name) who think it is far more contemptuous to call a man a philosopher than to denounce him as an ignoramus. Two years ago, the subject was introduced by Mr. Mill into Parliament: I remember well the things that were said about the motion before it was brought forward. Men said, 'Oh, you must come down on such a night; it will be worth while giving up a dinner party or any kind of entertainment; what fun we shall have over this female franchise question!' In one night, it is no exaggeration to say that it passed at once and for ever out of the region of ridicule. No man in the House of Commons would now think of treating this subject with ridicule. This Session it was proposed to admit women to vote at municipal elections. That proposal three years ago would have been considered as absurd and ridiculous as admitting them to the Parliamentary franchise; but when it was proposed, in a most able and temperate speech, by Mr. Jacob Bright, there was not a single laugh; it was treated as a proposal so sober, so reasonable, that the whole thing was settled in a quarter of an hour—settled with as much celerity and with as little discussion as if he had brought forward a proposition with which every one agreed. Feeling this, therefore, I am convinced that if the Society, over which Mrs. Taylor so ably presides, will go on in their persistent efforts, circulating arguments and pamphlets, in five years' time we shall at least be able to congratulate ourselves upon seeing that this injustice of placing women under political disability will have been destroyed for ever. Having mentioned Mr. Jacob Bright's name, and as this is a meeting of business, perhaps I may be allowed to make a practical suggestion. It is unnecessary for me to describe the intense regret with which we feel the loss in Parliament of the man who is our natural leader upon this question; but in his absence from the House of Commons, judging from what Mr. Jacob Bright has done this Session upon the Municipal Franchise question, seeing the admirable tact with which he brought it forward, the clearness of his statements, the closeness of his reasoning, his devotion to the cause, the firmness of his principles, and the honoured name which he bears, I think it is absolutely impossible for the cause to be in better hands than in his. Mr. Mill has alluded to many of the advantages resulting from conferring the franchise upon women, and I shall not go over this subject again. I will content myself with saying, that upon all questions connected with woman, and with man also, we should keep this cardinal principle steadily in view to guide our political action and our social conduct; we ought to consider that civilisation is not a reality, and that freedom does not really exist, until every man and woman in the community shall feel that in their youth their faculties have been duly and reasonably developed, and when those faculties have been developed, society shall place in their way no barrier to their turning them to the best possible advantage. I look upon the question of women's franchise as one department, and an important department of the great subject of education, but we Ought not to be satisfied until they have the same use of the educational endowments of the country as men have, until they have the same opportunity of turning the faculties with which they have been endowed to the best possible advantage. It is unnecessary to enter into the disputed point—whether women's intellectual powers are equal to those of men. Let them have the same opportunities of education, let them have the same liberty of career, let them have the same chance of developing their individuality, and then, and not till then, it will be proved what careers in life they are fitted to succeed in and those in which they are not. Feeling that the political franchise conferred upon women will be a most important, and, perhaps, the first essential step in placing women in their proper position, I most cordially and heartily support the Resolution which has been so ably proposed and seconded by Mr. Mill and Professor Kingsley.

The Resolution was then put and carried.

Mrs. Fawcett.— The Resolution I have been asked to move, is, 'That this Society pledges itself to use every lawful means to obtain the extension of the franchise to women; and it therefore considers that a Bill for that purpose should be introduced into Parliament as early as possible in the ensuing Session.' Those who desire to see the extension of political rights to women, have already done a great deal to further the success of their

cause. They have petitioned Parliament—some of them have written upon the subject—others have spoken in public upon it—all have talked about it in private. But it is sometimes needful to be reminded that a continued effort is necessary. A great many things combine to make us forget what a small minority we are, and I think we are rather too much apt to congratulate ourselves. The great interest we ourselves take in the subject, the books we read, the friends we associate with, all combine to hide from us the numerical strength of the opposition that we have to overcome. These considerations should be our strongest incentive to increased exertion, especially when we remember that the opposition we have to overcome is on the whole passive. It does not arise so much from those who have thought upon the subject and disagree with us, as from those who have never given the subject one moment's serious consideration. The members of this Society have a great deal to do, as long as 'I never heard of such a thing' is the particular objection urged against the claims of women to the franchise. The Resolution suggests that a Bill should be introduced into Parliament next Session, I am so little qualified to speak upon that point, that I shall leave it to those who are more competent to deal with it. I will only remind you, what you have already been reminded of, that the present House of Commons and the present Government has not been unfavourable to the claims of women.

I beg to conclude by moving the Resolution.

Lord Houghton.—Madam, Ladies, and Gentlemen.—In Sir. Mill's admirable work is a very impressive sentence, that laws would never be improved unless there were numerous persons whose moral sentiments were better than the existing laws. And I think we have a right to assume that there are numerous persons, many here and many elsewhere, who think the laws with regard to the women of this country impolitic and unjust. The graver points of this question have been so well gone into, that I am almost tempted to ask you to come down a little from the higher ranges of theory and thought, and to follow me for a very few moments into some practical considerations of this matter. I own that my own education in this question has been very much guided and impelled, first, by an accident in a portion of my own life, and secondly, by a portion of my studies. The portion of my life to which I refer, was the time I passed in the Eastern countries of the world, and I think it is almost impossible for any man fully to understand all the relation between the sexes who has not, either through his study or his experience, had before him the interesting spectacle and curious contemplation of a society in which women are invisible, and in which the whole of the outer world goes on without them, and in which it is almost sacrilege for them to be seen. In those countries you have not by any means, as is commonly thought, any worse state of moral society than exists in European capitals; you have the sacredness of home-life, such as only exists in the best European communities; and yet you have a condition of women living almost universally in a state of mind and of body which we should consider peculiar to childhood. How is it that there is such a difference in the societies in which we ordinarily live, with regard to the condition of women? How is it that women rose from that Eastern condition to what they are now; and is there a larger space, is there a broader difference between the highest aspiration and what you are, compared with what you are and the women of the East? Mr. Mill, in an interesting note in his work, has shown that even that peculiar life, even that singular seclusion, does not prevent women from showing remarkable capacity for Government, and becoming most eminent personages in the State. He has told us that the Indian Governments of which we can speak with the most comfort and applause, are almost solely those directed by women, and Sir Richard Temple, the Chief Commissioner of Central India, whom I saw yesterday, and who expressed his hope of being here to-day, says that a long experience of India fully convinced him in that opinion. If, under such peculiarly unfavourable circumstances, a woman of talent can be found in the East, surely it is very little to say that political rights and thoughts, if they become part of the education of the Western women, might not be developed with at least equal success and advantage.

Again, in reference to a story which I followed with much interest, and I doubt not there are very few men in this room who have not done the same—I mean the story of the French Revolution—there is one peculiarity in that which has always struck me, and that is the political equality which was then given to women, and especially the political equality of the scaffold. I do not find in the whole history (and I have looked at it with great particularity) a single instance in which a Frenchwoman, for fear of appearing before a political tribunal, or of being condemned by it, ever claimed an exemption on account of her sex, nor that it was proposed that any should be given her; not only did such women as Madame Roland go to the scaffold with the same sense of responsibility and the same recognition by society as other victims of political violence; but you find that it went down to the very lowest classes, and that women there received that sad homage of equality such as they have never received anywhere else. Then, at any rate, there was not, what exists at present, both in France and England, a large amount of power upon the part of women unaccompanied by responsibility. I am always inclined to wish to connect power with responsibility as much as possible. There are women, especially amongst the upper classes, in this country, possessing a very large amount of social and political power, but without social and political equality, and that seems to me an additional argument to those you have heard, that woman should feel that she is a citizen as well as the man; that her duties with regard to the State are just the

same as those of the man; that there is no reason whatever why her affections or her passions should be more likely to guide her wrong than the affections and passions of men. I believe that if women were educated in this feeling, you would find that the political force they would exercise would be a great deal better than the power they exercise now; because, I am bound to say, that I believe if the mass of women in England were at once invested with political power, the result might not at present be quite according to our desires and expectations, and that we might be a little disappointed at the manner in which it would be exercised. I don't know that it could be otherwise: but I do not think for a moment that any such contemplation as that should induce us not to wish the power to be given, because it is by the education which they would receive through political power, that their use of that political power would be justified and improved. The same argument should be used with regard to the extension of political power to women as has been used by all wise men with regard to the extension of the suffrage to men.

With regard to the effect this alteration would have upon the home, upon the daily life, and all those matters, I believe there never was a greater amount of rubbish talked than has been spoken as to that. Are husband and wife always agreed upon questions far more agitating, far more passionate, than those of ordinary politics? On the question of the destiny of man in this world and in eternity, is it supposed that husband and wife cannot live together unless they are perfectly agreed upon religious principles? Upon all matters most important, affecting the daily life of mankind, do not we see the happiest households where husband and wife, just as parents and children, exercise a fair critical judgment upon one another, doing it with mercy, justice, kindness, and benevolence; nevertheless not losing the sense of individual independence. And why should we suppose for a moment, because a woman was holding and exercising a difference of opinion upon ordinary political subjects, there should be any more disunion and discomfort in the family? This is the case, I doubt not, of a great many ladies here, who bring to bear probably a very strong opinion upon religious and other subjects, differing from the rest of their family, but nevertheless doing so without breach of courtesy, respect, and honour. These considerations lead me to think that this question requires only to be agitated to be at once clearly understood. As Professor Fawcett very properly said, this question does not necessarily entail with it any other considerations with respect to the faculty of women for different professions; but I think the great value of this question will be, if it is properly settled, that it will test this question. I do not presume to say that this question is by any means decided. And upon all occasions upon which I am asked to express opinions, to advocate the liberty of women with regard to professions in life, I simply say, let them have their fair chance, and that is all I ask for them. There is no doubt this danger: that women will try, as women always try, to get the best for themselves. Why should they not? They will try to get both advantages—the advantage of independence upon the one side, and the surrender of the independence on the part of men upon the other; because you know we have a great deal of surrender of independence with regard to women; and no doubt we must expect them to lose something not only in their place of society; but when women come into strong competition with men, in matters of profit and business, no doubt man will exercise his power and authority, probably as unjustly as he has hitherto done. You see it in the trades of London; in the difficulty of women getting into that skilful trade of watch-making, in which the Swiss women are so apt. You find it in the almost impossibility of women getting into the position of compositors in printing offices, notwithstanding the efforts of Miss Faithful, and notwithstanding it is an art for which their delicate fingers so deftly fit them. In all those matters they will have to struggle hard, but no doubt they have that energy and strength in them which will enable them to overcome these difficulties; and what will aid them most will be a sense that they do not labour under any state of moral or political degradation.

Mr. John Morley.—Mrs. Taylor, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—As this is a meeting in which we are all agreed probably as to the ultimate issue of the purposes of the Association, our object will rather be conference than conversation. And, indeed, it was perhaps doubtful policy on the part of the Committee to ask Mr. Mill to speak first, for his speech, like his book, contains nearly everything that can be said upon the subject, and, like the major premiss of a syllogism, every inference that can be drawn from it. It is, therefore, a comparison of experiences rather, for which we seem to be met. Mr. Boyd Kinnear exhibited himself as a recent specimen of a convert by the pamphlets and other productions of this Society. I would claim for myself perhaps an older connection, or an older fidelity, to the aim of this Society, for Mr. Mill's 'Dissertations and Discussions' appeared when I was an undergraduate at Oxford, and I believe that the essay upon the enfranchisement of women in one of those volumes, effected not only my own conversion, but that of a considerable number of men, who will not be found wanting when the practical necessities of the work press. As far as any more recent experience goes, it has not shaken the views which I formed when perhaps I was hardly mature enough to form a view. It was my misfortune not very long ago to have to contest a borough in a part of the world where women have been excessively active—in the county of Lancaster. The conviction on the part of the majority of the women in that borough was that I and my colleague had been expressly sent down by Mr. Gladstone in the interests of the Pope: and this conviction was so strong within their minds that on one occasion I and a friend

very nearly paid for it with grievous bodily maltreatment; and he whispered to me in the thick of the affray, 'How about female suffrage?' I confess that exhibition only strengthened my conviction that the time had come when women should have a vote; because this conviction of theirs, mistaken, as I believed it to be, did at least show in them the capacity for taking an exceedingly active interest in public affairs.

The Resolution I have to speak to, enjoins or prescribes the necessity of a Bill being presented to Parliament. Now, we have here to look at a practical point, and in looking at this Resolution from this practical point of view, it appears to me that we ought to do our utmost to dissever the object of this Bill from any particular ideal of the characteristics, or any special theory as to the functions of woman in society. There are various temperaments of men, and each temperament will be converted by a special and peculiar method. There are many (and this we may say without spiritual pride) of not the least elevated temperament, who will be most quickly drawn by such a presentation as Mr. Mill has made in his work, of a firm elevation of character, the woman being the equal partner of the man. But those who are drawn by that presentation of character are, after all, not the majority. And, moreover, reformations working in that method are always tardy, and not only tardy, but dependent for their success upon the propitious working of a number of collateral forces, over which none of us can exercise a very immediate or personal influence. But the basis upon which I would rest this proposal, and the argument to which I would appeal, in inviting support for the Bill, will be that to which Mr. Mill alluded among his other considerations, by appealing, I mean, to the principle of free trade. From this point of view our measure is simply permissive—it is no more than a removal of a disqualification. And it appears to me, farther, that, presenting it from this point of view, we shall be most likely to secure the two kinds of persons, both of whom it is well worth our while to secure, firstly, persons without any ideals of character, and therefore without prejudice: and, secondly, some of those whose ideals of character are most antipathetic to those which Mr. Mill and, I dare say, most of us here hold to be desirable. For example, there is a body of men to whom personally I have the greatest liking, and for whose principles, in the main, I have hearty sympathy, who cannot understand how we, who, like them, are working for a social reformation, should think of inviting women to take any part in political action. I allude to the Positivists. They expressly preclude any direct action on the part of women in public affairs. Now, if we put aside all questions of the final cause, we may then appeal to them most forcibly, and, as I venture to think, most irresistibly, upon their own principles, to support the Bill; because they, and all persons of their school, demand that we shall accept no conclusion which has not been verified by experiment. We, who wish this Bill to become law, hold that it will be the only possible opportunity of testing experimentally what is the end of woman, and her truest and most normal position in the social organisation. In the writings of one of the most illustrious of their society, one expressly finds such sentences as these—that our race is one that needs duties to form our feelings—we read that although women ought, as a rule, to confine themselves to domestic employments, still there will now and again be persons of extraordinary genius, to whom it is desirable to give the fullest possible scope. I say, accepting such propositions as these, upon purely experimental principles, we have no choice, we have no other means of determining what are their duties, or, when this extraordinary genius does arise, forgiving it the desired opportunity. Our only chance is to give them the fullest possible opportunity of testing every faculty they may possess. It has been well said by some one, I think by Du Maistre, that every social truth, and every public reform has to pass through three stages, first, the stage of neglect; secondly, that of the epigram; and thirdly, the guillotine; finally, universal acceptance. I think we may say that the temper of the times is adverse to the employment, as against ourselves, of the guillotine—although, as it is said, the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church, that would not seem to be a matter of congratulation. The first stage, that of neglect, I think, we may most honestly congratulate ourselves, has passed away. It is now universally felt that this movement can no longer at least be ignored; but, differing from my friend Professor Fawcett, I do not think the time for ridiculing us has by any means gone by. On the contrary, I believe we are in the very mid-heat and central fire of the epigrammatic stage; and, assuredly, this is a fact not entirely without encouragement. If we find many persons, otherwise of a high intelligence and of a deep and undoubted degree of public spirit, who can think a movement which affects one-half the human race worthy only of jocular treatment, then it shows fully that the time has come when we should endeavour to bring them to a more serious mind. I am very glad that this project of ours no longer remains an idea, but is to come practically before the public as a measure for which they may sign petitions, and for which members of Parliament may record their votes. This is desirable, if for no other reason, because it will reveal to themselves and to others, all who are Laodicean and hazy-headed. This is a question in which the Laodicean temper is untimely; and I think we may fairly say to those who decline to support the Bill which Mr. Fawcett has moved should be drawn, and eventually introduced, that they are in truth not with us, and that they do not fully understand the true force and meaning of what I hold to be incomparably the most progressive sentiment of this time.

The Resolution was then put and carried.

Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, M. P.—Mrs. Taylor, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—I have received, within the

last few days, a letter from the Secretary of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage, which contained a Resolution passed at a meeting of that Society, so closely in accordance with the resolution that has just been carried, that I will, with your permission, read it to the meeting. It states 'that at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage, held on the 13th of July, it was resolved, that having regard to the great advance of public opinion shown in the unanimous assent of the House of Commons to the proposal of Mr. Jacob Bright' and myself, 'for restoring to women ratepayers their ancient rights, this Committee respectfully requests those gentlemen to prepare and present, to the House of Commons, at the next session, a Bill for procuring the Parliamentary Suffrage for women.' A similar resolution was sent to Mr. Jacob Bright; and before I come to move the resolution that has been committed to my charge, perhaps it is as well that I should mention to the meeting the opinion which Mr. Jacob Bright (as he is not here) holds upon this question, his name having been much mentioned to-day. I may preface that, however, by referring the meeting to what my friend Mr. Fawcett has said, with regard to the way in which the proposal was received in Parliament. I think perhaps he began his account at somewhat too late a period. He has told you how favourably the proposal was received at the time when it was actually made to the House. But there was, among the friends of women's suffrage (not municipal, but political), a very considerable reluctance to bring forward even the municipal question this session; for it was believed, at the time I first suggested to Mr. Jacob Bright the striking out of the word "male" in the Municipal Bill, and up to within a day or two of the resolution proposed, that we should obtain no considerable support to that proposal. I would therefore express to the meeting the great debt of gratitude we owe to Mr. Bruce and Mr. Gladstone, because I believe, had it not been for the support which the Government gave to that clause, it would not have been possible to have carried the Bill this session. Having said so much upon that point, I would give the meeting the feeling of Mr. Jacob Bright, as he has been named as the probable introducer of the Bill to be drafted by this Society. He says, first, that the leaders of this movement are strongly in favour of such a Bill being introduced, and that he will have no objection to introduce it; but I should say he would not consider a general expression of the opinion of a meeting to be sufficient; he would wish to know that the Executive bodies of the Association are in favour of the Bill being introduced, and not only that they are in favour of it at this moment, but that when the next session actually begins, they shall still continue to be in favour of that course. I can only add, for my own part, if my name is to be on the back of the Bill, that any aid, in any way that I can render it, will be willingly given. In proposing it to the House or otherwise, I shall be excessively glad to have the opportunity of showing the strong opinion I entertain upon this question. The Resolution which has been committed to my charge is to the effect, 'That this meeting desires to record its satisfaction at the progress the Society has already made, which it regards as the earnest of success which cannot for long be delayed.' With regard to the progress the Society has already made, this meeting is itself sufficient evidence of it in London. But, with regard to the future—to the success which cannot long be delayed—I would venture to point out to the meeting that what we should ask for in any Bill that may be drafted upon the Report of the Committee of this Society, should be, as Mr. Morley has said, a mere experiment; because the argument that has been used here to-day by Mr. Mill, and continued by Mr. Kingsley and other speakers, is in the direction of giving a large share of political power to women. Now, any Bill, in the present state of the franchise, that we could draft, would evidently propose to admit women under the same conditions as men; and the effect of admitting them in that way would be to admit a very limited number, and, as it were, to reach the more accidental and exceptional, and not the normal case of women who happen to be householders, or lodgers paying ten pounds a year. It is clear that this would be a very limited measure, admitting in London very few, the largest number probably in Manchester, but even there, supposing all could be registered, admitting under 10,000 women to the register. We should be able to ask for support to this measure, upon the ground of its being a purely experimental one, and by that means we should obtain support from a large number who might otherwise be disinclined to give it. I am equally hopeful, with the other gentlemen who have addressed you, that we shall be able to carry such a measure in a very few years indeed: but even supposing such an experimental measure is to be carried, we shall have carefully to guard ourselves beforehand that such an admission of women to the franchise would be any termination to the question: therefore if such a Bill is to be introduced, it should be regarded as experimental on both sides. The question of success leads, perhaps, to the consideration of the actual practical means of working. I think we have had an admirable example set us of the way in which we should set to work, by the way in which the Birmingham people have set to work in the matter of education. They have got up there a League, chiefly headed by Members of Parliament, and they have calculated the number of members upon whom they can depend in point of principle. I would suggest that the Executive of this Society should be urged to work in that direction, to work in every quarter, not only on the Liberal, but also on the Conservative side, where I believe we may expect considerable support, to ascertain exactly those men who may be counted on upon the reading of the Bill. I believe if we could get a small band of twenty or thirty men who are so strong in their feeling that they will not only promise to vote, but take pains to be present when the Bill comes on, that would prove to be a

ball that would gather as it goes. Those who have once promised their support to the question will be led to consider it with perhaps greater care than they have yet as a body given to it, and, talking it over and meeting the arguments of others, who ask them how they can be so foolish as to support such a ridiculous proposition, meeting such arguments and such ridicule, they will themselves make converts throughout the House of Commons. I shall be perfectly preped to take my humble share in the work in introducing such a measure next session. I have been led on by the Resolution passed at Manchester to speak more to that Resolution perhaps than the one entrusted to me. I will not dwell upon it any longer, because I conceive that the fact of the satisfaction we feel at our past progress has been already sufficiently expressed in and by this meeting; and with regard to our success not being long delayed, I believe we shall be best "able to test that when the Bill is introduced next Session.

Mr. P. A. Taylor, M.P.—After the many admirable speeches we have heard, it would be unpardonable if I did not compress within the smallest space the very few observations I have to make. I desire to express my gratitude to the Executive Committee for having given me the opportunity upon this occasion of expressing my entire loyalty to the cause for which we are banded together; and I may add, likewise, of expressing the ever-increasing estimation on my part, of the importance and necessity of its success, if we would secure the progress and healthfulness of the community in which we live.

I trust you will not consider it pure egotism if I say, that perhaps to our opponents there might appear some special significance in the fact of my making this observation, considering the relations I have the honour to hold with the lady who presides over our meeting this afternoon. It may tend to show, in a degree, however trifling, that one of the commonest, I had almost said vulgarest, opinions, sentiments, or prejudices—call it what you please—cannot at any rate be of universal application, if I venture to say that I have never seen cause to regret that the lady to whom I have ventured to allude, has extended her aims, aspirations, and activity, beyond the walls and threshold of our home. The Resolution which I have to second, expresses satisfaction at the progress the Society has already made, which it regards as the earnest of a success that cannot long be delayed. In regard to the probability of rapid success, I regret to say that I hold more with the opinion of Mrs. Fawcett, than with the opinion of the Professor; while I take this doubt, however, entirely as an incentive to renewed exertion. I do not think we are quite so near success as my friend Mr. Fawcett would have us think. It is indeed quite true that the success we have achieved at present is something wonderful—we have jumped *per saltum* to the amount of success that we have obtained. I remember well when my late revered friend William Johnson Fox spoke upon this question twenty years ago, there were not six men in the country who dared have said what he did; but it must be remembered that when Mr. Mill entered upon the conduct of this question—and it is not the language of compliment, for we are all profoundly convinced of the fact, that to Mr. Mill it is due that at this moment this question has a practical existence—when he undertook, as it were, to garner into his barn the harvest upon this question, he did not garner in the harvest of one season only, but the harvest of a quarter of a century; he gathered around him all those who had been previously convinced, or half convinced, and whose thoughts were tending in the right direction, more or less consciously to themselves. To use another figure, we may now say that we have conquered the outposts, and find ourselves face to face with an almost impregnable fortress of prejudice and custom. Argument is not, by a great deal all that we have to contend with. We are not, I fear, going to breach that wall very easily with soundness of argument. We must depend upon what might be described as the mineral acid of slow working public opinion. Nothing is further from my desire than to discourage; but we must not suppose that the difficulties we have yet to encounter and overcome, are to be measured either by the rapidity of our progress up to this time, or by the strength of the arguments that can be brought against us. We have to meet arguments whose very strength is in their weakness—arguments only considered good enough to support a foregone conclusion, or of which it may be said, to use a more vulgar phrase, 'any stick is good enough to beat a dog with.' Let me illustrate this by mentioning an argument, common as the day. We are appealed to in this manner—'Would you really entrust the vast and important questions of State, all the great social questions of the day, to a being so weak, so frivolous, so superficial, as woman, and so given up altogether to fashion and frivolity.' We are asked, the next moment, and perhaps by the very same man—'What! would you really sacrifice all the valuable influence'—(I observe that the term 'influence' is never thus used except in the inverse ratio of power)—'would you really give up all the sacred, purifying influences of woman and introduce her into the brutality of a political contest, the chicanery of trading speculations, and to all the selfish and hardening influences of our life of struggle?' Of course I do not bring forward these arguments in order to answer them. I leave them, like the Kilkenny cats, to settle with each other; but I bring them forward with another object, not unimportant to bear in mind, and it is this—that these and all similar arguments are based upon this fallacy, that when we have improved the political and social condition of woman, the intellectual and moral condition of men and women, in themselves and in regard to each other, will remain the same as it is now. Small indeed could be our hope of success, or the good we should do, if such could be the result. On the contrary, if women are, and to any extent that they may be, justly chargeable with

being frivolous and weak, we charge this upon the very system which we seek to alter—the laws which we desire to reform—limiting as these do the arena in which she is allowed to exercise her faculties and aspirations. Again, if men are, and to any extent to which they are, fairly chargeable with being brutal, sensual, selfish, and self-seeking, we charge that also, not in a little degree, upon those very laws and customs which we desire to amend,—in that he is isolated, so far as sex is concerned, in the great struggles of life, from those influences which would tend, as we think, to elevate and purify him. To oppose, therefore, the changes which we desire to see effected upon such grounds, is neither sensible nor logical; our desire for change being largely (minded precisely upon the evils which have been done to both. To plead that men and women are not fitted to associate with each other in the affairs of life is to repeat and enforce our argument and not to destroy its force. We may well admit that if the changes which we seek to bring about, in regard to the political and social enfranchisement of women, were suddenly effected, the mischief done may be so deep that it would be long before their full advantages would be realised; nay, we may perhaps admit that the first result of the change would be but to make more evident how far in such matters we have wandered from the paths of nature and common sense; but, to use this argument against us, is no more sensible or logical than it would be to refuse to take the manacles from off a prisoner, lest, in the first days of freedom, the marks of the iron upon his flesh should be but so much the more patent and palpable. I beg to second the Resolution.

Professor Masson.—It would be very difficult, madam, for any one to say anything new upon the great question that has been occupying us—anything that could be relevant, and at the same time new, after what has been already impressed upon you. So all I shall do is to repeat one statement of Mr. Mill, and to connect that with another incidental remark of Professor Fawcett. Mr. Mill, in pleading this question, implied that the enfranchisement of women is desirable upon two grounds: in the first place, because only by that means will the flagrant injustices which women now suffer be effectually removed; and in the second place, because the direct influence and co-operation and political responsibility of women are necessary, both for men and for women, to bring our whole social life up to that elevation which it ought to reach. I will single out the first of these two things, and, under that, one injustice, which has been alluded to by Professor Fawcett, committed upon women. It is a gross disgrace upon this nation that, at this moment, when everything is made free and open for men, when all facilities are afforded to men for the cultivation of their minds to the utmost, there are no corresponding facilities for the cultivation of the minds of women. We have schools and universities, and scholarships, and fellowships, and all young men have these advantages. What corresponding advantages are there for women? There may be a poor governess trying her utmost to cultivate her mind for its own sake, and also that she may teach—so that cultivation for her is a means of livelihood—but there are no encouragements of the same sort for her as there are for her brothers; and this injustice will never be removed until women have the power of saying who shall be members of Parliament, and who shall go into Parliament to make new laws. This is but one instance, but it is an instance with which I am familiar, and therefore I bring it forward here. And, upon the whole question, I may just say this, that it seems to me that the recent large increase of the franchise for men is an additional reason why women should now have the franchise. It is possible that the enlarged franchise of men may put women to a greater disadvantage than they were at before, unless it is accompanied by their own enfranchisement; because you give power, as has been said, to an ignorant, rude, uncultivated man, with no particular qualification for the trust reposed in him, and you refuse it to an experienced, wise, and thoughtful woman. At this moment there may be danger of less justice being done to women in all particulars than there was before; for all their interests, their fortunes, and even their lives, are now subject to the uncouth tramp of multitudinous masculine hoofs.

The Resolution was put and carried.

Mr. Stansfeld, M.P.—Ladies and gentlemen, my duty will be short and, to me, grateful, as I trust that your response will be to you. It is usually a formal duty; it is that of proposing a vote of thanks to the person who has occupied the chair at the meeting which has been brought to a close. But, upon this occasion, that will be no formal Resolution, because this chair has not been occupied, as the chair is generally occupied at meetings, for whatever purpose. And never has the chair at a public meeting, as far as my experience goes, been occupied by one who could perform its duties with more business-like skill, and yet simple and modest and graceful earnestness. When I listened to the few remarks of my friend Mrs. Taylor, and to the statement of my friend and relative, the Secretary of this Association, I could not help—as those of us who, like me, bear years enough to look back upon not a few successful movements—I could not help thinking of the announcement of the number of pamphlets that had been issued and distributed, and the number of petitions which had been signed, made at the early meetings of other movements, whose success we have ourselves witnessed, beginning modestly, like this, but ending in success. I have no doubt that, at some future time—I will not define the number of years, but I take a hopeful view—we shall look back with a peculiar interest to this day and to this occasion, and that our friend who has presided will feel that it was a privilege to have occupied that place. Our friend Mr. Mill has shown us to-day, with that perfection of reason and of demonstration—that wide and wise and comprehensive

philosophy—that subtle and exhaustive analysis, before which no error can remain unexposed, and which have ever distinguished every speech and every writing of our eminent friend—he has shown us how and why that success will be attained. This movement and this cause has its relation to other movements and other causes with which the time is pregnant. It helps them, as Mr. Mill has told us, and it will be aided by them to its own success. If I might venture upon a simile, I would liken the progress of humanity to the on flow of a mighty river, of which every thought, translated into word or deed, is a confluent. The course of those isolated thoughts or conceptions, before they reach the great stream of progress, may be difficult, and doubtful, and slow; but when, as tributaries, they join themselves to the mighty stream, they add to its impulse and to its volume and to its flow, and their juncture with it is the assurance of their own success. Ladies and gentlemen, that great stream of progress varies at different periods in the rapidity of its flow. There are times of stagnation, and there are eddies sometimes upon this stream; but I think that we have arrived at a period, as far as our generation is concerned, when it is a mighty and an abounding river. Prejudices seem to be vanishing as the night, and I sometimes almost regret that in their place nothing hardly more reputable or substantial appears to remain than the likes and dislikes, the tastes and distastes, which seem all that the opponents of the great progressive movements of the age have to offer to that progress. As far as I am immediately concerned, my sympathies are and have ever been with this movement; I know, and many of my friends here know, how absorbing, I will say exhaustingly absorbing, is ordinary political, and still more, ordinary official life. We have often heard, and we are sometimes told, that when we plunge into ordinary politics, and still more when we betake ourselves to the occupations and duties of official life, we are apt to forget our old philosophies and to be no longer true to the faiths of our earlier years. There is too often a truth in that accusation; but there is something to be said for those of us who are not prepared to admit it in its more serious aspect; and that is, that the wear and tear, and the strain upon the mind and the body and the strength of those of us that are not blessed with more than the average mental and bodily strength of our kind, is so great in political and official life, that, despite ourselves, we feel from time to time left, as it were, stranded on the shoals of thought, and longing for periods of holiday—longing sometimes for that which is called 'the cold shadow of opposition,' in order that we may go back to those thoughts and take our part again in those great movements in which our interest has never really flagged. I will say for myself, that whether the time for this movement, and for the effort of this Association, be five or fifteen years, or more, I know that opportunities will occur, and I shall embrace them with eagerness and satisfaction, of paying my tribute to the principals involved, and of endeavouring, as far as opportunity may serve, of aiding a cause which I have most sincerely at heart. I beg to propose to you, that the cordial thanks of tin's meeting be given to Mrs. Taylor for presiding upon this interesting occasion.

Mr. John Stuart Mill.—I beg to second the motion. It is quite unnecessary that I should make any remarks, or add anything to what has been said. I am sure the whole meeting feels the grace, the dignity, as well as the business-like spirit in which the proceedings have been conducted by Mrs. Taylor, and all will join most heartily in voting thanks to her.

The Motion was put and carried with acclamation.

Mrs. Taylor.—I really have no words adequate to express my feeling of deep gratitude for the favour you have shown me, and also for the appreciation of my small efforts made to-day; I can only express a hope that the kind sympathies which have been exhibited by this meeting will be continued to this Society.

London: Printed by Spottiswoode and Co., New-Street Squard and Parliament Street
Free Trade in New Zealand. Answer to the Published Enquiry of Auckland Agricultursts. A
Pamphlet-Essay,
By William Edmund Sadler.

"Truth is the most insufferable thing on this-earth."—OLD GERMAN. *"Truth is the supreme necessity; the source of order, &c.; the world was created for truth. Error is irrational."*—SWISS. *"Truth is mighty and will prevail."*—MODERN ENGLISH. *"Truth endureth; and liveth and conquereth for evermore. Great is truth and mighty above all things."*—FIRST PRIZE SENTENCE—(ESDRAS [UNCLEAR: APOC]) *"The truth shall make you Free."*—REVEALED DECLARATION.

Auckland: Printed at the "Evening News" Office, 1868.

Preface.

PRIMA FACIÆ, and from title, it is open to question as to which side is here taken,—whether freedom for commerce, or governmental protectionism for New Zealand.

The reported request for the discussion conveyed no definition and nothing definite. It was simply and freely, which of the two particular lines of policy is the better for this country? My determined, peremptory decision was gratuitous, and solely on the responsibility of my own personal conviction. The following treatise

is decidedly for Free Trade and Free Ports all the world over, "and no mistake."

A request is above referred to. It was rumoured last July, and hinted before, that a prize was to be offered in this province for the best pamphlet-essay on the question, Should, or should not the agriculturists of New Zealand have government protectionism? Since, it has been intimated that, partly in consequence of hard times, and partly from the belief that probably ordinary newspaper ordinary writing would, the cue having been given, supply all demanded, the prize would not be offered. All was rumour. Albeit, the *on dit* did service,—it acted as a powerful suggestion. And the suggestion operated. This pamphlet is the outcome. Had there been competition, probably this confident predetermination of the problem would have been a fatal risk.

The only regret for the shortcoming alluded to is, that had a prize been offered, something fuller, more elaborate, and more satisfactory would probably have been presented.—Years ago gossip said that certain exquisite literary productions of renowned men were written eight times over for definitive perfection of touch. This small brochure has been written twice only. The good of free, honourable competition is quite inestimable.

THE RECENTLY ENACTED AUSTRALIAN PRECEDENT BEING CLOSE BEFORE OUR NOTICE MAKES THIS WORK APPEAR NECESSARY.

If Providence—to which is referred its projection—will make the Essay in any degree useful, the object in writing it will be attained, and any mere opinion of its quality must remain a matter of indifference. Only conceit of dissent and affectation of philosophic candour are deprecated.

The short quotations employed here as title-page-mottoes are worthy of notice by all, but especially by publicists. The leading, professional, working principle of some able writers is bad,—not truth but expediency. With them the constant mental inquiry is, what is the average of public opinion? what will take? and, sometimes, perhaps, what will *pay*? Often, doubtless, an unswerving adherence to the direct line of truth is unpopular. And herein is perceived the signification of the startling, impassioned expression of one of England's greatest men, "God Almighty save me from prudence!" But, as, in the long run, self-seeking is really impolitic and ungainly, so also is there a pseudo discretion. For of course it is the popular, sham thing denounced. It is surely more noble to bring over to the truth. It is difficult to estimate those minds which for years and by fair means and foul oppose a policy, and then suddenly veer round and, without explanation, premonition, penitence, or apology, praise and advocate it. Conviction does not appear with them. Of course in ease of simple mistake acknowledgment of it is sufficient. But not seldom in such noted cases animus is ostensible. Yet, as a great man has said, with large though not, as I think, entire correctness, "In order that a truth may become our own, it is necessary that we should have begun by disbelieving and disputing it." The reverse, most certainly, is fact anent *one* best class of great minds.—Man's vast interests here and hereafter are couched in truth moral and political. "And the whole constitution of human affairs is based upon some idea of God." Well were we ever prepared to suffer if necessary for truth! "Men should pursue truth for its own sake, and independently of the consequences it may be found to involve."

Editor—Hugh Miller.

Still it by no means necessarily follows that an earnest lover of truth is entirely free from error. Wrong, error, sincerity, earnestness, have ere now dwelt together. Nevertheless sincere love of truth is a genial soil luxuriantly productive of good. And I most decidedly believe that no former age was better than this.

Lately we have seen a newspaper report of plagiarism, as detected and exposed by an honorable literatus; who, on reporting it, affirmed that it was a gross violation of honesty. I concur in this judgment. Now mentioned because some time since literary theft was gravely alleged against some men in the highest places in New Zealand—parsons and others. I was once literally smitten with astonishment by a similar discovery elsewhere. Every thing, every sentence, and every expression I advance, whether good, bad, or indifferent, come straight and immediately from my own head and heart, as is always plainly perceptible to the perceiving. The contrary would be uninteresting, and, through consciousness of waste, disheartening. Self-love and rational aspiration should suffice to interdict such beggary. Here individuality and idiosyncrasy are alike sufficiently apparent. It is deemed generally injurious, and specially opposed to the second side of manly humility, to believe in caste superiors. The chief superiority in our world, as even Isaac Newton himself declared, is that of meritorious industry.—This government is doubly necessary because of said detection and the fact that my theme, in its general aspect, is not new. And there is a special private reason.—Plate says, an efficient teacher must be poor. Some will feel forced to do as they like about believing him. A learned sect of a large church is under a vow of poverty. Some feel and affirm the vow superfluous.

I was impelled to write the following, which duly appeared anonymously:—

Auckland and Protectionism.

To the Editor of the. Daily Southern Cross.

Sir,—Will you allow me to set forth a few words, chiefly as announcement, through the medium of the *D. S. Cross*? To-day, I read "Anthropos" advocating Tariff Protectionism, gratuitously owning incompetency therein, and inviting discussion. I wish authoritatively to inform him and "all whom it may concern" that some persons are now stripping for the race in competition for the £30 or £40 Otahuhu prize, shortly to be advertised. Further, that they are practising on their own private grounds, hoping soon to "come out strong," and that, "as at present advised," they judge it, improper to trespass with their disciplinary gyrations on your domain.

I dislike the strain of to-day's letter upon the problem.—I have, &c.

July 19, 1867.

Scarcely twice a-year have I ever resorted to the anonymous.

To this humorous communication it should just be added that only the first paragraph and a few relative notes were jotted in July: the paper was then stowed, in the limbo of oblivion for more than three months. A felt hesitation is accounted for by the first third of this poem.

W. E. S.

Auckland,

December 23, 1807.

L.

1. PHYSIOLOGICALLY to violate nature's laws inevitably entails ill-health. This is indubitably true; and attested by very frequent painful experience. Now, notice, truth is one; though certainly, we often do see that its course, like that of "true love, never does run smooth." Intervening circumstances and interfering selfishness frequently interpose obstacles to its benign and fertilising flow, diverting its course into a score ramifications and channels, so as to pose and puzzle the various peoples living on its vast and varied and salubrious banks to trace the source.

2. Nevertheless truth cannot be essentially altered by any possible or conceivable circumstances. And the obvious, certified truth pertaining to human body health, holds concerning human commercial intercourse, or trade; viz., to contravene nature's relative laws is sure to occasion disorder in the body politic.

3. It seems a self-evident postulate that "all people that on earth do dwell"—Father Adam's children especially, not now to say anything of the others—should find no actual obstruction in their honest, straightforward, respectable endeavours to trade or even truck together. Evidently, however, as here already hinted, there are many existent obstacles. Some of the principal of these shall be presently noticed.

4. One man grows a surplus beyond own want of potatoes; another grows wheat more than he requires for home. They hence advantageously barter. Or, a middle man is introduced, called a shopkeeper, who buys all such surplusage and sells. The first then sells him potatoes and buys of him bread from said wheat. Here is trade; and the medium thing called money is brought into requisition. This clear arrangement saves much time and trouble. All this is straightforward—*natural*. Extend the operation of the idea from two individuals to two or to twenty nations. We then have commerce. Mead middle man is then a merchant; and there are subordinate middle men—tradesmen All right.—Tariff now intervenes, and puts a big stone into the delicate organism,—intermeddles with the basis of "good-will." Sends officers with swords to "board" merchant earner ships. And soon there are laches and a hitch; and then comes horrid war.—Unimpeded trade, it must therefore be assumed as postulatam, is nature's law; monopoly protection is its infraction. We shall, however, are finishing this work, have particularly to inquire whether any peculiar conditions and circumstances, here or elsewhere, demand or justify departure from that natural rule of unrestricted liberty in honest trade. And it is just now believed that to such inquiry must be affixed a final negative.

5. During the quarter of a century last past enough on the question of Free Trade and Free Ports has been said and written, to stock a library; and were all gathered up, "the world could not receive the books that would be written." And it would certainly be the very easiest thing now to give pages of statistics in demonstration of the truth to nature of the political doctrine of free, unrestricted trade. Indeed, it appears, trade protectionists have not a leg left to stand on. Their very last pretext of artificial circumstances requiring artificial fiscal arrangements proved a poor fly under the ponderous wheel of the car of inexorable necessity. By their own full

though constrained consent they are argumentatively done. Aye, done up. Moreover, they have accepted the situation; and have implicitly promised fiducial integrity. Indeed, already, in turn, they have actually administered free trade laws. Truth is more powerful than its great adversaries. Good is often accomplished by those who were opposed to it. The whole old civilised world now laughs at the antiquated political nostrum of governmental monopoly protection to trade and commerce; and, doubtless, would groan at a serious, iniquitous attempt to reproduce it. But still, really, it does appear, we ought to look very sharp indeed devoutly to kick out godless chaps who would feign govern us. They are dangerous men. They are regardless of mental truth, and are not afraid of God.

6. The feeler proposition of governmental protection to traders in Auckland, whether agriculturalists, smiths, or carpenters, must, therefore, it is shrewdly suspected, be quashed. Under the very best auspices, or the least unfavourable circumstances, it would only come to enriching the left hand trousers pocket at the expense of the right. And plain people who know nothing and care *less* about the science of political economy, wholly and firmly believe that that would really be no gain. It showed more deep perspicacity in the Otahuhu agriculturalists than they ever yet got credit for, that they laughed at David Graham's public suggestion that possibly monopoly protection was necessary to them. And methinks I see David joining cordially and with wonted bonhommie in that general hearty laugh.

7. It is certainly not the present purpose to give a digest of the potential and extant works alluded to; else, instead of a desiderated pamphlet on a peculiar phase of the question a book would come. To mount the shoulders of Adam Smith, McCulloch, and Mill, in order to a view far away beyond them; and to present column after column of heavy arithmetical figures would surely be dry, uninteresting, and unacceptable. It is carefully declined. And not only for this believed non-necessity and unacceptableness, but also for the rather different reason that, though often heard of, I never saw them, and they are now inaccessible to me.—The simple fact is, I want just now to give the reader the ripe result of my own independent thinking, as I would do were I to meet him at a Saturday's market, and have a friendly, free-and-easy, leisurely, intelligent chit-chat; and am not at all desirous to give here, what by some persons might possibly be expected of me, pages of extracts from, or a digest of any elaborate works which upon this subject are or may be extant. Present design is to aim at a plain, simple view of the question as it bears on the considerable territory of Auckland, and chiefly as it affects its aratory interests. It is peculiarly, how and what about Free Trade in New Zealand? I would now well-nigh confine myself to this particular aspect. But must, however, just glance at *principle*, as underlying the question in its every possible application anywhere.

8. It is ordained that every man should love himself. Self-love is divinely implanted in man as fundamental motivity. Deny it, and no place is found for promised rewards and threatened punishments, and consequently for law and government to which these appertain. The vast distinctive difference between self-love and selfishness has never yet received sufficient notice and treatment, Selfishness is self-love under a mistake. It is depraved perversion. It may be safely affirmed that insufficient self-love is the occasion of most of the vice in our world. For instance, if a man duly respected himself he would surely not put into his body that which necessarily, certainly, and plainly injures it, as too much beef or too much beer, &c. Self-love is natural, and the God-ordained foundation of benevolence. Want of self-respect is a sin alike against nature and the dictates of Divine Revelation, which harmonize. Now, our theme receives illuminating illustration hereby, and comes in here with striking pertinency.

9. A shoemaker makes you a pair of shoes. Oh! does he? Yes; but why? *because* he loves you? No; not a bit of it, Because, rather, he loves himself honestly and righteously, and therefore seeks some money which represents this world's goods. If shoemakers never made shoes except from pure benevolence it is doubtful whether the people would be well shod. If the world's commerce were only legitimate when No. 1 is in abeyance, legitimate commercial transactions would be sparse. And then every man would have to try to grow his own potatoes, and worse, try to live only on them;—a result, by-the-bye, which looks rather like an emanation of malevolence. Self-love and social love have the same end. Now, just trace the operation of this idea throughout the whole community and the whole world, and thereby you will come easily to ascertain whether nature's freedom in commerce should be restricted by artificial regulations, or whether pure and simple let-a-loneism will answer. And it is specially desired that every man should see the thing clearly for himself, and not through the medium of another—should not believe on mere authority, or because he happens to know some excellent man who believes it. *Honorable self-love*, it is affirmed, is at the bottom of *the commercial fact that a fair demand commonly creates a fall simply*.

About three months after first, writing of above paragraph, an excellent preacher delivered a sermon, per advertisement, entitled self-love, and selfishness, &c. It was certainly, and according to confident expectation, a good discourse—spiritual and subduing. I do suppose the subject was suggested by a small polite personal debate I previously had with him on the meaning of the words, which are every day in everybody's mouth, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." I had said, almost every one misconstrued those words, apparently

understanding "as" to mean, as much as; whereas I believed the meaning to be exactly according to the saying; "as," or in like manner; and most certainly not as much as. Transacting howsoever, look over at him as being yourself. This excludes the "as much." As you would that men should do, &c., the ellipsis here cannot certainly be filled with, could or would wish, but, would reasonably expect or rationally count. It was protested by several present that the words really do mean as much as. I thought that if the bell had then rung out an alarm of a conflagration, and we had rushed to the door to see the direction and saw two fires, one at my house, and one another way at my neighbour's, I should of course run to mine first. No supposed balance of motives inducing hesitancy would be experienced. The grand question now is, would such course be right? By universal consent it would. And here, again, nature and Scripture tally; for, after all, it is "as—it is not as much as. God's word is true. Yet, I own, the command is exceeding broad. I should not anticipate success from any human attempt to widen it. But the rule for "brother" differs from the rule for "neighbour." This page or two of running preliminary discussion, which this note finishes, involves my whole present theme. The Royal Law demands equity in human regulations for trade. Only desperadoes deny that we should do to others as we would (rationally count) they should do to us.

10. Were a thousand carpenters wanted immediately to set up a township on the banks of the Waikato (such a likely demand would have made our railway feasible) it would be a violation of the rule of right, and of the principle technically called free trade, to get the government to impose a special tax on every carpenter not belonging to this province; and, as always, so notably and plainly in this case, such violation would be suicidal.—Oh! if that's it, I am for free trade—decidedly. Why, certainly you are,—of course! Well, now, if the carpenters of Auckland province should not have a protective governmental arrangement, ought the agriculturists? Now if a township be not just at present actually in demand, bread-earn is,—always is; and, lately, during the abnormal, extraordinary state of things—10,000 troops being located among us—it was in very large demand. Actual supply is essential, and of primary consideration; source of supply is a secondary, though not unimportant business. The *first* thing for the people, we say, is to get food for the keeping together of soul and body. Supply is urgently necessary. Who ought to be able, or enabled to supply the want, though not an insignificant question, is still a problem for more leisurely de- liberation. Give us something to eat *first*. After dinner speech is cordial.

11. It was certainly not an evil that California and Adelaide have recently had corn to spare and to sell; and, that we could freely and unrestrictedly buy, was incontrovertibly a good. The evil was, that large tracts of land in this country which could have supplied the demand did not, whereby our hard cash went far away. The burden of present inquiry, then, really is, Why did not this extensive territory of land yield it? Is there not a cause? There is, doubtless. And it should be ferretted out. We are unable, it is alleged, to compete with California in our own corn-market! "How passing strange!" Considering the many thousands of miles California is distant from us, and considering the high rate of shipping-freight in this South Sea, it might reasonably be supposed that the cost of transit would be ample protection for the home producer. Now, remark, this question is a large branch of politics; and the cause of our defeat and grievance is not alone agricultural but principally political. For one instance: our roads are deficient and defective, and consequently it costs a disproportionate sum for our own conveyance of produce to market. Of this we have all heard and read reiterated complaints. But, then, even so, how political? who so much obliged to make and mend roads as those who use or want to use them? Certainly this is plausible; but it is irrelevant; for the requisite money, and more, is really paid, and yet the roads are wanting. If half the money which the settlers have been mulcted to pay to our anomalous plurality of governments had been spent upon their own roads, and about various means of transit, this extraordinary evil would not exist as a grievous complaint. And so then it is political.

10. Some men evidently came out to these islands under the impression that the desideratum for this place, containing a few thousands of inhabitants, and the special want for themselves and their nearest friends, was a reproduction of all the institutions of old England, with its many millions of population; and hence we must, of course, have a Custom House, &c., &c., with an army of officials. Were it asked, What is our Post establishment for? the answer (blinking the subsidies) would be prompt and satisfactory. But, were it asked, what is our Custom-house for? the answer would be different and slow in coming forth.—*What for is the Custom House in these far-off sparsely peopled islands?*—In reality, therefore, the question resolves itself into this, Can we, a few thousands here, having such an army of officials to support, produce corn to pay, as well as the Americans, whose officials are economically supported, and so supported by many millions of population.

13. And, again, some people are deceived by a flippant naming of coins. Possibly 5s. in California may represent 9s. of New Zealand necessary articles. Suppose we here were properly to make 4s. 6d. cash next month worth 8s. cash this month how then? What goods do coins represent? we should inquire. In 300 B.C., the standard price of a bushel of wheat was one penny; of an ox, 3s. 5d.; of a sheep, 1s. 8d. Then money was dear.

14. In England, manufactures demanded free trade, and tithes demanded "protection." Here, Customs' Tariff' cripples the people; and they cast about for a redress; and, as a drowning man will eagerly clutch at a

straw, so the farmers, (no man at these antipodes should be a farmer: he should cultivate his own), ground down by extraordinary taxation, look askance at a (morally impossible) government fiscal protection as a necessary help.

15. The use of the single word protection is apt to be misleading, for all admit that the grand function of government is to protect—is truly and legitimately the protection of person, life, and property. Often, people, for lack of thought, are misled by words. Tariff monopoly protection expresses the meaning better: *i. e.* taxing the many solely and only for bounty for the few. And sophistry, it is presumed, is undesired. We do not wish to blind ourselves.

16. Suppose that in a country where wheat-growing is so protected the growers of other articles were each, in effect, to say, Well, if your wheat-growing is subsidised by taxing everybody's wheat except yours, I demand that my tea-growing be in like manner protected, by taxing everybody's tea except that which I grow. So, then, Jones would be giving Smith 3s. for his own private pocket for every bushel of corn had; and Smith would give Jones 1s. 6d. extra for every pound of tea bought. And, if men can get rich by taking money out of one pocket and putting it into the other, these very intelligent and industrious men, both, would soon demonstrate to the world a confirmation of darkey's deposition, "dat all men do love lazy,"—they would retire on their acquired independent means.

17. Oh, but, then, such a thing was never in contemplation we never even dreamed that our beloved brother the tea-grower over the way was to have a tariff protective tax, but only us wheat growers: which gives a fresh face to the thing!—Now,—Jones won't stand it; but he pluckily bursts out, Fair play all the world over. Fair play is a jewel. But then, friend Jones, like Richard Cobden, is a thorough business man, and smashes idle theories evidently devised to cover dishonest practice.

18. Be it ever borne in mind that protective duties, so-called, are not primarily designed for revenue; and in point of fact very seldom make or minister to revenue; the tax is only protective, as it is named; it is to prevent full, fair competition. But interested sophisters have sometimes found it very convenient to; forget the meaning of the name. But revenue is designed to be expended on all the people who pay it in, bating a percentage for collectors' salaries—necessary expense, which about 5 per cent, should amply cover.—Query: Is this expense in New Zealand about 75 per centum? or is it 85?—Is any article in Auckland taxed if produced elsewhere, and exempted from the tax if produced as good here?—And even though this be so, bread must always be allowed as an exception to any such bad rule, for it is proverbially "the staff of life." And it is really a merciful Providence that supplies of this essential do not fail, although local harvests sometimes fall short. So, legal restrictionism may be to oppose directly Divine Providence. The most enlarged freedom in the wish to buy wheat must not therefore be in the slightest degree interfered with. And the modern invaluable facilities of ocean transit must not be by canning craftiness counteracted or rendered unavailing. You may or may not have a prejudice against the phrase Free Trade, especially as applied to the article wheat;—possibly you are unable to divest it of the notion of party. Any such possible prejudice cannot be deemed worthy of much notice. And in truth we do not much care about any particular phrase, more especially if ignorantly employed as a "cry." But it is very earnestly asked that no man make any attempt to intervene by coercive law between the buyer and the seller of bread-corn.

19. Well, upon the whole and spite of circumstances, I must think that any return to abolished protectionism is utterly hopeless. The only chance for it would be in a prevailing political ignorance, which we must try to obviate or disperse. The thing had better now, once for all, be tranquilly regarded as defunct; and, like a bad one dead, talked of as a possible helper no more.

20. To talk about, so as to create an expectation of protective monopoly-taxes will be very injurious, in its certain effects, to the cultivators of the soil. If they be induced to anticipate that the people will soon be compelled by law to subsidise them in their work, it will throw off their dependence from themselves; and, to their own very serious detriment, they will be mentally looking for extraneous aid; and retardation of improvements will surely be consequent. And, furthermore, considering the fact that there is not the slightest chance, nay, not so much as the ghost of a chance, of their ever getting such compulsory aid, the case, so, is very much aggravated. This is really no time to hope for the resuscitation of protectionism, or for the promotion of one trade by Act of Parliament at the expense and by the hindrance of every other. If it could obtain, it should not; but surely it cannot possibly; especially where every house-keeper has a vote. In England the thing is dead and condemned,—let it alone.

21. I somehow fancy it is to do immense service to the agriculturists here to clearly point out and exhibit the utter hopelessness of ever putting into operation the protectionist recipe lately prescribed,—hence these free remarks. It is to contribute to best temporal benefit to force the inference of inevitable self-reliance. What is done for men mostly subtracts from the healthy stimulus to do for themselves, and so entails injury.

22. But is it necessary to set forth the abstract truth of Free Trade, which very few indeed would now deny to be truth in the abstract, when it is remembered, that our circumstances altogether are undeniably artificial;

and that our laws generally and Tariffs in particular are founded upon presupposition of this fact? Now, this, in reality and in effect, is the gist of all the plausible platitudes ever advanced by advocates of tariff protection to agriculture. Omitting the consideration of the gross inconsistency of contributing chiefly to the artificial, and then pleading the artificial so produced as main argument for an urged protective enactment by way of reprisal, the following should suffice as reply:—But, bread being a necessity;—bread-eating being universal;—bread-eating being eminently natural; it cannot be legitimately brought under any artificial arrangement, but especially under a law of prohibition for securing monopoly and consequent dearness, without catching instanter the avenging rebuke of nature, and painfully demonstrating that to violate nature is to entail disorder. Trifle with satins and embroidery, and even with "baccy," if you will, but, when you busily set to to concoct and elaborate a cunning, complicated tariff, in the name of God and for the sake of the multitude, let bread alone.

23. Again, the "artificial state and condition" argument is based on the assumption that it is practicable and sometimes proper to overcome evil with evil, which is erroneous. And to do evil that good may come is policy blundering. Good may be educed from our evil by a wise and merciful Providence, and most likely very often is, else, in all probability, we should destroy ourselves; but we cannot possibly by designed direct evil produce good.—Very much in our artificial state, doubtless, is unmixed evil. That which is proved so should be removed. Certainly this seems the unambiguous dictate of common sense, and of plain, simple honesty. Because my neighbour the sugar grower over the way has his business protected by a factitious enactment whereby my sugar costs too much, it is surely not so much an argument for me to get my wheat-growing protected also, as it is that I should sedulously seek the abolition, for the good of all, of the law which has actually conferred on him a monopoly. Doubtless, tariffs often have been artfully partial and unjust. The partiality and the injustice should be expunged. But to proceed to this by way of reprisals, and to labour assiduously to get an additional partiality for another trade or calling, is positively to confound confusion, to the general and grievous detriment of the respectable multitude who consume and pay.—Anyhow to tax trade is egregiously and obviously impolitic. And would surely never have been resorted to by any nation but under the extremest emergency. Such policy is an effect of horrid war.

24. Hence I happen firmly to disbelieve in tariffs altogether, and to believe that the very least of their many hypothetical evils is that they are a clumsy, complicated, difficult "way 'of getting the "means." And, apparently, the principal reasons why some great men have advocated them, are, first, they conceal taxation from the public; second, they confer patronage and power by creating lots of good billets to give. Yet, incontestably, whilst standing, law, not touching concerns of "the world to come," must and should be obeyed. Only if bad it is a public virtue to labour assiduously for its abrogation:

25. Let us now suppose, for example, that two contiguous islands, say in the South Sea, and named A and B, were occupied by 400 industrious immigrants with their families—about 200 men on each. At B a large proportion of the people, knowing well how to grow it, regularly produced more than enough wheat abundantly to supply the two countries. At A the people, indifferently acquainted with that branch of agriculture, produced only a small quantity of wheat; but being good horticulturists, and skilled in handicraft—boat-building, &c., it was generally believed to be more mutually advantageous to traffic by regular trade or by barter, than for each man to attempt to produce every necessary article of consumption he wanted. In short, and very plainly, they wisely opined that it was decidedly better "every cobbler should stick to his last." One island country, then, regularly supplied wheat or flour; and the other, fruits and some vegetables, &c., &c.; also well-equipped trading vessels, and clothes, house-furniture, &c. Population naturally and steadily increased; fallen human nature showed its ordinary depravity; temporal government became necessary; courts for disputes, and judges, watchers, and warders, must be forthwith appointed. The few necessary public servants must be paid by the public. Where is the money to come from? There is wealth among them; but how is public revenue fairly to be got, and how appropriated? A few intelligent men are chosen (elected) to arrange these things; the principle of *representation*, inaugurated to our world by God (the Covenants), is espoused by these two new states. All these simple institutions are working well and smoothly. But,—yes, there comes a *but*, and a hitch,—depravity, common to all, crops up ostensibly and peculiarly among these simple representative rulers. Selfishness, always impolitic, comes forth to legislate. A wiseacre comes out strong with a mighty fiscal project; he sets it forth fluently and with seemingly "intense earnestness;—from his abundant imaginings his mouth volubly speaks;—he knows how to get the necessary expenses of government without any tax on his constituents, viz. tax the products, not the persons; and those products other people's, not ours. (Hear hear. Loud and prolonged cheers.) Every bushel of corn brought hither from other countries to pay an import tax of So our wheat-growers, exempt from that tax, will be able to compete in the market; and our people will be spared taxation. (Cheers.) A large landowner present could not see revenue accruing from the policy, but could distinctly see an enhancement of the value of his property,—he was sagacious. He supported it. But the odd 3s. increase of price to *the people* is very conveniently kept out of view during process of argument. And, worse still, the tight

restriction inevitably supervening on trade and barter it is very carefully resolved to forget. Affairs between the two interesting countries get complicated, disordered, factitiously deranged, and tangled, The natural law of nations,—free, unrestricted trade,—is violated Some discern this violation to be the secret of the prevailing commercial disorder, and of the consequent public discontent. Others don't or won't see it,—can't see it at all Forsooth, they are "making a pretty penny" out of the corruption, which was both the cause and the effect of the fiscal error. In the name of all that is honest and straightforward, how can it be expected that these most excellent, honorable men should "see it!" The hindrance and entailed impoverishment of many people is surely a wholly immaterial consideration when a few individuals get rich by the fact! Any one who will protest against this must be bad and be branded!

26. I hold it to be bad policy to tax any nameable articles of trade; the certain loss resulting is more in amount than the tax payment. But to tax bread-com is incontestably iniquitous. And it is deprived of even the color of a plausible pretext when it is a tax on all wheat except the wheat of home growth; for when, by nearly excluding the stranger, which is in reality the chief object of protective taxes, the extra price goes straight into the pockets of the small protected portion of the community who produce wheat, or of their lords, and not into the public treasury for the public service, as do all legitimate taxes. Observe this particularly, corn-laws were never primarily designed for revenue. Any revenue accruing from them was always incidental—merely by the bye; and always a secondary consideration. They have ever been only restrictive, protective laws. Now, the notion that protection by monopoly law is necessary, is exploded and dissipated in all enlightened countries. Relaxation preparatory to abolition is the order of the day in all the great nations where any such laws yet remain. Shall we, then, the descendants and colonists of Great Britain, which lately set the world such a noble example of freedom, and which the world has not been slow to follow, as witness the liberal international tariff between England and France, shall we go back to an effete institution Which was conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity, and which has been, at instance of the vox populi, extinguished long since elsewhere? Let us rather go forward. The sun never goes back. The thing is manifestly impossible.

27. It is singularly apropos that about three hours after first writingg of this page the following telegraphic paragraph appeared in Auckland prints as a second edition of mail news:—" The King of Burmah, under the advice of the Viceroy of India, has consented to modify his Customs' Tariff, and to abandon monopolies which enriched himself personally, to the detriment of his subjects and foreigners alike."—That the coincidence should powerfully arrest my notice was natural and of course.

28. However plausible a wheat-grower in Auckland may see it or suppose he sees it to be, it is in no-wise feasible that the bread-eaters would allow an exclusion from the market of our brethren and friends and fellow-colonists of Adelaide solely and only to keep up wheat dear enough to satisfy our growers. Does it not now carry unmistakable signs of impracticability on the very face of it? Here, remember, the bread-eaters are electors as well as the bread-growers. We protest that distance should occasion ample protection: if excessive taxation exactly counterbalance this natural advantage, the remedy is plain to see. Laws for monopoly protection are, I think, for ever impossible to Auckland. And it must be a thoroughly heartless and disheartening job to labour for an object that is unattainable!

29. Unlucky men, ignorant self-seekers, and "bad hands" are of course forward to clamour for protective subsidy. The regular presumption of this should cause inquiring "good men and true" to be very suspicious of protectionism.

30. What, then, is to be done? Agriculture here, owing to numerous drawbacks, is seldom sufficiently remunerative, and is always uncommonly precarious.—I am not careful to deny all of this allegation. Possibly it is a fact. I believe it is so in regard to some products, and that it has been hitherto so in many spots regarding wheat-growing in particular. I think I forsee it will not so continue. But even were the case fifty degrees worse, whatever it might say to such an island, it would certainly not fairly follow that therefore all other workers should be compelled by law to help out.

31. The grand point is this, and I readily and promptly own that it has its seeming difficulties,—there is *something* that may well be advanced on the other side,—viz., there being here an actual tariff, should not foreign wheat, considering our difficulty of growing, be taxed as well as other articles of daily consumption? The whole thing seems to me fairly to come to this tariffs—taxes on articles of trade—being an existent evil among us, should we not fairly be entitled to fight one evil with another?—as tariffs do exist, and as weak imitators in power have made them rampant in order to secure salaries for their sons, cousins, and nephews, who could not or would not go and clear the bush; and as, consequently, we have but a very poor chance at present of obtaining the abrogation of tariffs, would it not be decidedly better for us, helplessly taking the thing as it is, to work the tariff for our own *protection*—to get on to the tariff a duty "on every man's com except ours. As for thereby starving lots of folks, why, we ought not in reason to be looked to as in anywise responsible for that or any such alleged inevitable result; the tariff itself must of course be alone looked to, and the inventors, or introducers, or sustainers of the tariff must be held to be solely responsible for any supposed

injury or suffering it induces.—All this supposed special pleading, however, only seems to enforce the idea that tariff's are, especially in a young country, a curse, and of which we here should speedily rid ourselves. That is all.—But—

32. I have used the old-fashioned compound word commonsense. Well, I mean precisely the thing it imports. Personally you and I would not think on removing one bodily evil by the infliction of another. If a thorn were in one finger, a man would try to extract it, but would certainly not think of trying to mend the matter by inserting a thorn in another finger. Protectionism is affirmed to be an evil—an evil equal and very similar to getting a rate laid on a town for a subsidy to enable its suburban wheat-growers profitably to follow their calling; although rates are usually for the convenience and comfort of the rate-payers; but as—as you suppose—some articles have tariff protection, (I happen not to know which, it is only too well known that too many articles are highly taxed for revenue), therefore your produce should have it too. Cure one disease by superinducing another;—dangerous, extremely! None but the most eminent of the faculty may be suffered to resort to such a dubious ultimate experiment. Perhaps after all it would be better to be without any malady. And better to be without tariffs. Far better, surely, totally to remove oppressive burdens than to shift them on to your neighbours' shoulders.

33. I would not be dogmatical, nor improperly harsh; and would not advance a thought or an opinion with temerity; but such is the strength of my conviction of the paramount importance of this question—my firm belief being that it seriously touches the business and bosom of every man amongst us; that if "the Church of God," in its every section, had arisen *en masse* in earnest, fervid protestation against tariffs for New Zealand, by which evidently the people here, who have manifested utter inability to get away from these islands, have been dragged down to poverty, they would have done vastly more for the public good than by embarking in factitious relieving schemes of City Missions, Ac., &c., which are specially unsuited to colonists. To prevent and to cure poverty are a far higher order of charity than temporarily to relieve.—As I suppose myself to be addressing the intelligent, I cannot descend to disabuse any persons of the ignorant prejudice against the word *politics*.

34. It is almost always forgotten, when speaking of the late English corn laws, and was cunningly kept out of sight by protectionists,—hence it is worthy of repetition for prominence,—that those laws did not exactly impose a tax on corn, but on all other peoples' corn but *ours*;—an iniquitous style of selfishness, which, whilst it enriched the great landlords, (but not the farmers, whose rents were reckoned on the basis of that protection), was crushing out the life of English trade; and, not rhetorically, but literally and really, grinding the people down from a "nation of shopkeepers" to a nation of paupers. "He who with holdeth corn, the people shall curse him." By a convulsive effort, aided by special Providence in an opportune, mysterious potatoe disease, the incubus was thrown off and into the depths of the sea; and English commerce arose, like a giant refreshed with new wine; and rejoiced like a strong man to run a race And a marvellous race it has since run!

35. I do not care largely to avail myself here of any reasoning on the propriety of cosmopolitanism and of universal brotherhood, and of erasing from our vocabulary the word *foreigner*. No doubt much might come of it; but it is not now my vein. I suppose the sum would just amount to, We have as much natural right to be free at their market as they; and they just as much right to be free at our market as we. Certainly tariffs are opposed to international amity; and, indeed, have often been wielded as belligerent instruments. It is well known how Napoleon 1st distressed Great Britain by legally touching merchandise with prohibitory law. And a tariff was the single, sole cause of the laws by England of the noble American Colonies.—Enough.

II.

1. In a letter extraordinary from the South, the hon. President (or Speaker) of the House of Representatives, bemoans the excessive taxation which he thinks is crushing down the New Zealand Colonists. He pathetically asks for some remedy, and virtuously hopes that truth may prevail. The Premier, also, seriously asks, Only toll us how to reduce! The self-interested anti-separationists so anomalously addressed will not be able to respond. Their preposterous creed of ten legislatures for a handful of people forbids. We Aucklanders have often and in various ways pointed out the only efficient, and, seemingly, the solely practicable remedy, and which was summarily given forth last August, viz., *Two* central legislative governments in and for these *two* island countries, with their appendages of district or provincial boards, &c., in substitution for the present ten legislatures.—The hon. Holmes, in a capital speech, the other day in our Upper House, as reported in print, gave in his full adhesion to this particular prescription, as an urgent, clamorous necessity. This, again, I take it, is more clear gain.—If precedent be demanded, we have that (I would never ask it):—Prescott says, "The different provinces of Spain were consolidated into one Empire under the rule of Ferdinand and Isabella."

2. It is painful to iterate and reiterate a thought, though in varied phraseology, by reason of exposing to the

charge of repeating oneself. But verily the suggestion of reduction and consolidation adverted to still demands foremost prominence. The case is truly urgent: we are really—as a good while ago I had to remind an anonymous writer who inattentively repeated the word "humbug"—we are well-nigh smothered and stilled with numerous different governments here. And to set forth this fact now and here, though it is not directly the question, yet, as it underlies it all, is decidedly the reverse of irrelevant. Nay, it must surely be superfluous to rebut a hypothetical charge of irrelevance; for the least consideration will issue in the conviction that denunciation of our excessive taxation, with an exposure of its unprincipled cause, is a necessary sequence. The argument, observe, is this,—and it is really plain,—We cannot compete in our own corn market with far-off California! Marvellous premiss indeed! How is it, and why? Why, we are taxed about ten times as much as they; and the frightful excess is owing to the fact that we have about ten times as much so-called government as they. What is the use of your earning good means, if half or more of your earnings go away, imperceptibly and you know not how, but veritably, to the support of so-called governments, in which you positively have but little interest? Cui Bono?

3. Now here is nothing recondite, nothing occult; all is plain, and above-board,—perspicuous, obvious, and undeniable. And it is abominable.

4. The president of the House expressly and properly decries the "sectional" condition of New Zealand political. Of this they all have very painful experience in the House of Representatives. It doubtless took vast power of conscious wrong so to bring out the dignified Speaker.

5. But a hankering is discerned for the substitution of one legislature for these two large island countries with their numerous pendent islets, in lieu of *the present ten*; rather than, according to above quoted proposal, two for the two, instead of the ten. E. W. Stafford evinces the same inkling. Extremes, again, alas! If it be a hankering after large, concentrated power, it would surely soon prove to be going counter to the march of mind and the spirit of the age. Their aim realised would clearly bring them under the just denunciation of true opponents of real, erroneous centralisation. Tampering, tinkering, and splendid trifling are in politics objectionable. It is advisable that they seek for our institutions stability, and aim at the permanent.—Precedent again, if required:—Independent Portugal,—once brought down under the dominion of Spain, a thrall which lasted 59 years, ending A.D. 1640,—it is known, is a successful independent nation, notwithstanding that some statesmen did demand its final amalgamation with Spain. This precedent is decidedly "on t'other side;" whereby we are again thrown on to the *via media*. Like the pure, life-giving river, which ordinarily selects for its channel the centre of the champaign between the hills, truth is often found at the mean.

6. Maugre, on the whole I rather like the honorable President's letter; and would particularize the evidently earnest spirit that pervades it. And I exceedingly dislike the banter and lame attempt at wit, palmed off and protruded as criticism on that letter, which lately appeared in a Wellington newspaper, and in Auckland as a quotation.

7. A celebrated Swiss philosopher (Alex. Vinet), in his admirable Prize Essay advocating the necessity of ever keeping separate and distinct the two institutions styled the church and the state—the temporal and the spiritual—has the following, pertinent to this present theme, and particularly concurrent with the matter just now touched:

8. "Every thing now tends to abridge the sphere of action of human power, and to reduce the number of its exclusive prerogatives. Government is considered to have under its conduct only that which private people cannot accomplish. The modern spirit of communities is to be governed as little as possible—we do not say as feebly. It desires that the spontaneity of human nature should find opportunity for development; that general interests, apart from public functions, should occupy the minds and hearts of individuals; that society should would and transform itself freely, under the sanction of general conventions, independently of state interference. This is not an abstract notion, but a part of the principle and instinct of modern communities."—He argues for more spontaneity and less government; more liberty and love and less law. He is a benefactor.—However, I do not intend to enlarge in this place on the specially alleged important *method* of the absolutely necessary reduction of taxation. That sole *method* has already been developed elsewhere; and the more suitable media of ephemeral journals may possibly be soon resorted to for amplifying and agitating the question.—I am only sorry that some here having power and influence evidently seem to reckon that the mere mention of undeniable, horrible, retarding abuses qualifies a man to be spoken against. They would appear to think that their own personal interest requires of them so to reckon. But it is strongly felt that if even these abuses directly yielded a man £700 per annum, he should nevertheless feel it incumbent upon him, on principle, to urge and press their removal. Selfishness, we have said, is self-love under a mistake. It is hoped this may not be deemed a novel doctrine. Present deep depression of New Zealand is one proof of its correctness.

9. On this head, finally. We are sometimes forced to hear loose talk about the desirability of restoring to Auckland the seat of government. Maoris were recently put up to making this the burden of their verbose speeches. But all such talk at this time of day is idle vapid vapouring; unless it be accompanied with a like

demand for Canterbury—the central important place of the South Island. In a word, above proposal is the only feasible thing out. It is submitted as the means and the only means of reducing taxation,—of lightening the springs of industry, and of a lasting, happy indiscerptibility.

Instantly see Appendix.

10. The Colossal Martin Luther once addressed in behalf of the people the governors of his day, and used the following words, "Now, that you levy and extort money in the way you have hitherto done is no longer to be endured. What would it avail if a farmer's field produced as many florins as blades of grass, or grains of corn, if the rulers only took from him so much the more; and proportionately increased their extravagance, and squandered it away in buildings, &c., &c. Extravagance must cease, and expenditure be lessened, that the people may be able to retain something for themselves."

Pfizer.

Words, these, strictly and strikingly applicable to a certain place we know other than Germany; and to a time much later than 340 years ago! Recenrate of expenditure in New Zealand would be wholly unwarrantable if we had a population of a million wealthy people, instead of one seventh of a million of plain immigrants.

11. An Episcopalian Rev. author, lately deceased, left in print the following sage remark on general politics:—"The voice of the nation must go along with the nation's law. This law must be the expression of their own feeling, and then it will be obeyed. But if it is only the law of a government, or a law which is against the whole spirit of the people, there is first the murmur of a nation's disapprobation, and then there is transgression; and then, if the law be vindicated with a high hand, the next step is the bursting that law in national revolution by the rising of passion in its giant might, made desperate by restraint."—That this has been the common course all history attests. But a more excellent way was exemplified by the English Anti-corn-law-League with its efficacious, fervid, but peaceful moral suasion, the wondrous success of which for ever abolished the monopoly corn-laws. Had not Richard Cobden manfully and successfully frowned down his opponents the physical force "chartists," commercial freedom for England would not be yet won.—The Southern States of America did not deserve to win their desired independence for resorting, in this more enlightened age, to the arbitrament of the sword. It will come, however; but not for their sakes; and it will come, not by the force of powder and iron, but by the bursting, developing force of truth. The truth shall make them free.—This protruded contrast of results of the greatest Anglo Saxon movements of the latest generation is a Providential illustration of a Divine lesson to mankind, and this will be compensating for its attendant human evil. I carefully point to it.

12. The retrograde movement of democratic Victoria (Australia) may be justly reckoned and written a tentative freak. The people there will doubtless soon get sober. Experienced writers have largely pointed out the injury already brought about by the monopolising attempt. And a plain builder there, writing plainly and well on the matter of depreciation of house property (*Argus*, Sept. 6, 1867) uses the following words: "The so-called protectionists may certainly claim credit for doing their best to reduce rents —*by driving trade from Melbourne*."

13. I certainly do not ostentatiously presume to attempt to teach agriculturists their business; it is designed to dilate only or mainly on their special politics. Nevertheless, suggestion as to some of the possibly best things to grow here may not be out of place; it may be in perfect beeping with the main object of this essay, and may peradventure result in useful thought and purpose, by more experienced practitioners. I find the following in the history of the colonisation of Virginia (America) of 1615:—"The labour of the Colony had long been misdirected." Things were grown and manufactured which could not yield the means to "sustain the competition with" the old European nations. "It was found that tobacco might be profitably cultivated. The sect of gold-finders had become extinct; and now the fields, the gardens, the public squares, and even the streets of Jamestown were planted with tobacco. Tobacco, as it gave animation to Virginian industry, eventually became not only the staple, but the currency of the Colony."

14. All the world has during the 150 years last past heard plenty about Virginian tobacco.

15. "It was found that," &c., simply says the historian. Yes, "found" as the result of self-reliant enterprise. I attach vast importance to this quotation from George Bancroft's history of Virginia; and desire to draw best attention to it. Could we not certainly do something in the same line?

16. It is a very great consideration to grow things here that slugs and caterpillars dislike. These constitute an army with which north New Zealanders have proved totally unable to cope,—against whose predatory incursions we can do little more than bite either our lips or our fingernails. Sometimes, in some places, the land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness." Their surprising cunning has made me asseverate that the devil is their general leader.

17. Well, now, though we be very wise, we—even we—may yet surely "live and learn." Does not this tobacco story from the history of America convey to us an invaluable suggestion? Of course any inquiry about the propriety of the wonderfully general use of tobacco would be quite out of the question.

18. Query: should not two or three American tobacco growers be obtained and retained at any rate, to give instruction in its growth and manipulation?

19. If south Auckland be not quite warm enough for tobacco growing, north Auckland is; especially the extensive territory from Matakana, viâ Bay of Islets., to the North Cape. But Maoris roughly grow it south, near Waikato. I shrewdly suspect that these have not bought this year of whites a twentieth of the black tobacco they did seven years ago.

The excerpt of a brief Virginian record given above is judged invaluable. Before they grew tobacco the Colonists happened to be in serious difficulties. (A pamphlet was then published entitled "The present sad state and condition of the English Colony in Virginia;" by L. G.) Afterwards they prospered exceedingly. Were some agricultural association in north New Zealand to undertake to thoroughly test the matter by engaging an efficient agency and selecting a suitable hundred acres for the trial, it would be another work to show the importance of such society to the colony. Already, in small patches the thing has, I know, succeeded hero. These paragraphs on tobacco growing were shown to some principals here and met high approval.

20. But, adds a protectionist, When soil, climate, and circumstances combine to render a work desirable, legislation can protect the infancy of enterprise against the unequal competition with established experience and skill.—Plausible weakness!—O, pray do not let the child breathe the free air of heaven; its lungs must be tender; it must for awhile constantly wear a respirator!

Bosh! Only adapted to the rickets. Perhaps that doctrine had better at once be written heretical and antiquated; and put with the propriety of 150 yards of broad bandage for the swaddling of a fine infant to "protect" nature,—the cases are strictly analogous;—it must be put among the doctrines held by professional, cunning old women who can't read.

III.

1. It is essential to well-being and well-doing that agriculture should thrive. But farmers by sheer mistake have sometimes formerly frowned on their best friends. The special want for Auckland is successful and vastly increased agriculture. It is believed that Auckland has built up its town to the neglect of its country,—has prepared a fine market-place, as the town may be called, with a miserably insufficient regard to the likelihood of a perennial, unfailling supply of country produce. After all, the way and the order set forth of old by Solomon—strenuously enforced by Dr. Lang as advice to the intending emigrants to Geelong 17 years ago—cannot be improved upon, "Preparethy work without, and make it fit for thyself in the field, and afterwards build thy house." The contrary brings into exemplification the adage, "One builds and another possesses."

2. I have deemed the 1858 forty-acre scheme altogether a great good to this district of New Zealand. Undoubtedly, however, it might have been worked much better.—I have often had occasion to remark that the fatal omission in the forty-acre Act, and that chiefly which brought odium upon it instead of the highest praise of which it was otherwise decidedly meritorious, was the not demanding a material guarantee that every portion of land awarded for simply coming hither should be occupied, or cultivated, or else at least as much money spent upon it as government demanded for land when selling, ere a Crown Grant could be had. Such a guarding clause alone would have done more for desired occupancy than any other device. Its diversified operation for this end is too obvious to need particularising. And it could not have been deemed oppressive. And had it checked and steadied the tide of immigration, so much the better. During the first three years there was an injurious rush.

3. Again, it was a gross perversion, after having, by that measure, obtained the requisite increase of population, to rest cunningly contented in the one single incidental yet inevitable result of that increase, viz., that the labour market was easier—that workmen's wages were reduced. The natural and due course consequence of such shortsighted selfishness was the gradual draining away of the people, and so the frustration of the project.

4. Possess ye the land and subdue it. Providence, and human politics, public and private, alike urgently demand it. For this every facility should have been previously provided and ostensibly proffered. Neglecting this has occasioned a break, Hundreds of the best forty-acre men desponded before presented impracticability; threw up the concern as a bad job; and become competitors with the townsmen for town work; or else went away from the province or the country altogether. The loss to Auckland will never be fully known, from the crass, stolid neglect by the Auckland rulers of the very simplest provision, viz. accessibility. I know men of considerable capital who had prepared to come out, but were stopped by adverse accurate reports from their friends who came first.—Many scores of thousands in hard cash, have been, during the five years last past, paid away by Auckland to America and to Australia for bread and beef. Doubtless the regular irruption of imperial troops into this island during that period produced a wholly factitious state of affairs amongst us, and did put trade and commerce into an abnormal condition. But it is now showing itself very ill that commissariat

expenditure ultimately found its way abroad. Everyone here consequently suffers. One contractor who often dabbled in sums of twenty and thirty thousand pounds lately found himself without so much as one golden sovereign sticking to his fingers. This fact would, certainly, have been a much lesser evil had those large sums been distributed over this country. And a Victorian contracting company, during same rush, located an emissary here (Johnson) who nobly drove his carriage, and shovelled the cash proceeds of his extensive agency out of this country. Now, the best business men of Auckland are perpetually using the expression, "There is no money!" All the rest are asking Judge Moore to insist on their creditors squaring up and settling for from 9d. to 9s. in the pound. Cause and effect, Auckland province, with fair play since the famous year 1858, could and would have supplied all, or nearly all the extraordinary, strained demand adverted to. It is a vast district between here and the North Cape,—our peloponnesian peninsular, north of the isthmus, or the line across from Waitemata to Manukau,—and to most of us a terra incognita;—and since the evacuation of the Bay of Islets—for occasioning which the darkies cannot forgive themselves—has been as peaceful as the interior of England. The quiet North could and should be occupied.

5. But irrespective of the adventitious circumstances alluded to, it is no news to state, that with all our vast tracts of land, and our comparatively very sparse population, we have never yet grow it even our own daily bread. Oh, but, then, the climate! the climate! Look at Adelaide, the granary of Austral-Asia, with more heat than north New Zealand, and, like it, without snow. Why, Adelaide *exports* breadstuff' vastly. Now, this is not asked for the large province of Auckland. But it is demanded, every national consideration, that the small population of this large tract of country feeds at least itself from its own fields. This, as yet, it has never done, by a long chalk. Now, surely, this demand is very small; it is designedly and calculatingly put at its minimum. Of course, every wiseacre will promptly put himself into a bold, forward attitude to tell you confidently that this province won't grow wheat to pay. I don't quite believe it. That the whites have not, as yet, been able to do it, is another and a rather different thing. Seven or eight years of potato and maize growing has perhaps altered the soil for full fitness. Some best agriculturalists believe it has. But, anyhow, settlers might save themselves the expense of carting breadstuff's some thirty miles to their homes. That saved expense should be in effect as a protective subsidy on home growth. So, surely, they may profitably grow enough for home consumption whilst our voluble Utopians are advocating *corn-laws* to enable them profitably to grow, and desirable but unattainable railroads and canals in order to enable them by easy conveyance lucratively to sell.

6. But, then, after all, even were it granted that the statement is correct that this province cannot be made to produce wheat for sale profitably,—merely suppose it so,—it by no means thence fairly follows that agriculture won't pay here; although many seem to reckon this a matter of course consequence. There are many things other than wheat. There is the variety of animal food. And this country might certainly be one of the best in the world for fruit-growing; and by this alone many countries have got their wealth and do now flourish (wines, preserves, &c.) Again, here is analogy; England consumes more tea than any other State in the world. It grows none. Do these two plain facts condemn its agriculture? Aye, or nay. Clearly, were it proved that this province is unadapted to wheat-growing, it would certainly not therefore be condemnatory. All know it grows beef. And as for potatoes—galores! Not bad prog for a hungry tike!

7. During 1866 New Zealand imported

These figures show the terrible shortcoming of New Zealand agriculture! What an *import*!!

IV.

1. Well, now; What practical conclusion can we draw from from the whole, additional to our mental and cordial concurrence in the reasoning and the keen plausibilities?

2. This, as a rough summary;

3. First and foremost, remove your legal obstructions. But don't even dream of a balance by interposing, with protectionism or any other ism, obstacles to other people. Wholly put away encumbering burdens.—This thesis is not agriculture simply, or most assuredly I should not have chosen to write on it. But some suggestions are incidentally and relatively advanced.

4. Learn at any rate to grow tobacco, after the experimented example of Virginia, as here quoted;—it will pay best. Also wine and beet sugar. Peaches to sell at Maori price, one farthing each, capital pay. An odd fifty acres of peaches would be first-rate. Remember, this is not England: get out of the rut of English agricultural notions.

5. And as you can and do grow well beef, mutton, and potaoes, choice vegetables, milk, butter, cheese, eggs, &c., &c., there somehow surely should be prosperity. Try wheat again. And with cheap unencumbered land, agriculture in New Zealand really should and must pay. Remove the obstacles! And ever contend reasonably yet resolutely for unshackled trade and commerce!

Appendix.

THE portion of this section ending here was sent to the *D. S. Cross*, a good while ago, with a request for its insertion as a specimen of forthcoming pamphlet. Peculiar circumstances, perhaps pressure of matter principally, prevented its appearing therein, which certainly was one occasion of deferring this publication. Purpose was that every thoughtsman in these islands should have a copy of it ere expiration of 1867. However, that journal is now spiritedly advocating same or similar line of curtailing policy, and this satisfies.

Forsooth, our disproportionately large and correspondingly expensive governmental machinery is not only coming to be generally known as unprecedented, but also to be looked upon as truly monstrous and ridiculous. A costly machinery very much too large for twenty millions, appointed for a struggling population of one-seventh of a million!! *So it was not* the Commissariat seven years' cash expenditure for 10,000 troops that made Auckland bankrupt, as some weak ones have been, through the newspapers and on the rostrum, trying to teach! Yet, doubtless, the rural districts, being the seat of war, fared ill. There has existed a political vampyre! Now, Providence inquires.—The fact is, people who give nearly all their time to trade, or to music, &c., and none to exercise in wide, magnanimous thought, and who amiably desire quiet above all things, are awfully at the mercy of scheming, designing politicians. It would have obviated vast misery and effected great good had England shown its legal connexion with Colonies by ordaining that ten per centum of the total proceeds of all taxation shall be the maximum of abstraction from revenue for all official salaries. "But, however," we have *freedom!* But, voluntarily and willingly, we are not "free indeed." Oh, we don't meddle with politics!!—Let others, for pay, do your politics, and, the chances are, they will *do* you. Representatives should represent the voters. If a man having only a hundred pounds orders a house which per contract costs £1500, although he may have been very well reputed virtuous, yet he is most certainly a fool or worse. The house will be sold by auction for present necessary demand of contractor; will fetch nearly one-third of its cost; and for the large balance the reckless man will be—damned. Yet, notwithstanding, who can deny that it is fine to have a fine house!! Is that New Zealand?

Really it is pitiable to see respectable men searching profoundly for the cause of present distress and disaster, and gravely and in tears fetching up some recondite reason—parsons affirming it is colonial irreligion, &c., &c. I have been annoyed and well-nigh disgusted with this sort of thing. And it is straight in the teeth of the deposition of all history. Why, the whole thing is plain. If we, infatuated by pride which has culminated to insanity, madly desire and will have the magnific pageantry of 1,500 high-paid officials and can barely afford 100, why, of course, &c.

After all the sham profundities, I really must think that if the most pious man puts his hand in the fire he will be burned. Simply and only New Zealand has put its hand in the fire. That is all. Allegation of irreligion is irrelevant.

An extraordinary curiosity has lately appeared; an anonymous writer, after often feebly cursing the writers who opposed ten separate legislative governments for New Zealand, has just now come out saying, in substance, Well, I now see that everybody thinks my curse causeless, and believes me in political error; as legislative provincialism is very evidently doomed, do now just allow me to tell you exactly how to do the whole thing!! And then there follows the wearisome washy washy.—But, then, this is only a plain specimen of a score of New Zealand cases. It is somewhat after the manner of the notorious L. A. of 1862. Verily we are often nearly on to the conclusion—better had England not so soon given to New Zealand a constitution!—Newspapers of small circulation must not frequently give strong obvious truth directly in the teeth of subscribers' work error. Accordingly, some persons sometimes cannot appear therein. No doubt this is a necessity,—an evil incident of small communities.

The grand desideratum for these two large island countries—geographically near but circumstantially remote—is colonial (not national) independence, like that subsisting between Victoria and Tasmania, which are similarly situated. Much has been written for this desired consummation. And there is now a vast concurrence of mind pro. It is on the foregoing page set forth as *the* way to reduce the exorbitant taxation, which reduction is affirmed to be the *sine qua non* of our retrieval and of our agricultural and commercial well-doing. In the race of the colonies we are heavily weighted, and are not "free indeed."—Of the scores of papers the writer has had published (since Prize Pamphlet, a thousand copies of which are scattered far) the following are selected as pertinently proper for representation here:

Precedent Facts on Colonial Self-Government.

To the Editor of the Daily Southern Cross.

SIR,—Something fresh has recently turned up in current news bearing on the question of

self-government,—a question that has lately moved New Zealand to its heart, and which, it seems to me, demands notice. Reasoners continually cry, Give us facts; these being the solid wood and stone with which they build the structure of argument for the sustentation and protection of correct opinion and right practice. It bodes ill when any one appears afraid of facts. Many talk of the Separation movement in New Zealand as though it were a novelty, or a thing unprecedented; ignoring the fact that about 20 years ago the Australians were in a ferment of political agitation which culminated in an indomitable resolve to obtain governmental separation between Melbourne and Sydney; that success crowned that political movement; and that such vast prosperity instantly ensued,—whether related to cause and effect, or whether a mere coincidence, they did not trouble themselves to philosophise about: sufficient that it was a patent palpable fact,—that other large districts in that vast country forthwith engaged in a similar movement, and succeeded; so that now, instead of having "the Australian colony," we have "the colonies" of Australasia.

As to cause, &c.: We coolly estimate the effects of the gold discovery in regard to this matter; and shrewdly guess that if Melbourne had not then achieved separation—had she not then done her own government—the principal benefit accruing from her gold bullion would have been cunningly diverted from her, and that, consequently, there would have been a totally different tale reported from that which the whole world (not excepting China) has wonderingly received concerning her during the fifteen years last past—the era of her colonial independence. So, it appears, we are not afraid, in reference to this question, to look at the distinction between cause and effect and mere coincidence, about which philosophers have for long talked in reference to things in general. If separation was not the direct cause of the wondrous advancement of Melbourne, it was incontrovertibly the indirect cause, or the medium through which the chief cause could operate

Melbourne, or Port Philip, won separation—cut its leading-strings with a Downing-street blade—in the year 1851; and its district was then designated Victoria. Just 15 years before that event, it contained exactly 177 inhabitants. Just 10 years after it, the census gave an enumeration of over half a million (540,322). "The Colony or State of Victoria," says the Times of 1862, "is now as populous, as full of gold, of trade, of faction, of public debt, of railways, of newspapers, of grand ceremonials, of volunteer reviews, as the most anxious parent or the most ardent believer in progress could desire. Victoria is only another Britannia, and is only the counterpart of this huge town."

The anniversary of their Separation is a grand gala day—another fact of significance. Repent, or recant? Nay, nay. Doubtless they would laugh at the idea of a railway from Sydney to Melbourne and a submarine telegraph on to Tasmania being set forth as a good reason for returning to the "glorious old days," when their Government was concentrated in Sydney. Yet such, in parity, is the strain of a London correspondent to a New Zealand newspaper, as per reprint by Daily Southern Cross of 16th current. We are to have a submarine telegraph at the Straits. Well! aye, very well; but is it not rather a reason for increased exertion to obtain independent colonial government for each island as the sine qua non of concord—a reason for an earnest motion to guarantee that increased facility of communication between these two countries may be for good, and not, as is so plainly possible, for evil? If two relatives had been for years quarreling over a disputed right to property, that surely would be a monstrous intellect that would devise and gravely propound, for a specific redress of the grievance, that those relatives come and live next door to each other. Such prescription might be possibly very good after settlement of dispute by proper means, and the consequent return of amity. But it has not about it even the semblance of being, per se, the proper means to this end.

The writer alluded to is no doubt a sincere well-wisher to these colonists; but in his expression of loving kindness he has evinced a deplorable ignorance of relative antecedent facts and present circumstances. "Give us facts." There is a fanatical spurious love which receives its expression in what common folks commonly call "blarney." This is not asked. We must hold it in disesteem. But to a particular class of susceptible people it is alluring and proves deceptive. This warning is not superfluous, for some are captivated by it. Yet, undoubtedly, the opposite extreme must be deprecated.

That telegraph argument is not new; it is a London reproduction of an old New Zealand reason. Many a man who feels himself drowning in argument will catch at a straw of sophistry. Well, it is really useful to discuss this great practical question; and, in prosecution, it is only candid and fair to face all advanced objections to its affirmation. Surely the desiderated phalanx of the writer in question could be conglomerated better by means of amity or good will,—indeed this is its essential condition,—than by means which from the beginning have proved fruitful of feuds. And all of us well know what those different means are. Precedents are necessary to some for confidence. On this question I could be satisfied with the argument a priori.—I have, &c.,

W. E. SADLER.

Parnell,

March 17, 1866.

The following is last three-quarters of a paper headed "Separate aspects of Separation:

I think the entire tendency hitherto of circumstances and events, spite of some time-serving, is to the consummation wished and asked.

Sir, you know, all our Auckland separate constituencies sent each its representative to the Assembly expressly to labour and to vote for the effectuation of independence of the South country, and so to rid us of humiliating and hurtful control and dictation. I dare not now enlarge on this particular; but would remark on the subject in general; and now wish to submit to you some fresh observations, partly as a resumé of the past.

When the people of Auckland united as one man to demand Separation, the common reply by Southern anti-separationists of all classes was, that they knew not what they wanted. The demand was couched in such vague terms—leaving that an open question which was absolutely essential to the thing, viz., definition—as utterly to preclude a successful repelling of the unambiguous accusation. Particular definition was carefully declined. It might be either the separation of Auckland from the other eight provinces; or from the South Island only, and leaving the other provinces of this North Island in anarchy and to the condition of cringing for support to Auckland, or else to go across the Straits. No one was informed as to which was meant, and strong separationists condemned both projects, believing that the great question did not at all mean Auckland in particular or exclusively. Manifestly, and as subsequent events have demonstrated, there was a prevalent confusion of ideas, or an immaturity of thought, regarding the problem. No marvel, therefore, that their efforts, though worthily united and strenuous, were unsuccessful. From the remarks of John Kerr, in his electioneering speech on Monday, it would appear that he, too, is at sea on this very question. He as good as says we want Separation; but only on this condition, that the Southerners resign to us our own Island, and throw into the bargain the worth of a great portion of their country—that they, not share equally, but assume all present New Zealand liabilities. Verily, this is an invaluable thought and, after lauding the Southerners' intelligence, with which, quoth he, "we Aucklanders cannot cope," most strikingly pertinent and timeous!

Lately, the misty vagueness has crystalised. Definitive though different propositions are extant. Three of these are remarkable. First: Constitute two central legislative Governments in and for these two island countries, with their appendages of district or provincial boards, &c., in substitution for the present ten legislatures. Second: Exalt the present Provincial Legislatures by increasing their powers and prerogatives, each having a head Superintendent or Governor and a responsible parliamentary executive; and appoint two central General Governments besides; i.e., in short, eleven actual legislatures instead of the existing ten. Third: Financial without legislative separation; with an addition to the prerogatives of Provincial Legislatures; i.e., each province to appropriate and expend nearly the total of its own revenue; which means, being interpreted, leave the General Government nothing to do; and worse, especially for such a condition, without any money to spend; or, as was lately naively said, twice in two weeks, on the hustings, "Reduce the General Government to a skeleton;" which certainly does look very like something worse than merely to let it die—it clearly means murder. This third proposition, favoured by Julius Vogel, is more than inherently erroneous in politics, it is ostensibly absurd in itself, and any attempt to carry such an anomalous measure must be necessarily inept and vain. And pity that any influential men in New Zealand just now should waste energy and spend their real strength for nought.

The chief objection to proposition No. 2—the eleven parliaments scheme—is on the score of expense. We now waive the consideration of its absurdity—eleven legislatures for 170,000 people, the amount of population of a third-rate English town—and, at present, only earnestly protest against the expense. Even, if desirable, (but I submit it is not, under any possible circumstances), New Zealand really cannot afford it. This is undeniable. And it is unanimously demanded that present cost of government here be reduced; which necessarily involves curtailment of political machinery, or at all events cannot admit of the increase adverted to. It does really appear, then, that legislative provincialism, as it is, is incompatible with Separation; and we are therefore shut up to proposition No. 1, viz., two central legislative Governments in and for these two island countries, with their appendages of district or provincial boards, &c., in substitution for the present ten legislatures; and which, moreover, seems alike practicable and proper, simplest, cheapest, most efficient, and, for all and everybody, best.

—I am, &c.,

W. E. S.

August 10, 1867.

Latest.

Writer was extremely interested in the passage quoted the other day in the speech by Hugh Carleton from the Hon. Swainson's pamphlet on colonisation. Its existence was previously unknown to me, never having had the pleasure of seeing the tractate containing it. Is it a fact that that particular passage was penned and printed in 1859?

Not unpleasing coincidence of opinion, apparently, has long existed anent the very peculiar constitution originally awarded to New Zealand. But, as in the human countenance, with the strongest and most striking resemblance there is always, singularly, distinctive variety, so, herein, with likeness there is observable difference.

Opposition, nearly amounting at one time to clandestine puny persecution, against a persistent advocacy of the total abstraction and elimination of the legislative element from our "provincialism" has been experienced. This was unnecessary as well as uncandid. It now appears, besides, such advocacy, was no singularity. Said extract gratifies. The course of the newspapers, by line of policy once regularly marked "ultra provincialism," must not be now commented on. And not much must be now said of an individual who tried to avail himself, for the special benefit of the Bay, of the recent Act for increasing the number of provincial legislatures.

But the ex-General Government attorney, writing before the open demand for governmental Separation, assumes the unity of these two countries, and pleads for (as we do with another reference) *one* legislature for *one* country. The salient point to be now noted is, that these two large islands, with their numerous islets, are not only geographically two countries, but, being circumstantially and extremely diverse, must necessarily and shortly become politically separate. Therefore, to assume continuance of the amalgamation will give erroneous data; and these certainly conduct to a wrong conclusion. The so-called "unity" hitherto subsisting between the two governmentally amalgamated countries has been signalled by one protracted wrangle and an incessant row—a feud which threatens to be interminable or else eternal; or, rather, co-existent with the heterogenous conjunction.

The two countries must have two legislatures, as have Victoria and Tasmania—countries similarly situated; and no longer ten legislative governments as now. In short, these countries must be, and must be held to be two,—these countries physically two, must be also (for many reasons) politically two.—Main object of present brief note is to point out this difference. Yet, demand for constitutional reformation is nearly unanimous; hereanent disinterested difference is *non est inventus*.

FREEDOM for trade, or oven freedom for person, cannot well consist with our strangely numerous legislative and political institutes.

After all, and finally, it is really no great marvel that the Agriculturists here should ask whether there be not obtainable some sort of "protection" against the vulture demands of ten confederated legislative governments for a small people

The French Revolution.

A Lecture:

By J. Fred. Dean.

Dunedin: Published by Reith & Nicolson, Princes St. Cutting. Switzers: William Brathwaite.

MDCCCLXIX.

The French Revolution.

In allowing one's mind to wander back into the dim ages of the past, how fearfully strange does the history of Man appear! From the time when, as we are told in the Sacred writ, Nimrod, the hunter, began to be a mighty one in the earth; from the time when Nineveh was first built, and stood on the earth as a monument of the inequality which should ever exist between man and man; from the day when the few denizens of this lower world began to separate and form themselves into detached communities; from the very earliest time of which we have the faintest legendary record, to the present nineteenth century of the Christian era, man has been rising and falling, rising and falling, with a history which appears to us as that of one long continuous struggle of forces—forces which present to the mind such a strange chaotic medley, that one is perplexed in endeavouring to discern whether the powers of attraction or repulsion fasten on it most strongly. Nation has risen on the ruin of nation; power has had to submit to yet greater power; vast empires have raised themselves to be dominant over smaller or weaker peoples, and in their turn have had to succumb and grovel in the dust before others who were destined to become even vaster and more powerful than they; and so rising and falling like the storm-perturbed waves of the ocean, the surface of this globe we inhabit has changed its appearance

along with the history of man, till we look upon it with bewilderment, and wonder what our exact position in the complete history can be *now*. *Now*—the only word which really belongs to us. The *past*, the *past*—it is no more; the *future*—it is before us, but we see it not ; both are in the endless eternity: but *now*, the present, it is in a limited degree ours, and even that, with all the knowledge of which we are so apt to boast, we cannot understand, In good truth do all men *now* look into a glass darkly; Heaven grant that when we come to see it face to face, we may be thankful and satisfied with what confronts us therein.

Of all the convulsions in which Universal History presents communities of men to us, perhaps none is so remarkable, both on account of its causes and origin, its aim, and its effects on the social condition of the nations, as that ordinarily spoken of as the French Revolution We have pictures of the plebeians struggling against the grinding tyranny of the Roman aristocracy; of times about which Macaulay makes the minstrel to sing:—

*"For then there was no tribune to speak the word of might,
Which makes the rich man tremble, which guards the poor man rights."*

In another page of the World's Annals, we see a Longbeard endeavouring to alleviate the condition of his brother Saxons under the ruthless Norman; a Rienzi trying to awaken the Romans to imitate the example of their glorious forefathers, when they obtained their tribune in "the brave days of old a Tyler made a leader by a maddened populace whom tyrannous exactions had goaded to frenzy; a rising under Ket against enclosures of common land; a general revolution among a loyal people to withstand, ay, and to punish, the perfidy of one who had been trained to believe that the millions were created for him, and not he for the millions; and last, but not least, we have the spectacle of a free and a god-serving people, who had fixed their homes among the sylvan solitudes on the other side of the wide Atlantic, uniting as one man to shake from them the chains which even pursued them to the home that they had fondly thought the ocean would secure free. We have innumerable convulsions depicted on the pages of history, but not one of them is presented to us with such a variety of phases as that Revolution which, in a few short months, transformed the ancient kingdom of France from the darkness of night to the confusion of chaos.

When Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette succeeded to the French Crown, Europe was very different to the several nations which constituted our western continent in the time of Francis and our own Henry VIII. Erasmus, and Luther, and Gottenburg with his printing press, had cast a burning brand amidst the millions of the commonalty, which, while it diffused light, also radiated such materials of combustion, that the devouring flame could not be quenched, even though the swords of the mighty were employed for centuries in cutting down rubbish to smother it. Religion was fast casting aside the cloudy veil of superstition; and, as must ever be with real religion, it was marching under the protection of that which cannot fail to be invincible—Universal Truth. Truth is the peculiar attribute of the Omnipotent, and the march of man towards it must of necessity be both a glorious and a successful march—ending in eternity.

Hence religious and political freedom will invariably be found going hand-in-hand. Sometimes they may appear as if coming into collision, but this can only be when either the political freedom, or the religion, is wanting in the vital element of Truth. And the two did march hand-in-hand. In England the flame burst forth in our Great Revolution—a continuous struggle from before the year 1600 to the accession of the Prince of Orange in 1688. In France also there had been a struggle, but the strong arm of power had succeeded too well in deadening the sacred flame. The flame was put out, but the burning ashes still remained, and continued till the raging element again appeared, and startled the world by the uncontrollable fury with which it scathed everything that came in contact with it.

Louis Quatorze, *le Grand Monarch*, had not only insisted upon the indefeasible right of kings to govern arbitrarily, but also to lead what moral life seemed good to the kingly mind. Kings, he held, were exceptional beings, and were not bound by the ordinary codes of morality which fettered common mortals. Therefore he had his Maintenon, and other Delilahs, as suited his kingly whims. To him the people he governed were as slaves—they existed but for his sole pleasure. And so he got and spent, and, like the rest of us frail mortals, he died and was buried, and carried only a little cerecloth to rot with him in his grave. The only thing he could have been said to do effectually, was to demoralise the people over whom he had been destined to govern. His great-grandson, Louis the Fifteenth, improved upon such a kingly model, and in his turn kept his Pompadour; and loaded all who gratified his selfish desires, with the bread which his tax-gatherers wrung from the growling poor. His end was like the end of his kind.

And then, in 1774, came poor Louis the Sixteenth, and his wife, the ill-starred Marie-Antoinette. Rousseau was now middle-aged, Voltaire was an octogenarian, fast sinking into his grave; but though they in the body were going, their disciples, the Philosophes, still were active, until the whole of France had well nigh become leavened with their cheerless scepticism. With no religion to guide them, with a vitiated philosophy to lead them to speculate upon they knew not what, with an example of immorality among the royalty and nobility such as a nation has rarely been cursed with, it can be readily understood that the people of France were, on the

accession of Louis the Sixteenth, in as dangerous a condition as it is possible for a people to be. Louis was only nineteen when he took upon himself the government of a people whom only one of the world's transcendental geniuses could have succeeded in managing. His beautiful wife had seen but eighteen summers. Poor souls! how little recked they, as the gaudy butterflies which usually flit, and buzz, and play their useless lives out around the stool of royalty, came to salute the rising morn; how little recked they of the abyss which was even now beginning to gape beneath them, and which, in a few short years, should yawn with its horrible jaws, and swallow them all indiscriminately into the unfathomable waste of eternity!

The year 1774 was one which could not fail to have a great influence upon the minds of a people who had already begun to look abroad into the world for new forms of things. The preceding year, the people of Boston, in America, had thrown out the whole of a ship's cargo of tea, which was being forced upon them as taxed by England. The standard of revolt was raised, and the whole of France sympathized with the movement of the sturdy colonists. In 1775 Bunker's Hill was fought, and the aims of the Americans to form a Republic became clearly defined. France hailed the news with delight, and in 1778, Lafayette, with his volunteer force, sailed across the Atlantic. The insurgents were successful; the oppressions of Britain were among the things of the past; a Republic was erected in the New World, which thenceforth would tower as an inviting beacon to the down-trodden nations of the Old. Lafayette returned in glory; and in every town—nay, in almost every village throughout France, the starving myriads could talk of nothing but Scipio Americanus, and liberty, and glory, and the price of bread. Who had wanted to starve the New Englanders? The royalty and aristocracy of England. Who was ever starving the poor of France? The pining multitude was not slow in supplying the answer.

And what had the Court of France been about during these nine years? Maurepas, an oily fox, who could smile, and blandish, and be everything to everybody, so long as he could keep himself as the driver of the royal coach, was minister till 1781. The old sinner!

*"Let the world jog on as it will,
I'll be free and easy still."*

Such was the motto of the careless, unconscionable Maurepas. Turgot, the Economist, was the Controller of the Finances for two years. Famine was an ever-present spectre amongst the poor. There were bread riots; Turgot advocated a freedom from imposts in the domestic corn trade; Turgot was dismissed through the pressure of the selfish courtiers, and the riots were quelled for the nonce by suspending a number of the grumbling wretches on a gallows forty feet high. Turgot had hinted that it would be only fair to tax the nobles and clergy as well as the commoners; the nobles and clergy drove him from office with execrations.

And then Necker, the Genevese, was called to the exchequer; but he could not see how to meet the expenditure, unless the nobles, and clergy, and magistracy, who necessarily possessed so great a proportion of the whole wealth of the kingdom, were taxed like their poorer neighbours. He had to go the way of Turgot.

Old Maurepas, sadly against his will, was summoned to join his ancestors, and for two years the finance department could scarcely be said to have a director. Finally Calonne was appointed to keep the poor ship Argos afloat. As a thoroughly commercial man, Calonne kept the concern going, as thoroughly commercial men have often been too apt to do. He issued bills, and borrowed again and again to pay them with. The Court was jubilant, simply because the money came. The butter flies and grasshoppers were merry and happy, for they had a few days of summer. The cash was found, and the cup went round, and the dancers hopped right daintily. Three years passed away, and Calonne found that his power of borrowing farther had entirely failed him. He, as a last resource, persuaded the king to call a convocation of the notables. Accordingly, the notable men from all parts of France assembled at Versailles, and they lost no time in expressing their strong objection to both Calonne and his new plans of taxing. Calonne had to gather up his papers and depart like his predecessors; his borrowing could not last for ever. "All the world," said he, "was holding out its hand; I held out my hat."

Cardinal Loménie de Brienne now took the helm, but he only hurried the devoted vessel the quicker into the gaping maelstrom. The notables were dismissed, but Loménie even found the Supreme Court of Law as refractory as the Convention. To raise money he was about to issue stamp-taxes, and requested the Parliament of Paris to register them. It refused; and when it discovered the Cardinal's scheme for nominating the members of a Plenary Court to undertake the registration, it declared itself in permanent session till its differences with the Government were settled. The upshot of it all was that the Parliament was banished from the capital, and some of its members suffered from Loménie's "lettres de cachet." Though the Parliament was eventually recalled, yet it was plain that its members and Cardinal Loménie de Brienne could never work cordially together. Loménie was dismissed, loaded with pensions and gifts bestowed by a grateful Court, and the Genevese Necker was once more recalled. He immediately advised another Convocation of the Notables, as a preliminary step to the assembly of a States-General. The Second Convocation of Notables met in the latter part of 1788, and, after agreeing about the meeting of a States-General, it separated without settling how the different bodies of the New Assembly should meet, or how they should discuss and vote upon the various

questions which might arise.

The elections of the States-General commenced with the year 1789. On Sunday, the 4th of May, the elected members assembled, and marched in procession to the church of St. Louis, at Versailles. Then came the great question: how should they meet to discuss and vote? "In three separate chambers," said the king and courtiers. "In *one*," responded the representatives of the people. "No, in three," reiterated royalty and the court; "one for the nobles, a second for the church, and the third for the people—thus, there being only three votes, we, the court, can always secure the nobles and the clergy, and therefore shall ever swim on a majority of two to one." Two to one; the nobles and clergy to have two of the national votes, and the representatives of the people—of the twenty-five millions—to have only one!" Nay, nay, stubbornly ejaculated the representatives of the people, "do not hope to play the cards into your own hands in that fashion. We represent twenty-five millions of human souls; we have twenty-five millions of human bodies to back us; and we must perforce have a main voice in whatever concerns the nation."

For seven long weeks the determined representatives of the people continued to doggedly sit and do nothing, and at length they found the door of the very room in which they assembled closed against them. They were deprived of their ordinary hall; but they had assembled as a meeting of representatives, and a meeting they would hold, even though it were in the open air. They accordingly adjourned to the Tennis Court hard by, and with President Bailly at their head, swore that they would cling together as one man till they had accomplished that for which they had been appointed—that is to say, until they had made the Constitution. Six hundred save one took this oath amidst the waning elements; but neither the thunder's peal nor the deluge of rain could cool the ardour of those men. They had met to regenerate their country, and they fervently trusted that they would live to compass that end. The Third Estate was victorious, and at length both the nobility and clergy were compelled to submit, and to meet in one house with the representatives of the people.

After such manifestations of a popular spirit as the Court had witnessed since the meeting of the States-General, it became of the utmost importance to secure the devotion of the troops. Their devotion was gone; for how could soldiers be expected to remain loyal to a master who could only pay them for their services by promises? Then again, the private soldiers who happened to be intelligent and ambitious, were galled by the thought that, strive as they might for promotion, their plebeian blood would for ever bar them from attaining higher than a subaltern's position. Sergeant they might become, but the ambition of a genius must be content there. France was cursed by a system which has so long degraded the rank and file of the British soldiery; the higher commands in a regiment were not dependent upon ability, but were exclusively retained for those who could boast themselves of gentle blood. No wonder, then, that Marshal Broglio soon found that his Gardes Francaises were not to be depended upon; that the only troops upon whom he could rest sure, were the aliens from Flanders and Germany, and the body-guards from Switzerland.

The whole of Paris was in a ferment. The troops had been inspected; the Gardes Francaises had been ordered to confine themselves to their quarters, and had dared to disobey; and on Sunday, the 12th of July, came the news that Necker, the favourite minister, had been dismissed, and had been commanded to depart secretly to his native Geneva. "Bread, bread, bread!" was the cry in every street, and in every alley. "We are starving, and he who was to provide us with bread is sent away—is now posting home to Switzerland." Immense crowds gathered in the streets; St. Antoine—the Whitechapel of Paris—poured forth its thousands upon thousands of hungry, squalid images of mortality; the crowd wanted to vent its rage on something, and congregated rascality was ready to give a direction to the fury of the storm. Bread, *lettres de cachet*, tyranny, the Bastile—such was the burden of the groans and the yells of the thousands who had wandered, like maddened dogs, from their kennels of St. Antoine; and immediately the stream of human life set towards the famed state prison which skirted and frowned upon their miserable homes. "To the Bastile! to the Bastile! raze it to the ground!"

To the Bastile they went. Howling and bellowing as only a Celtic mob can howl and bellow, the thousands clustered like savages around the devoted pile. With a noise which we attribute as a peculiarity of the infernal regions, did that furious crowd accompany the sharp crack of their fire-arms, and the herculean blows of their crows and hammers. The noise won the day, and, for once, the majesty of mere numbers was triumphant. The prisoners were set free, and the gallant defenders of that venerable remnant of feudalism were captured, and many of the unfortunate wretches were tom limb from limb as they were being escorted towards the Hotel de Ville. That 14th of July is a notable day in both the history of France and of the world. On that day a starving populace was revenging itself for their complaining brethren, who, when they dared to ask for bread, were suspended as scarecrows on a gibbet forty feet high.

The huge unwieldy mass of humankind had tasted blood, and was not long in returning to the horrid vindictiveness of its un-cultured nature. Henceforth it quickly assumed the dread ferocity of the famished wild beast.

'Tis true the Bastile was demolished, but the stones which they rolled from its ancient walls would not

furnish the Parisians with bread. Bread, bread, bread! Why did bread continue so dear? Could not a maximum limit be put upon its price? A few of the king's servants had been hanged at the Lanterne, and "*a la lanterne! a la lanterne!*" had been the cry which had accompanied many a poor baker to his last and gratuitous swing in the mid-air; and yet the bread, the bread, continued to get scarcer and scarcer, dearer and dearer. From early morn could those dolorous strings of women be seen waiting at the baker's door for bread which often would never reach them; *en queue, en queue*,—ah, yes, *en queue*, indeed they might remain the whole miserable day, and still no bread, no bread! Starvation was becoming mad; and, in the midst of this exasperation, news came from the palace at Versailles that the king had been feasting, amidst music and dance, a troupe of aliens who had just arrived from Flanders. This was too much for the thousands of women who were daily spending so many weary hours *en queue* before the baker's door. On the 3rd of October the king gave the dinner to his alien supporters; on die 4th the account of it reached Paris; and early in the morning of the 5th, ten thousand women were in the streets of the capital, with dark vengeance depicted on their starved countenances. Mademoiselle Théroigne, whose beauty was her only fortune, like a fallen angel had stepped into the crowd. With her petticoats daintily tucked up, and the regimental drum before her, did that lovely but unfortunate maiden beat her strange *rat-a-ta-tat*. First, the unprecedented crowd of women thrust themselves into the Hotel de Ville. They penetrated into every room; for what guard could shoot, or bayonet, or even lay unseemly hands on female besiegers? bad indeed would it have been for the Town Hall and the city officers that day, had not the ready-witted Usher Maillard seized a drum, and, with a brisk *rat-a-ta-tat*, shouted the magic words *au roi, au roi—à Versailles, à Versailles!* The Town Hull was freed from its swarms of petticoats as if by the stroke of a talisman, and the vast train of ten thousand women followed Usher Maillard towards the Champs Elysées.

What a spectacle! Ten thousand women marching the long ten miles towards the king's palace at Versailles! Demoiselle Théroigne sitting as drummer on one of the guns which they chugged along! A damp, cold day of October has very rarely presented the world with such a scene. Were it lady or gentleman whom that procession overtook, all alike had need to alight, and trudge on the muddy road afoot. No carriage and gaudy trappings while these thousands are wanting bread; alight, whoever you may be, and kiss the mire with your trim-cased feet, and drag your useless trains over the ruts which your rumbling chariots have made.

Meanwhile, news of the approach of this singular throng had been whispered into the ears of a few of the residents of Versailles. The States-General—or what we may perhaps better designate as the National Assembly—was sitting. "*Mounier*," warned Mirabeau as he walked up to the President's chair, "*Pans marche sur nous.*" "*Je n'en sms rien*," returned the incredulous President, and attempted to go on with the orders of the day. But the tidings spread, and there was evidently a feeling of uncertain discomfort in the assembly. Anon a hubbub was heard at the entrance of the hall, and in streamed a number of women, headed by the clever Usher Maillard. The amazons made him their interpreter. They came, said he, for bread. "*Du pain, du pain*,"—this was what they wanted,—"*du pain, et pas tant long discours.*"

What could the Assembly answer to such words as these? It agreed to send a petition to his Majesty—nay, a direct deputation of women should go with it, and beg Majesty for bread with their own tongues. And again, were there not the aliens about the palace; aliens who had trampled on the national cockade? These must be exterminated along with the *black* cockade which they had so swaggeringly assumed. The deputation was admitted into Louis' presence; he talked smoothly—nay, it was rumoured that he even kissed one of the fair demoiselles; but he could give them no direct response about the bread. Time passed quickly; the women and the rascality of St. Antoine swarmed the palace, and sorely pressed the poor guards. At length one of the officers lost patience, and chased a few of the most aggressive intruders away. A wild cry was raised; rascality drew its sword and presented its firelock; blood was spilt, and the poor guards were massacred without mercy. Now see majesty retreat to its innermost chamber in consternation; the women, aided by the mob of male vagabonds, forcing their way into almost every room, and majesty in vain seeking means of escaping from the palace. Surely such a scene ought to be pregnant with lessons, both to every thoughtful king and to every serious student! But Lafayette, on his noble white charger, has arrived with his guards; the abode of royalty is at length cleared of its motley throng; and poor Louis XVI., for a moment, consoles himself with the thought, that now ho may once more be permitted to rule in peace. No, no; it is at Paris where the people are starving—where they want bread; and our king must return with us to Paris, in order that he may see the wretchedness of the breech-less men of the metropolis himself. The women and the *sans-culottes* have gained the day, and both Lafayette's military, and the lack-bread women, and the breechless men, escort their sovereign to the Tailleries in triumph.

From the day when those ten thousand women fetched their king from Versailles to their own Tuilleries in Paris, poor Louis the Sixteenth was practically a prisoner. During the next two years the National or Constituent Assembly was busily engaged at what they called "making the Constitution." Never, I ween, was there a stranger gathering of men than that which sat for those two long years at their impracticable task of making the Constitution. Twelve hundred men—sent from every corner of France—presented a wondrous diversity of

character. First, were the royalists—men who, either from the prejudice of class, from interest, or from principle, were staunch supporters of the monarchy, were it limited, were it absolute. These formed but a small minority in the Assembly; and, as they found their votes had no influence, gradually absented themselves from the debates, and, eventually, from the kingdom. Then were the Constitutionals—men who, while seeking a radical change in the old government of France, were yet unwilling to part with royalty altogether, though they were desirous to curtail the kingly power by every possible check. And finally, were the uncompromising Republicans—who believed in nothing which savoured of either king or hereditary nobility. According to them, every title of address beyond "Fellow-citizen," was an insult to France and to rational humanity. The real struggle of the French Revolution was between these two latter sections of the Assembly—between the moderates and the ultras.

Mirabeau, born a noble, but who now saw in the good of the people the cause of his country, was as thorough a reformer as any of them, I believe that even a Republic would not have frightened him, had he seen that his country was ripe for it. But that it was not ripe was plain to him; and he saw that a Republic in France, at present, only meant an anarchic chaos. Hence he began to find himself, day by day, more estranged from the ultra-republicans on the left.

Was ever a city so stirred within itself as Paris during this Revolution? I think I see the giant Mirabeau standing before that Assembly of twelve hundred, and on the one side battering the remnants of feudalism to pieces, and on the other stamping down the senseless clamour of the men of one idea who gathered under the shadow of the ultra-republican Mountain. How earnestly he rubbed away the false gloss which, for so many ages, had been gathering on feudalistic society; and, on the other hand, how unsparingly he exposed the canting hollowness of many of the Jacobin leaders! See the venom which steals from the eye of the incorruptible Robespierre. He winces under the manly onslaught of the honest Mirabeau; he feels that the noble patriot penetrates into his inmost soul, and he hates the man who has the power so to read him. How stormy waxes the debate in this making of the Constitution! Now the ultras appear to be gaining the day; but up springs the indefatigable Mirabeau; words of fire issue from his indignant lips; he speaks as a man—as a Frenchman; and whatever is noble and intelligent in France no longer wavers; Mirabeau has not thundered forth his eloquence in vain.

But follow the members of that National Assembly from their common hall. The few royalists go to prepare for emigrating from their country; the Mountain retires *en masse* to its Jacobin hall, where the friend of the people, Marat, and Robespierre, the incorruptible, and the thorough-going Danton, have no Mirabeau to keep them within reasonable limits, and to expose their intolerant designs. And where does Mirabeau—the noble Mirabeau—wend his way? To his lodgings, where he stretches himself on his couch, and thinks, and thinks, till his brain is well nigh exhausted with the depth and variety of his anxious thoughts. He feels as if France depends upon his efforts, and heroically he struggles on. He was full of animation and even of gaiety when in the social circle; but with all this the man was alone—solitary even amidst the myriads of his countrymen for whom he so valiantly fought. Such men are moral and intellectual kings amongst us, and must ever be solitary.

He saw the inflammatory journals and broad-sheets of Marat, and the growing influence of the secret clubs. He felt the stupendous power which the Jacobins might obtain; for, corresponding with the mother society, which constantly held its debates in the Jacobin hall, it was marvellous to see with what rapidity thousands of its daughters were born in all the towns and villages throughout France. At the Feast of Pikes, he beheld the mock re-union of all parties of Frenchmen at Fatherland's Altar in the Champs de Mars. He heard the oaths of the myriads who went there in procession. *Je le jure, je le jure*—ah! how often have those words been solemnly uttered even while a determination to break the oath has been yet forming in the heart! Poor Mira-beau! with what bitterness would those broken vows come to his memory! And yet his countrymen took them; and, with all their faults, they still continued to be his countrymen. At length, the news came that French blood had been spilt. The soldiers stationed near Nancy, under General Bouille, had arrears of pay due to them. The revolutionary spirit was fast spreading among the ranks. A number of them refused to obey orders; closed the gates of Nancy against their brave commander; nay, tired upon his advancing columns. Then followed a rush, and the fire of musketry, and the din of clashing arms—Frenchman against Frenchman, till the disaffected were for the time subdued. Quick did all classes among the Parisians arm, and in walking through the streets of the capital by night, a citizen scarcely felt sure of his life. The Jacobin Club became bolder and bolder; the incendiary placards which were posted in the streets were ever increasing in the violence of their tone; and Mirabeau saw that unless something decisive was done, and done quickly, his country would drift into anarchy. As a last effort to save his beloved France, he resolved to give his assistance to the Court. He renewed his herculean struggles till his overtaken frame could bear no more. Wailing the fate of his poor France; wondering what the other side of the grave would disclose to him; the great, the noble Mirabeau yielded to the summons of death. He fell like a heathen of old. "Ah!" murmured he, as he gazed upon the last sun which in

this world he was destined to behold," if that be not God, it must be very like him."

With the death of Mirabeau in the spring of 1791, may be said to have fled the hopes both of royalty and of the lovers of order. Only a fortnight afterwards, the king purposed to dine at St. Cloud, where he intended to remain a short time for his health's sake. His coach was drawn up before the palace gates in the Place de Carrousel, but the alarm had spread throughout the city. An immense crowd had soon flocked to the square; Louis and his wife entered the carriage, and the order was given to move forward. But no, royalty must not stir from its own palace. Strong arms seized the reins of the prancing steeds, and for a full hour and three-quarters royalty sat still. *Nous ne voulons que le roi parle*, was shrieked from a thousand throats, and royalty had to retire once more into the Tuilleries. Poor royalty! it could not so much as get to spend its Easter holiday even at its pretty country-seat at St. Cloud—a distance of but four or five miles from the capital!

From this moment it was plain that the members of the royal family were prisoners in their own palace, and therefore their constant thoughts were directed towards securing the means for their flight. On the night of Monday, the 20th of June, Louis the Sixteenth, with his wife and children, escaped from Paris on their way towards the German frontier. They were recognised, however, at Sainte-Ménéhould, by Drouet, an old dragoon officer, who closely pursued them as far as Varennes, where he raised the inhabitants, and stopped the king's further progress. On Saturday of the same week, the royal pair was triumphantly brought back to Paris, never more to quit it. Three weeks afterwards one might have seen the ultras of Paris crowding towards Fatherland's Altar in the Champ de Mars. They went to sign a petition that the king should be deposed. But hark! what meant that shout around the altar? Some one beneath the platform upon which the subscribers stood. The boards were torn up, and lo! two wretched specimens of humanity were kneeling there, and they it was who, with a small gimlet, had been boring the shoes of the unsuspecting petitioners. The poor affrighted wights were madly dragged forth. They were first thrust into the nearest guard-house as spies of Lafayette, and finally punished for their whimsical curiosity by being hoisted for their last sad swing into eternity. The mob had begun to take upon itself the sovereign right of the executive; and the indignant Lafayette rode forth, with the bewildered Mayor Bailly, to read the riot act, and with the military to execute it. French blood was again shed, and this time even on Fatherland's Altar. The sore may appear to heal, but the healing will be false. The wound will continue to fester till completely washed away with blood.

But now it is the nut-brown October, and the Constitution, which the National Assembly has been so long in building, is complete. So they say; and surely one might hope for the Millenium. The labours of that historical States-General, or Constituent or National Assembly, which, more than twenty-seven months ago, swore, in the Tennis Court, amidst the thunder's roar, and under the drenching rain, that it would not separate till it had done the work for which it came together,—the labours of that strange gathering of twelve hundred representative men are now ended; and King Louis has accepted the Theoretical Constitution which it had framed. The National Assembly had dissolved itself, and had made the singular and absurd provision that none of its members should be eligible for election in the new Legislative Assembly which their wisdom had formed. The fiats for the elections have gone forth, and now the Legislative Assembly under the Theoretical Constitution has met, and all true constitutionalists look for peace at last.

Is it peace?—What peace so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many? Fond hopes of peace, whilst a whole nation is gone mad! How can there be peace under a Constitution which has not been sealed in blood? How can there be peace whilst uneasy insecurity reigns, and tumult rises, in every city, and village, and hamlet in France; while murder goes rampant in Avignon; whilst news is brought of the loss of St. Domingo and sugar, of the continental despots uniting to extinguish the very life out of our poor France, of a re-actionist camp at Jalès, and of brigands preparing everywhere to ride over innocence, industry, and patriotism? Looking for peace when not a single ministry can be formed which can satisfactorily carry on the executive! Good, honest Boland! I think I see thee sitting in thy study utterly perplexed. The Jacobins suspecting thee of a leaning towards royalty, and condemning thee for thy too scrupulous moderation; the king disliking thee because thou wert a creation of the times, and at heart a republican. I seem to behold thee there with thy face buried in thy hands, heaving a deep sigh in thy bewilderment. But now the door is pushed gently open, and thy angel wife glides to thy side, and places her hand soothingly on thy sorely burdened shoulders. She whispers words of strength to thee; she cheers thee on in thy pilgrimage; she endeavours to dispel the clouds which obstruct thy vision; she is thy companion and comforter, and raises thy soul to the ideal. Ah! well may thou press her soft hand in thine, for she is one of the world's heroines, and her spirit is made of such a true nobility, as is rarely vouchsafed to this perishing tabernacle of clay. The reigns of government are not for thy hands, O Roland! and well dost thou in relinquishing them to be held by more adventurous or more debased spirits.

When will this end? The king constantly using his veto against all important measures; a wild mob rushing into the palace of the Tuilleries, and forcing their king to assume the red woollen cap; a public procession, in which is borne high in the air such words of intimidation as, "*Tremblez tyrans, voila les sansculottes.*" When

we see these things, surely, where can the end be? In blood, one fears—in blood. The king cannot procure a ministry to act with him; bread continues scarce; and all public affairs are in a state of stagnation. Nay, the foes without are gathering around our devoted country, and yet the government remains inactive. "Send me six hundred men who know how to die," wrote Barbaroux, to the municipality of Marseilles; and forthwith start five hundred and seventeen men on their wearisome northward journey. Each one of the five hundred and seventeen offers himself as a man who *knows how to die*.

And while Marat is hatching his sanguinary plots in the cellars and kennels of Paris, do those dusty and footsore five hundred arrive. Some happy moment has inspired the soul-stirring song of the Marseillaise, a song which has led thousands upon thousands of brave Frenchmen to carry their lives in their hands with the determination to do or die. Now the Jacobins receive the five hundred with open arms; a public dinner is given to them; the different sections of Paris are busy organizing themselves into armed committees, and everyone feels that the volcano of human passions is ready to burst.

But list! What sound was that from the eastern suburb of the metropolis? Surely the tocsin from some steeple or tower. But hark again! Is not that another bell ringing forth its agitated voice in response? Ay, and now another, and another sounds, until all the steeples of Paris utter their loud summons. And as the morning dawns, vast concourses from the different sections of the city move towards the Tuilleries as its centre. There has been no sleep for royalty during the past night. The few soldiers which the king has yet remaining to him have been under arms throughout the whole weary hours of darkness, and are completely jaded. The national troops cannot be depended on—they will not fight against the liberties of France. Only the Swiss are staunch and true. There are a thousand of them, and they will stand like the solid rocks among which they were cradled. The king has forsaken the poor Swiss, and, without leaving orders, has sought safety with his family in the Salle de Manège, where the assembly is sitting. The Place du Carrousel is filled; on the inner side of the barriers stand the few Swiss, on the outer stand the Marseillaise, backed by the whole of rabid France. The Marseillaise demand entrance; the Swiss have no orders from their king and commander to that effect, and therefore must refuse. The infuriated Marseillaise fire the three cannons which they have brought with them; the Swiss have no orders, but, of course, must defend themselves. They, in return, nervously raise their firelocks to their shoulders, O Swiss! see how those cannon belch destruction at you. You must not stand passively to die; the chateau is in your care; it is assailed; therefore—fire! Volley follows volley unceasingly, and many are the dead among the mad Parisians, and their leaders, the Marseillaise, who knew how to die. And bravely stand those noble Swiss to their post, and deadly is their aim amongst that surging mass of humanity. But a messenger hastily presses forward to those valiant Swiss; he bears in his hand the king's written order that they shall cease firing. Cease firing? cease firing, when the cannon and musketry from those incarnate devils below are mowing us down?

Ah, poor, noble Swiss! Ye had been trained to obey,—ay, even in the face of grim death. Sad fate! No escape for ye, ye sons of the everlasting hills. In front, behind, in whatever direction you turn, a horrible death stares you in the face.

They seek shelter in despair. Some leap at once into the jaws of death. About three hundred rush towards the Champs Elysées, the majority of whom are shot down like dogs as they fly in separate parties. A few run right across the leaden hail, and find a temporary protection in the Legislative Assembly. Fifty are being escorted by the National Guards to the Hotel de Ville, when the breechless crowd bursts through the lines, and massacre the hapless prisoners to a man. O! that tenth of August, 1792, was a fearful and yet a memorable day in the history both of France and of the world. For many, many ages will the lovers of true nobility heave a mournful sigh, as they think of the heroic devotion of those ill-fated Swiss guards.

After spending three days in three small upper rooms connected with the hall in which the Legislative Assembly sat; after hearing the suspension of himself as Hereditary Representative or King being moved, Louis the Sixteenth was, with his family, taken as close prisoner to the Temple. Danton was declared Minister of Justice, and his first act was to obtain a decree empowering the arrest of all suspected of designing against the liberty of the people. On one evening the decree was demanded, on the following four hundred unhappy *suspects* were hurried from their domiciles, and exchanged their soft couches for the straw pallets or the hard floors of the Parisian prisons. The barriers are sealed; the ends of the streets and thoroughfares are guarded; and the nightly arrests follow each other till upwards of a thousand political prisoners are in the charge of the patriot turnkeys. And behold that novel machine which has been erected for the curious of Paris to gaze upon. Dr. Guillotine's practical invention stands waiting for its victims, and the new Tribunal of Justice of the seventeenth shall not let it long remain idle. The latter days of August witness the tumbril daily carrying its doomed ones to that dread engine; but even the decapitation which that so speedily accomplishes, does not satisfy the sanguinary desires of some of the sanscullotic patriots. While the ministers are enrolling troops to go to meet Brunswick on the frontiers,—what, O Marat! what, O Villainy! what execrable designs have ye been hatching?

On Sunday, the 2nd of September, the tocsins are once more sounding in all parts of Paris. The sansculottes

are crowding the streets, and rascality is marching in arms. The Abbé Sicard, with five unfortunate companions, is being conducted to the Abbaye Prison; rascality thrusts its head into the carriage with vituperative speech; the fellow will not withdraw his head; he will not allow the window-sash of the carriage to be raised; he will speak of vengeance and of traitors; and at length one of the priests loses patience, and strikes him with a cane. There is a rush of rascality; the carriages are smashed, and the poor priests are massacred, only poor Sicard being saved. Like the enraged tiger who in an instant returns to his native ferocity at the taste of blood, did that fearful multitude lash itself into fiendish madness over the life-blood of those wretched victims near the Abbaye Prison. I think I hear its awful voice. "Have we not traitors enough on our borders, who are bringing all the nations of Europe upon us? How can we go with confidence to withstand them, while we have plotting traitors in our very midst? Are not the Suspects who lie in our prisons the most dangerous of traitors? Let us free ourselves from them first. To the prisons; to the prisons; and death to the traitors and the friends of the emigrants!"

To the prisons they go, and many poor prisoners feel their flesh creep as they hear with dread forebodings the approach of those noisy and ruthless murderers.

Before the prisons are thousands upon thousands of spectators, and right in front of the crowd are ruffians fully armed, with murder stamped on their foreheads. A few of the intellectual ringleaders march into the interior. The various cells are opened by their myrmidons, and the hapless prisoners are dragged forth. "What is your name—profession—cause of being suspected? Oh! we see in your countenance that you are a traitor to liberty; let him be taken to the prison La Force." The doomed wretch is dragged to the entrance of the prison; no sound of *Vive la Nation* accompanies him, and with a savage yell he is received on the points of the spears and bayonets of the bloodthirsty ruffians who stand there waiting for their prey. For four long days they continue their murderous labours. The dead bodies begin to scent the air, and large quantities of quick-lime are procured as disinfectants; carters are paid by the load for transporting the ghastly wrecks of humanity to the cemeteries; and fair Paris, for the third time in its history, has become a horrible scene of human butchery. By Thursday, the 6th of September, ten hundred and eighty-nine human beings have been thus sent to fathom the unknown depths of Eternity. O, Marat! *Ami du peuple!* O, Danton! Minister of Justice! O, Robespierre, the Incorruptible! Ye have witnessed these things, and have not said Nay. Murder is rampant; and think ye, ye demagogues, to escape? *Vengeance is mine*, saith the Lord, *and I will repay*.

Satiated at last, the bloody work ceases. Lafayette has escaped across the borders; the Duke of Brunswick is invading the land by Argonne. But France has still a Dumouriez, stanch and true,—ay, and a soldier not even second to the Hero of Two Worlds. With rain ever accompanying them, the Germans come among the woods and marshes of Argonne. But the fertile brain of Dumouriez is at work, and he throws up barricades to stop the progress of the enemy, and harasses poor Brunswick on all sides. Try as they may, utterly confused and cooped up amidst the woods, the marshes, and the deluge of rain, the Germans can get no farther. Day after day their position becomes worse, and they are only too glad in being able to secure their retreat. The September which witnessed the butcheries of Paris, witnessed the raw troops of the nation nobly straining every nerve to drive the enemies of their country back to their native Rhine. And they were successful.

The National Convention has also assembled, and the Legislative Assembly is defunct. The real power is gradually passing into the hands of the Ultra-Republicans, of whom Marat, Danton, and Robespierre, with the journalist and poet Camille Demoulins, are the most active and conspicuous members. Roland returns for a time, but his actions are jealously watched by the Mountain. For Roland, though a reformer, ay, and a republican, yet loves order, and therefore is disliked by all excepting his own party of Moderates or Girondists.

Ten hundred and eighty-nine suspected traitors have been offered at the altar of Moloch; the fifty prisoners brought from Orleans have been massacred as they were being conducted into Versailles; terror may have been struck into the hearts of many; but what is the use of all this while the archconspirator, the one great cause of national treason, is still in the flesh? "The life of Louis Capet," cry the Ultra-Republicans. "And two hundred and sixty thousand aristocratic heads," chimes in the horse-leech Marat, "and then, and then, we may indeed hope for deliverance and peace." And Louis' accusation is prepared, and on this, the 11th of December, he is arraigned at the bar of the House of Convention.

We will not keep company with the patriotic dames who watched that trial, much the same as they would watch the play from an opera-box. There are, perhaps, many even in that Convention Hall whom the mind would willingly contemplate. The aged Malesherbes, pleading for his sovereign in dumb eloquence; the astute Roland, scarcely knowing which way to turn; the heroic Madame Roland, his wife, sitting as a calm spectator; the chivalrous Barbaroux, now beginning to doubt whether his Marseillaise had brought with them the germ either of order or of peace,—over these and others the mind would fain linger as we look into that densely crowded hall; and as we turn from them, and glance at Marat and Robespierre, we feel a strange shudder in trying to imagine what the future may bring to all these. But we will not linger there, for the end is certain—Louis is condemned to death by a majority of some fifty votes—to death within twenty-four hours.

Many of the Girondins have recorded their votes for death through a sort of fear, and yet the thought of what is being done is bitterness and wormwood to them. Henceforth no peace between the Girondins and the Ultras of the Mountain—it shall be war, war to the knife—to the Guillotine.

It was a cold morning, on the 21st of January, 1793, when Louis Capet was carried in the tumbril to the foot of the Guillotine which had been erected in the *Place de la Revolution*. The drums are beating loudly, so that a voice can scarcely be heard. "*Taisezvous*," cries the discrowned monarch in exasperation. He reluctantly submits to be bound, and then steps to the front of the scaffold. By his side is the fearful knife; around him are the six executioners, with Abbé Edgeworth his only attendant; beneath him are the revolutionary troops. Before his mortal eyes human life is teeming; on the other side of that dread machine is eternity. "Frenchmen," says the unfortunate mortal, "I die innocent. It is from the scaffold, and near approaching of God, that I tell you so. I pardon my enemies; I desire that France" *Tambours*," shouts the stentorian lungs of the general in charge, and the victim's voice is heard no more. "Executioners, do your duty and, amidst the rolling drums, the fated man is seized, and, after a short struggle, is pinioned to the board. The heavy axe falls, the head drops into the basket, and Louis the Sixteenth is no more. Luckless sovereign—even now only thirty-eight years old.

But the execution of Louis the Sixteenth only served to exasperate the various parties of the Revolution more and more. Many had been opposed to it, and these could not help looking upon the main movers of it with dislike. This distrustful and retaliatory feeling was reciprocal; for how could the resolute regicide do otherwise than have an ill-feeling towards those who, by their manner if not by their words, intimated that they considered that a crime had been committed. And Dumouriez, the victorious general of the N.E., was amongst the first to express aversion for the deed. Nay, he habitually spoke of it as *murder*—neither more nor less than bare, revolting murder. He was sick of it; how could he be victorious more, when serving under the orders of wretches who had consummated such a crime? The Convention became suspicious. Was Dumouriez, then, like his predecessor Lafayette, become a traitor? Better to seize time by the forelock, and call him to explain at all events. They sent four commissioners to arrest him; but Dumouriez, as soon as they had clearly told their errand, uttered a few words to the German troop which surrounded him, and the four were instantly pounced upon, and guarded safely across the border to cogitate in German dungeons. Dumouriez quickly followed them, and numbered one more among the thousands of French emigrants.

There were scores of talented patriots like Dumouriez in the Convention, and it was clear that there could be no peace between them and the extreme Ultras. How could any French gentleman act with a party to which Marat and Robespierre—to which, the butchers of last September belonged? And mutually accusing one another, the Moderates or Girondins at length ventured to throw aspersions on the sincerity of Danton. This may be said to have sealed their doom; for now Danton cast the full weight of his influence against them, and they were finally expelled the Convention by another raging insurrection of sansculottes, similar to that which had ushered in the dreadful massacres of August and September. Twenty-two of the most talented among the discomfited Girondins were declared under arrest by the remnant of the Convention, which now was compelled to obey the orders of the miscreant Marat.

The days of this Marat were, however, numbered. Not a foe whom he once clutched could hope to escape; but there was one tall, stately maiden in the far north, who was musing on these things, and nerving herself to a sacrifice for her countrymen. The list of suspected even included some of her own friends at Caen, and at length she calmly resolved to act. No sudden deed of passion was hers—everything was foreseen, and quietly balanced in her mind. She obtained a note of introduction to Deputy Duperret, and travelled southwards in the company of her aged valet. She has bid farewell to her home, to her friends, and to the world. Little did her friends, little did that aged valet, suspect the errand upon which she was bound. She arrives in Paris; she quietly engages lodgings, and, walking abroad, purchases a sheath knife. She drives in a cab to the Rue de l'Ecole de Médecine, which is the residence of Marat, and asks to see him. He is ill, and cannot be spoken to. She returns to her hotel and writes a note to him. No answer. Another note she writes, stating that she has an important communication from the seat of rebellion at Caen. She follows it in a cab, and is introduced to the ailing Marat while he is seated, taking a bath. I am from Caen. "Ah! What deputies are there Charlotte names a few. Marat takes his tablets to write them down. "Their heads shall fall before the next fortnight. *Barbaroux, Pétion, Louvet*,"—but the steel is in his heart. She has struck home. To follow her to the guillotine were useless. She was doomed, but she was prepared for it. What she considered her mission, was completed when Marat shrieked his last *A moi, mon ami*. With the same unbroken calmness she stood before the judgment seat, and went on her last journey to the fatal axe. She was a meteor shining strangely on the page of history. She had slain Marat; she had taken, as she expressed it, one life, the life of a villain, to save the lives of a thousand of her countrymen. Charlotte Corday lived and died a republican.

To enter fully into the history of the following six months, which witnessed the total extinction of the leaders of the Moderates or Girondins, would lead us far beyond the limits which we have set ourselves, and would serve only to sicken the mind, by recounting a succession of atrocities which we can scarcely persuade

ourselves to belong to this modern age. The nations of Europe were preparing to invade the frontiers of the Republic, and the remnant of the Convention declared *Le Peuple Français debout contre les tyrans*. The Jacobins were determined that, in fighting against declared foes abroad, they would clear themselves of every soul who did not heartily co-operate with them at home. And the Jacobins, with their breechless supporters, had number and strength on their side. Hence the struggle of the Girondins was only the struggle of death. In vain did the Eleven stand at bay in the devoted city of Lyons. The breechless ones must conquer you Poor Barlaroux—chivalrous Barlaroux! there thou goest, footsore and in disguise, with thy unfortunate companions; hiding in the wood by day, travelling in pain through the night. It is of no avail—thy fate pursues thee; thou art doomed. Now thou hast escaped the perils of the sea in that frail Scottish lubber. Thou art once more on the shore of thy native France. But hark! A sound of the tramping of men. Surely come to take thee! Thou raisest the pistol to thy head. Fire! Thy brains are scattered upon the soil thou lovedst so well. Poor Barbaroux! Thine was a hard fate,—and yet, better perhaps that, than to be carried, as so many of thy fellow-patriots were, amid the jeering, breechless crowd, on that dreary journey to the guillotine. Thou livedst to hear the last of the majority of them; to hear of the twenty-two—of Valazé stabbing himself to the heart before his judges, and then of his body being earned along the streets with the living twenty-one, and of the heads of the whole twenty-two being lopped off by the inexorable guillotine at the rate of about one per minute. Thou livedst to hear of these things; and at length, O, gallant Barbaroux, it was time for the pistol to go to thy head!

And the luckless Marie Antoinette—she too has disappeared. No crime could be truthfully laid to thy charge; but thou wert in the way, thou daughter of the heroic Thérèse, and thou hast been sent to thy long home.

And thou, wife of the fugitive Roland, thou too art among the doomed! The heart bleeds to think of thee. Thou wert ever virtuous and sincere, and a true daughter of Liberty. Thou wert a true woman, and had served thy country well. But thy very talents and virtues were hateful to that bloodthirsty crew. They feared thy spotless purity, and thy unswerving truthfulness cowed them. Poor soul! Thy merciless judges are deaf to thy womanly appeal. To the prison—the cheerless prison—must thou return, and quickly prepare thee for the unknown country. Ah! choicest of earth's mortality! Thou smilest in order to keep up the spirits of thy friends who visit thee; but yet, in the retirement of thy closet, thou weepest bitter, bitter tears, to think of the dear husband whom thy fate will bring to utter, hopeless despair, and of the daughter whom thou must leave motherless. Thy queenly form is ignominiously borne towards the place of doom, and yet thy solicitude is not for thyself, but for those beside thee, and whose dread journey is linked to thine. "O Liberty, what things are done in thy name!" These must have been bitter words of thine, uttered with the soul's anguish, as thou didst contemplate the exertions of thy life-time. Lamarche, thy companion to the fatal axe, was unnerved; the fortitude of manhood had fled from his soul. Thou, noble lady, wilt die first, to show him how easy a thing it is. Sunson, the executioner, says, that for Madame to die first is contrary to order. "Pshaw, you cannot refuse the last request of a lady." She is pinioned, the neck placed on the frame, and one of the earth's choicest treasures has perished. Let us quit the fatal spot, for the scene is harrowing to the soul.

Destruction is doing its work in earnest. Buonaparte, the obscure lieutenant of artillery, has captured Toulon; at first seventy, and then more than two hundred, have been led out of Lyons to be destroyed by musketry *en masse*. Amidst the gloom of night, a vessel containing ninety priests has been moored into the middle of the Loire. They are from Nantes, and are fastened in the hold of the flat-bottomed boat. The prison-house, is scuttled by the disciples of Marat, and the vessel, with its living freight of ninety, sinks. Another night, and one hundred and thirty-eight are thrown into the river—one hundred and thirty-eight, among whom are women and infants.

Let us not recount more of these horrors. Never was there a country more racked than this poor France in the winter and spring of 1794. Foes without, wholesale executions of the suspected within—surely, the whole land was in a devouring fever. But now the opponents of the Jacobins were utterly crushed, and the leaders of the Mountain were supreme. Marat had gone to his long account, and there only remained Danton and Robespierre who had, unchecked and unscathed, kept themselves conspicuous in the van of the revolutionists and the ultra-republicans. And these two, Danton and Robespierre, now stood side by side as the chiefs of the triumphant Mountain. But there was no love between them. Danton was a man of a large mind, true to his friends, and a terrible though an open enemy to his political opponents. The guillotine might be always at work, so long as it was for the furtherance of the republican cause; but he took no delight in the destruction of human life from mere vindictiveness, or from mere love of slaughter. He was not by nature suspicious, and of late had become weary of the butcheries around him. He began to express his dissent to the continual and wanton arrests, and at once incurred the envenomed hatred of his coadjutor, Robespierre the Incorruptible. His end had come. He was arrested, and tried along with his friends, the witty Camille Demoulins, and others. The trial was abruptly stopped, in fear that the wild eloquence of this child of nature might provoke a rescue. They were doomed, and Danton and the witty poet rode side by side in the dread tumbrils. "Our heads will meet there," said he, as he embraced one of the companions of his fate, and indicated the bag into which both must fall. Ah,

Danton! There was a certain rude nobility about thee, but thou didst then travel on a road on which thou hadst sent hundreds more guiltless and quite as noble as ever thou wert.

Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord, *and I will repay*. And, truly, vengeance is doing its work in bloody earnest. Robespierre is now supreme. He decrees that there is a God, and, under the Revolutionary Calendar, every tenth day is declared the Sabbath. Reason, and Beauty, and such like, are worshipped as in the old pagan days, until the virtuous Robespierre stops such profanities. Robespierre is the Great High Priest, and will make a religion by legal enactment. Daily now go the tumbrils to the barriers, bearing their living freight of doomed ones. The guillotine is as a constant spectre in the French mind, and a horrible terror sits on all. But the end is quickly drawing nigh. Tallien and others hear that their own names are pricked on the list of doom, and desperation prompts them to bestir themselves. To them it is a question of life or death. Delay and false security were madness, for through them Danton had suffered. The Incorruptible comes down to the Convention, and in a lugubrious speech deplores the lukewarmness of certain patriots. There is only one remedy. The guillotine, the guillotine, must be sharpened; it must fall quicker and quicker. So says the Incorruptible, and is thrown into consternation at not receiving the usual applause. "What can it mean? Wait till the morrow and we will see. Some of their heads shall roll among the sawdust for this strange silence." The morrow has come, and Robespierre is again endeavouring to address the Convention. But no; they will not listen to him; he is accused by Tallien, and, with a number of his supporters, is placed under arrest. The Convention separates—Robespierre escapes—all Paris is arming. The Convention meets again, and declares Robespierre and his confederates outlawed; his party is broken—he hears his foes ascending the stairs of the Hotel-de-Ville—he raises the pistol and fires, but only shatters the jaw; they seize him and his companions, and the following afternoon witnesses them all borne in the tumbrils, to be lopped out of existence by the engines whose velocity they had so lately begged the Convention to increase.

The fall of Robespierre the Incorruptible may be said to have been the fall of Jacobinical sansculottism, and of the anarchic period of the French Revolution. The tumbrils bore their doomed burden to the bloody engine on the very evening of the day when Robespierre was arrested. Ay, along that dreary journey went the aged General Loiserolles, who, availing himself of a mistake of the jailors, contrived to have himself conveyed to the fatal spot in the place of his unsuspecting son. Our countryman, Thomas Paine, was also named amongst the victims of that evening, but a mistake in chalking the innerside of his cell door saved him; and on the morrow the power of Robespierre had gone, and mercy had once more begun to raise its benign countenance to soften human woes.

The Mountain shrank; the creatures of the Incorruptible sang low; but sansculottism did not give up the reins of power without a vicious snap and a growl. It was in July, 1794, that Robespierre's head followed so many hundreds of his victims over the gory block; and at the season of All-hailows in November of the same year, we again see the motley crowd of men and women from St. Antoine rushing like maddened dogs into the Convention Hall. But their violence had lost its force; the organization was shat-tered, and the struggle was but the one which precedes the last great one of death. The gentle youths of the city soon drove them away, and scattered them, even outrageously treating some of the female patriots with a hand dressing *avec les cotillons retroussés*. In April of 1795, the breechless St. Antoine was again in commotion. They poured westwards like swarming bees. But it was of no avail. Pichegru, the conqueror of Holland, dispersed them with smoke and the terror of his name. In May, we find the Convention Hall again invaded, and sixty of its members, the remnant of the dissatisfied Jacobins, passing decree after decree with a vigour commensurate to its impotence. Again was Order victorious, and the leading members of the insurrectionists were doomed by the Military Tribunal. Mad despair was rampant in their midst. Old Ruhl applies the muzzle of a pistol to his brain, and vanishes. Among those who are doomed before that stern tribunal, see the determined Goujon draw out a dagger, and, thrusting it into his breast, hand the bloody weapon to his friend Homme. And Romme strikes the blade home, and hastens to join his compatriot, after passing the dread instrument to a third. Ay, and the third has well-nigh accomplished the deed, ere their guards could recover their presence of mind sufficiently to stop their resolute self-slaughter. The lives as well as the deaths of these men were as the lives and deaths of the civilized pagans of the Republic of Rome. They had nerved themselves for death with the stoicism of Stauffacher's wife, and might have repeated her lofty words:—

*"Die letzte Wahl steht auch dem Schwächsten offen,
Ein Sprung von dieser Bruecke machi mich frei."*

The Convention had been a long, a very long time in making and settling the Constitution, but at length the cries from without caused them to act with despatch. The Constitution under the Republic was at length completed on paper, and one of its provisions instantaneously roused all the latent force of Jacobinism and

Sansculottism into action. Two-thirds at least of the retiring members of the existing Convention must be elected in the new Legislative Council. Was there ever heard anything so tyrannical and unjust? This was purely a new phase of popular representation and freedom of election! St. Antoine was again and for the last time on its legs. Thousands upon thousands provided themselves with arms, and vowing dire vengeance against all traitorous deputies, rolled in the confidence of numbers on their westward journey of reform. The members of the Convention sat debating in utter perplexity. How could they withstand these surging crowds of armed sansculottes? What force had they at command? and, above all, whom had they to command it? They had between five and six thousand troops under their orders, but what were they among so many? However, something must perforce be done. Mention is made of Barras as the most fitted for command; and a whisper is heard of the name of a certain gloomy, sallow-featured artillery officer, who had rendered such signal service at Toulon as well as in Italy. This officer is Citizen Napoleon Buonaparte, who happens to be here—moody, as any man out of employment is apt to be. Citizen Buonaparte is appointed through the influence of Barras, and, after half-an-hour's self-communion, decides to accept the responsible post.

Now a man—nay, now *the* man of France is at the helm. Cry aloud, ye sansculottes, ye breechless ones; vow with shouts your vengeance during the brief moments of seeming triumph which remain to you; for there is a short, taciturn young man in your midst, who has undertaken to scatter you to the four winds—and lie will do it, for they say his will is of iron. Quick fly the messengers; the bridges are guarded; the cannon is secured; and the vaunting crowd may come. We are ready; our linstocks are at hand; our matches are burning; our guns are charged with grape-shot; and ye, O ye breechless rabble, may do your worst. Law and order and the Convention is on our side, and we have a man at our head who knows how to act.

The crowd of sansculottes advance; they seize the Church of St. Roch; a few shots actually fall on the passages of the Tuilleries. Still the mad multitude presses on; ay, they will even storm us in the palace here. The artillery-officer is ready for them. With compressed, determined lips he waits. The fools! they yet push each other to their fate! It is four o'clock in the afternoon of the 4th of October. They are too bold; they will be upon us in a few moments. Buonaparte's lips are opened—it must be. "Fire!" Again and again is the grape-shot belched forth, and by six o'clock the hungry crowd is dispersed, no more to reappear.

The power of the breechless ones was completely broken; that hour or two's hail of grape-shot thoroughly stamped out the life from the anarchic insurrectionists. True, the government of France was not finally settled by it—even now, in 1869, one can scarcely affirm it to be satisfactorily settled; and yet from that evening when Napoleon Buonaparte gave the command to fire, order began to reign, and terror took to flight with the groans of the wounded in front of the Church of St. Roch. From that memorable evening of October, 1795, the influence of the dark-complexioned Corsican began to extend itself, till he had become the man of the country and of the age; and the subsequent history of France is connected more or less with the history of Napoleon Buonaparte.

Now that the violent convulsions of the Revolution were among the things of the past, how could the thoughtful historian look upon the strange work which they had performed. Historians are fallible, and therefore differ according to their associations, their prejudices, or their individual interests. When I think of the work of blood, my mind wanders back upon the France of poverty and ignorance, which had been left as legacies by the feudal ages. I think of the licentiousness of her sovereigns and of her nobles, and the greed and worldliness of her priesthood. I then turn to the wretched people of the land, who had to bear all the burdens of the country on their aching shoulders. And then the witty, but reckless and scoffing encyclopedists rise before my mind's eye, and I hear the plausible and sarcastic words of the Philosophes, and see them disseminating their revolutionary and sceptical doctrines throughout the length and breadth of the land. The sovereign, the nobility, and the clergy, did not strive after their country's good; they merely sought to crush the life's blood out of their country, in order to obtain means to minister to their own inordinate pleasures. And the people, the people, the twenty-five millions—they were starving, they were starving. The Revolution was inevitable, and its excess of violence was only in proportion to the debt which had for so many ages been accumulating. Deeds of blood were done during those six years, the recounting of which makes the blood curdle in one's veins; but then, think of the hundreds of years during which the combustibles of that six years' explosion were in preparation. The governing classes had become too thoroughly corrupt, to allow any hope of effecting a change excepting by violence,—and who shall set limits when once retaliation is in the hands of the multitude?

*"For then there was no Tribune to speak the word of might,
Which makes the rich man tremble, and guards the poor man's right.
There was no brave Licinius, no honest Sextius then;
But all the city, in great fear, obeyed the wicked Ten."*

Ay, and all France had too long been ruled by a despotism. The poor people of France had no Tribune—no representative to speak the word of might, and to guard the poor man's right. No, all that the people of France had to do was to patiently suffer—to support their rulers in idle, nay, in licentious luxury, and themselves to want for bare bread. Surely this was very far from the greatest, happiness to the greatest possible number!

Is France—is Europe, better or Worse on account of the French Revolution? Undoubtedly better. A strange, unwieldy Republic had been formed on the western shores of the Atlantic, and stood as a monument of contented liberty to the whole of the Old World. Suffering France bestirred itself, and though its position and its historical associations prevented it from building an edifice like that of the United States, yet its Revolution served at all events to shake off the unjust oppression which had held it riveted for so many centuries. The chains of feudalism were broken, whatever else might be forged on which to anchor the vessel of state. And there is not a nation on the Continent which has not felt the effect of this Revolution in the character of its government. Truly did the Republic, and its adopted son, Napoleon Buonaparte, teach the sovereigns of Europe—

"That common men have rights as well as kings."

The fire-brand which was thrown in the midst of the ancient dynasties is even burning to this day, and for many years will continue to burn. Fearful and bloody as was the Revolution of '89, yet every thinking man must feel that it was one of the great cleansing epochs in the history of the world. The soul-numbing Shams of ages received a rude shock, and, by the ordeal, Truth, at all events, became purified of a great portion of the festering hypocrisies which had grown around it.

In all revolutions, and particularly when the principal actors in them are the uneducated part of the community, many outrageous extravagancies and fearful cruelties are sure to stain the best of causes; but where would Progress find a home and a pathway in the world, if the fear of these extravagancies and cruelties altogether deterred mankind from action?

"Wagt es, Herr!

Eu'r Walton hat ein Ende. Der Tyrann

Des Landes ist gefallen. Wir erdulden

Keine Gewalt mehr. Wir sind freie Menschen."

Wir sind freie Menschen,—we are free men! Ah! the way to every perfection in this lower world must be through blood. *Wir sind freie Menschen*, indeed! No nation ever could call itself free until blood—ay, and often much blood, had been shed As it was in the Jewish kingdom of old; as it was with the Roman plebeians; as it was in the days of our Magna Charta; so was it with the poor Swiss who fought with Tell; and so is it even to this, the year eighteen hundred and sixty-nine. And we almost weep as we mournfully shake our heads with the noble and pure-spirited Madame Roland, and echo to her murmur—

"O LIBERTY! WHAT THINGS ARE DONE IN THY NAME!"

Souter and Stock, Printers, Princes Street North, Dunedin.

Democracy the Climax of Political Progress and the Destiny of Advanced Races: An Historical Essay.
By J. Lothrop Motley.

Australian Edition. Melbourne: George Robertson, 69 Elizabeth Street. MDCCCLXIX.

Preface to the Australian Edition.

THE elequent and forcible defence of Democracy by the eminent American historian and statesman John Lothrop Motley, here reprinted for the benefit of Australian renders, has already had a very wide circulation both in America and England. It is, beyond question, the ablest exposition of the fundamental ideas and principles of genuine Democracy that has been published within the living generation. Nor are its force and value for readers here lessened by the circumstance that the author deals with his subject somewhat alter the manner of his countrymen. The argument for American democracy is, almost to the letter, the argument for Australian democracy. What the one country has become, the other is fast becoming. Both alike are under the irresistible spell and power of a "manifest destiny." A perusal of De Tocqueville's famous book cannot fail to leave upon the mind of any intelligent Australian a strong conviction of the similarity between the general conditions of American society, as that keen and philosophic observer noted five-and-thirty years ago, and those of the society around him. The political and social progress of the Great 'Western Republic thus becomes, so to speak, a mirror in which Australians may see reflected the future progress of their own country. Hence there is for them a special interest in every exposition that comes to them, bearing any weight of authority, of

the true character and tendencies of American democracy. And if there be one of the citizens of that Republic whose claim to be heard in defence of the political institutions of his country stands supreme and indisputable, that citizen is certainly John Lothrop Motley. The claim has been well proved by the publication of the grandest historical work yet written by any American pen, and also by the ablest statement

Published in the *Times* some years ago.

in defence of the Republican party and its policy throughout the great Civil War, that has ever appeared. The claim, moreover, has been acknowledged and fitly rewarded by Mr. Motley's grateful fellow-countrymen, in his appointment to the coveted office of Ambassador to the Court of St. James's.

As the historian of the noble struggles, long-sustained, and finally triumphant, of a democratic republic against a monarchical despotism of the most oppressive and hateful character, Mr. Motley stands unexcelled amongst historical writers in the English tongue. The publication of his first work, the *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, placed him at once in the foremost rank of living historians. It would scarcely be too high merit to award him, to say that his writings combine all the brilliancy and movement of Lord Macaulay's best manner with all the fidelity of Froude. His vivid pages glow and burn with the genuine fire of Thucydides, and they present pictures of the era as faithful to fact and nature as the pages of Tacitus. No man who loves knowledge for its own sake, can say that he knows all that history at its best is capable of achieving in illuminating the mind and stirring the heart, until he has followed throughout Motley's splendid volumes, the glorious story of the self-devoted patriotism, the unconquerable bravery, the high inspired heroism, of the founders of the Dutch Republic, diaries Lamb characteristically suggested to his friend Manning, when the latter was proposing to take a voyage to China, to "read a few romances to *coal down* his imagination." The same suggestion might be made in sober earnest to a reader who has just laid down the last volume of the *History of the United Netherlands*. Romance pales into colourless commonplace beside such a story of real life as there is evolved in that masterly work and its predecessor. The wand of the great magician himself who conjured up the marvellous scenes of chivalry in *Ivanhoe* is less potent,—as truth is always grander than fiction,—than the pen which records in imperishable English the course of the Inquisition in Holland, the bloody rule of the merciless Alva, the siege of Antwerp, the battle of Nieuport, the leaguer of Ostend, the heroic life and glorious death of William the Silent, warrior, statesman, patriot, and martyr.

D. B.

June 22nd, 1869.

Democracy.

I HAVE the honour of addressing the Historical Society in the Great Metropolis of the Great Republic. These simple words suggest to me so wide a range of thought, that you will pardon me if I do not dwell on local details of our history or of any history. I see before me an immense result, and I would fain grope my way, with such lantern as I can provide for myself, towards causes whether distant or near. As I have sometimes wandered almost at random through this magnificent city; as I marked the long, sumptuous avenues of stone and marble houses, which seemed to multiply even while I looked upon them—as in tropical regions the strenuous, full, vitalised vegetation, with its gorgeous blossoms, rampant vines, overshadowing foliage, expands in growth almost beneath the gazers eye; as I saw the innumerable steamers and ships which crowd your wharves, like moving woods and shifting palaces, forming an unbroken chain of connection with every zone and clime; as I moved through the crowded mart, whose slightest throb sends a pulsation through the world; as I felt myself—a casual spectator—caught up and whirled along, almost against my will, on the impetuous rapids of this swift commercial life; when I surveyed this million-headed monster stretching forth its feelers and feeders—its long lines of rail, river, and canal—into the far distance, devouring for its daily needs the product of farm, forest, factory, and mine in every corner of the globe; clutching in its ever-expanding arms, as each day rolls on, thousands of the forlorn, the adventurous, the outcast, and lifting them out of misery into hope; assimilating all this discordant material into its own flesh and blood with a swiftness which suggests an occasional doubt whether such violent digestive powers are quite natural or wholesome; as I turned from these scenes of excitement to the stately parks—than which nothing more luxurious is to be found in older and imperial cities—to the frequent splendid churches of every sect, to the colleges, libraries, institutions of charity, of administration, and justice; as I looked upon and listened to this vast, resonant, vehement whole, I was oppressed with a single thought—that all this is of to-day. There is something at once startling and depressing in the rapidity with which this result has been reached.

We talk of History. No man can more highly appreciate than I do the noble labours of this Society, and of

others in this country, for the preservation of memorials belonging to our brief but most important Past. We can never collect too many of them, nor ponder them too carefully, for they mark the era of a new civilization. But that interesting past presses so closely upon our sight that it seems still a portion of the present—the glimmering dawn preceding the noontide of to-day. I shall not be misunderstood, then, if I say that there is no such thing as human history. Nothing can be more profoundly, sadly true. The annals of mankind have never been written, never can be written; nor would it be within human capacity to read them if they were written. We have a leaf or two torn from the groat hook of human fate as it flutters in the storm-winds ever sweeping across the earth. We decipher them as we best can, with purblind eyes, and endeavour to learn their mystery as we float along to the abyss; but it is all confused babble—hieroglyphics of which the key is lost. Consider but a moment. The island on which this city stands is perhaps as perfect a site as man could desire for a great commercial, imperial city. Byzantium, which the lords of the ancient world built for the capital of the earth—which the temperate and vigorous Turk, in the days of his stern military discipline, plucked from the decrepit hands which held the sceptre of Cæsar and Constantine, and for the possession of which the present lords of Europe are wrangling; not Byzantium nor hundred-gated Thebes, not London nor Liverpool, Paris nor Moscow, can surpass the future certainties of this thirteen-mile-long Manhattan. And yet it was but yesterday—for what are two centuries and a half in the boundless vista of the Past?—that the Mohawk and the Mohican were tomahawking and scalping each other throughout these regions, and had been doing so for centuries; when the whole surface of this island, now groaning under millions of wealth which oppress the imagination, hardly furnished a respectable hunting-ground for a single Sachem, in his war-paint and moccasins, who imagined himself proprietor of the soil. But yesterday, Cimmerian darkness, primeval night; to-day grandeur, luxury, wealth, power.

I came not here to-night to draw pictures or pour forth dithyrambics, that I may gratify your vanity, or my own, whether municipal or national. To appreciate the unexampled advantages bestowed by the Omnipotent upon this favoured Republic His youngest child of civilization, is rather to oppress the thoughtful mind with an overwhelming sense of responsibility—to sadden with quick-coming fears—to torture with reasonable doubts. The world's great hope is here. The future of humanity—at least for that cycle in which we are now revolving—depends mainly upon the manner in which we deal with our great trust. The good old times! Where and when were those good old times? "All times, when old, are good," says Byron.

*"And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to 'dusty death,'"*

says the great master of morals and humanity. But neither fools nor sages, neither individuals nor nations, have any other light to guide them on the track which all must tread, save that long glimmering vista of yesterdays which grows so swiftly fainter and fainter as the present fades off into the past. And I believe it possible to discover a law out of all this apparently chaotic whirl and bustle—this tangled skein of human affairs—as it spins itself through the centuries. That law is Progress—slow, confused, contradictory, but ceaseless development, intellectual and moral, of the human race.

It is of Human Progress that I speak to-night. It is of Progress that I find a startling result when I survey the spectacle which the American Present displays. This nation stands on the point toward which other people are moving. It has put itself—or rather, destiny has placed it—more immediately than other nations, in subordination to the law governing all bodies political as inexorably as Kepler's law controls the motions of the planets. The law is Progress; the result Democracy, Nearly forty years ago the clear philosophical mind of De Tocqueville was so impressed by this comparatively infant Republic, the phenomena of which he had examined with microscopic minuteness, and with statesmanlike breadth of vision, that he exhorted his countrymen and Europe in general to accept the fact that Democracy was the preordained condition of the human race—a condition to which the world was steadily tending—and to seek happiness in conforming to the divine command, instead of wearing themselves out in futile struggles with the inevitable. Circumstances, mainly due to now very obvious phenomena in the policy of this country, to which the philosopher did not pay sufficient heed, have retarded the result, but it is again signalling its approach with swiftly augmenting speed. Whether it be a bane or a blessing, it is all-important for us to accept and make the best of it. No man more thoroughly believes and rejoices in the fundamental truth on which our system is founded than I do; but it is not to flatter nor exult that I allude to this foremost position which we occupy—not entirely through our merits, but mainly from the bounty of Heaven.

Sydney Smith once alluded, if I remember rightly, to a person who allowed himself to speak disrespectfully of the equator. I have a strong objection to be suspected of flattering the equator. Yet were it not for that little angle of 23° 27' 26" which it is good enough to make with the plane of the ecliptic, the history of this earth and

of "all which it inherit "would have been essentially modified, even if it had not been altogether a blank. Out of the obliquity of the equator has come forth our civilization. It was long observed by one of the most thoughtful writers that ever dealt with human history, John von Herder, that it was to the gradual shading away of zones and alternation of seasons that the vigour and variety of mankind were attributable. Nothing good or great had ever come out of the eternal Spring or Midsummer of the tropics, nor from the thick-ribbed Winter of the poles. From the temperate zone, with its healthful and stimulating succession of seasons, have come civilization and progress. But for this graceful inclination of our mother earth toward the sun, as she revolves about that source of light and life—a dip which great Jupiter, standing perpendicular on his plane, disdains to make, and doubt less causes his children to suffer woefully inconsequence—who can tell whether our places might not have been occupied by wandering savages or speechless brutes? It is certainly no merit of ours, however, that the earth makes this blessed angle, and as earth-men we may gratefully recognise our superiority to Jupiterians without being braggarts. And, as Americans, we have the right to rejoice—but with trembling—at the more fortunate conditions in which our political orbit has been traced around that great central fact toward which all civilised bodies must turn. I have never remarked, moreover, that the nations by whom our tendency to boastfulness is sometimes rebuked are absolutely overwhelmed with bashfulness themselves, or ready to sink into the earth with shame, when alluding to their own advantages or achievements. Self-assertion is perhaps the natural, although not engaging, characteristic of vigorous and progressive peoples. It is sometimes as well to appreciate as to despise in national self-contemplation. And certainly we are never likely to pine for want of sharp criticism on this or the other side the water; for if ever nation survived perpetual vivisection, especially during the last half-dozen years, and grew fat and strong upon it, that nation is America. Not a quivering muscle, not a thrilling nerve, even in moments of tension and agony, but has been laid hare before the world, and serenely lectured upon for the instruction of ignorant audiences by the learned doctors of privilege; but when the long sigh of relief had been drawn from the spectators at the demonstrated death of Democracy, behold the monster on his feet again, and very much more alive than ever. There is no reason, then, why we should shrink from our opinions, even if not entirely unfavourable to our national character or our national hopes. I honour the man of opinions, and of courage to proclaim them, and I deprecate neither the wrath nor the lamentations of the prophets of evil on either side the ocean. Men of genius and virtue have uttered boding shrieks from time to time, and have done us excellent service. I trust sincerely that their voices may never grow too hoarse to croak for our good. And if I speak hopefully, even in regions where Mammon is supposed to be not entirely without votaries—

*"Mammon, the least creeled spirit that fell
From heaven—"*

it is because I know that the pursuit of riches in this country, maddening and often demoralising though it be, has strengthened the energies of the land, and that wealth has been poured forth like water at all times and seasons, whenever needed to save a nation, to encourage enterprise, relieve distress, or foster science and art. Out of the vast reservoir the overflow has been constant. If Midas has bathed in our Pactolus, and Croesus incrustated himself all over in its golden waters, we know, too, that its perennial streams have fertilised the broadest prairies and the lowest depths of humanity.

I asked, where and when were the good old times? This earth of ours has been spinning about in space, great philosophers tell us, some few hundred millions of years. We are not very familiar with our predecessors on this continent. For the present, the oldest inhabitant must be represented here by the man of Natchez, whose bones were unearthed not long ago under the Mississippi bluffs, in strata which were said to argue him to be at least 100,000 years old. Yet he is a mere moderm, a *person* on this planet, if we are to trust illustrious teachers of science, compared with men whose bones and whose implements have been found in high mountain valleys and gravel pits of Europe; while these again are thought by the same authorities to be descendants of races which flourished many year-thousands before, and whose relics science is confidently expecting to discover, although the icy sea had once engulfed them and their dwelling-places. We of to-day have no filial interest in the man of Natchez, He was no ancestor of ours, nor have he and his descendants left traces along the dreary track of their existence to induce a desire to claim relationship with them. We are Americans; but yesterday we were Europeans—Netherlanders, Saxons, Normans, Swabians, Celts; and the day before yesterday, Asiatics, Mongolisms—what you will. Go to the ancestral home of many of us; strike into the very heart of London with pickaxe and spade; sink a shaft in the central ganglion of confused and thickly crammed streets about Tower Hill and Thames Street, along which the ever-accumulating mass of traffic has been rolling for a dozen centuries, and if you go deep enough, and excavate widely enough, you will find beautiful statues, tessellated pavements, mosaic pictures, pagan shrines—relics of that puissant Roman people who governed what they

thought the world, when Britons were painted savages. Yet they never dreamed of the existence of that great American continent where the man of Natchez and his race had been roaming hundreds of year-thousands before, but never producing temples nor pictures, statues nor fountains. For what are Roman antiquities in England or anywhere else? Many of us trace back our ancestry to Bedfordshire and Suffolk, and are never weary of tracking the footsteps of our pilgrim fathers in quiet villages and peaceful English scenery of two or three hundred years ago. Go back two or three hundred thousand years, and saunter on the margin of the Ouse or through the primitive valleys of Bedford, and find your ancestors—as great naturalists inform us you will contemporaries and companions of the mammoth and the woolly rhinoceros, the lion, and the hyena. Yet we talk of history, because we can grope backward dimly and vaguely for a matter of thirty centuries, while those rude forefathers of ours have faded for ever from our chronicles.

Men, through all ages—other than those accepting the revelations of Holy Writ—have solaced or distressed themselves with shadowy or whimsical fancies of a great beginning of the universe and of themselves; but perhaps they had better pause in their theorizing until the modern dauntless investigators shall find, in full fruition of their hopes, among the fossils of the pre-glacial period, some connecting anthroposimial links, some precious relics of the ancient ancestral ape, and

*"Madly play with that great kinsman's bone
As with a club,"*

to smite all other theories to the earth. But even then we shall probably arrive at the same conclusion with the venerable Ephraim Jenkinson, in the *Vicar of Wakefield*, who sold Moses a gross of green spectacles, and told him at the same time that "the cosmogony or creation of the world had puzzled the philosophers of all ages." One thing is certain: man is here. And another thing is equally certain: he has arrived at his present condition through a long series of improvements and developments. Placed on "this isthmus of a middle state," between two eternities, he looks backward with a curiosity half exultant, half loathing, and forward with a hope which is often akin to despair. To be created at once in likeness to the Omnipotent and to a fantastic brute; to be compounded thus of the bestial and the angelic, alternately dragged upward and downward by conflicting forces, presses upon us the conviction, even without divine revelation, that this world is a place of trial—of progress toward some higher sphere. Perhaps, to beings in the next stage above us, our gambols may seem very ludicrous before high heaven. But let the gorilla stand erect in frightful caricature of humanity. Weigh his brain and a Hottentot's together in the same balance, if you choose, and find less difference between the two than between Hannibal's and a more southern African's. Until you can find a dumb animal endowed with the religious faculty, who worships the Eternal Father on his knees, who has treasured in his heart the hope of an immortal future, who "looks before and after, and pines for what is not," you may be sure that the interval between man and the angels will be crossed at a single leap sooner than the infinite space between the brute and man will be diminished by a hair's-breadth. All the inconceivable time since primeval man before the glacial flood is but an hour's span compared to that which the brute must traverse before he can crawl even to the threshold of humanity. There is something in man alone which has weighed the heavenly bodies, measured their inconceivable distances, marked the spot where lost worlds after year-thousands must reappear, prescribed the course in which the planets wheel, expounded the laws which the universe obeys; something which has guided the almost divine finger of the sculptor, the pencil of the painter, to create visions more beautiful than Nature's self has revealed; something which has inspired the poet to raise his less gifted brethren into spheres of thought and emotion far above the visible world; something which has produced from shapeless matter the Grecian temple, the Gothic cathedral, the Pacific railroad; something which has nerved heroes to despise luxury and welcome death in the sacred cause of country; something which ties the great sailor to the maintop, above the smoke of the conflict, that he may control his fleet and guide the battle, nor fall, even though he die, until victory is won; something which chains the great soldier, despite of danger, opposition, or censure, to one line, even if it takes all summer—ay, and all winter too—when duty commands; something which has sustained thousands of obscure men and feeble women as they were consuming by slow fire at the stake, when a word against what they believed religious truth would have saved them. So long as history garners such proofs of progress out of the lower depths, man needs not to tremble lest the angelic part of him should be imperilled by his likeness to the brute.

Language makes man. The beast can chatter, roar, or bellow, but man can speak. The child talks in fragments, and earlier languages are monosyllabic. A Chinese Dr. Johnson would be impossible. He would perish for want of polysyllables. If it had not been for the tower of Babel we should have been spared much superfluous trouble, for although we all are speaking very choice Aryan at bottom, we find it difficult to converse fluently with each other in that tongue, or even in the more modern Sanscrit, which we are told by

great scholars—no doubt with accuracy—is essentially English, French, German, or Greek. It is an awful thought that languages, perhaps, cannot live unless they are stone dead. Cicero or Demosthenes might take his stand on any platform to-day and be reported in the papers for a classically educated public speaker; but should King Alfred come from his tomb, like the elder Hamlet, to reveal important secrets, he would find no living soul, save a professor or two, throughout his ancient realms, to comprehend his warnings. We celebrated Shakespeare's third centenary four years ago. Let another half-a-dozen centuries go by, and perhaps 'there will be none to philosophize with Hamlet or weep over the sorrows of Lear. Shakespeare himself may become as mythical as either of those princes whom he seems to have endowed with immortality, and some future Wolf may divide him into a score of balladmongers. It is a dreary possibility at least, that unless the Anglo-Saxon race dies out after a few centuries, the accretions and transmutations of language may make those wonderful dramas as obsolete as the odes of the Kymri or the lays of Llewellyn. Man, as far back as we know or imagine him, could speak; but it was long before he learned his letters, without which accomplishment erudition is apt to be limited. At last Schoolmaster Cadmus came out of the East—as is the habit of schoolmasters—and brought sixteen counters in his pocket which he had picked up among the Pelasgians. The schoolmaster being abroad at last, progress became rapid enough. For in truth what human invention can compare with that of the alphabet? It is no wonder that Cadmus was pronounced not only a king's son, but allied to the Immortals. "Founders of states and lawgivers," says Lord Bacon, "were honoured with titles of demigods, but inventors were consecrated among the gods themselves." And if heathen mythology still prevailed, what a pantheon we should have in the Patent Office at Washington!

After the almost infinite space already traversed by mankind, at last something like tradition, record, and monumental history began. And contemporaneous with the epoch of Egyptian and Hebrew grandeur there was a siege—so men say—of a city in Asia Minor, and it chanced that a blind man sang some songs about it, if he was a man and was blind. Wonderful power of poetic genius! The leading personages in that war, their passions and sentiments, the minute details of their costume, the colour of their hair and eyes, the names of their soldiers, and their ships, their habits of social life, the scenery surrounding them, the daily military and household events of that insignificant quarrel are almost as familiar in this remote hemisphere to-day as the siege of Vicksburg, with all its heroic, picturesque, and passionate circumstance, and its momentous consequences for all time. And out of the confusion of songs, monuments, and records there comes at last a glimmer of chronology. There, was once a cook in Athens. Whether he was skilful or not in the kitchen is not known, but he was swift of foot. He ran a race at the Olympic games, his name was the first to be recorded as victor in the archives of those festivals, and accordingly the subsequent history of Greece, with all her heroes, poets, sages, is registered from the Olympiad in which Corcebus won his race. Strangely enough, too, the date of this first-registered Olympiad has a sacred but familiar sound in our ears. It was 776 years before Christ. One thousand seven hundred and seventy-six years after Christ another epoch was established, from which this great Republic dates its records; a day on which equal rights were proclaimed as the heritage of mankind—a nobler era for the world than any that cooks or racers are ever likely to establish. At exactly the same period with Corcebus—as chronologists have settled it among themselves—there was a certain she-wolf in an Italian swamp with a pair of human foster-children. And, as we all have read in the storybooks, the foster-children founded a city which has had much influence for good and evil upon the cause of human progress.

The orbit of civilization, so far as our perishing records enable us to trace it, seems preordained from east to west. China, India, Palestine, Egypt, Greece, Rome, are successively lighted up as the majestic orb of day moves over them, and, as he Ranees still further through his storied and mysterious xodiac, we behold the shadows of evening as surely falling on the lands which he leaves behind him.

Religion, poetry, æsthetic art have already ennobled the progress of man. What would the world have been without Palestine? What present idea of human civilization would be possible without the poetry, sculpture, architecture, the magnificent drama, the subtle, lofty, almost divine philosophy of Greece—without the imperious and cruel nationalism, the all-surpassing: military art, the colossal self-esteem, the cynic materialism, the massive, sharply-chiselled jurisprudence which made Rome the mistress of the world? Dead Athens shines there for ever—not a constellation, but a whole universe of lustre—with the milky way of her exquisite, half-nebulous fables; with the pure starry light of her fixed and unchanging truths illuminating vast spaces of obscurity before and since her brief mortal' existence;—Rome, both in her military and legal glory, and in her shameful crapulous decrepitude, remains a perpetual memory to encourage human progress, and to warn from the dangers of luxury, ambition, and ineffable disdain of human rights by which she justly perished. And then came the wandering of the nations—the northern deluge. Rome sank miserably beneath the glacial flood which, like that in early geological ages, had become necessary in the grand scheme of civilization. Surely the Roman world had need of submergence and of ice. And at last, as the deluge subsided, Germany conquered Rome, and the new civilization began. But a low civilization at best. The iron-clad man on horseback divided the whole soil among his captains and corporals; the multitudes were throttled and made to wear the collar of serfdom

marked with their owners' names; burglars and filibusters became kings, princes, by grace of God—which meant the steel-gloved list; the feudal system was established, and poetry, romance, grovelling legend and sycophantic chronicle have spread a halo around the perpetual crime unto our own days. Man still reeled on—falling, rising again, staggering forward with hue and cry at his heels, a wounded felon daring to escape from the prison to which grace of God had inexorably doomed him.

And still there was progress. Beside the sword two other instruments grew every day more potent—the pen and the purse. The power of the pen soon created a stupendous monopoly. Clerks obtained privilege of murder, because of their learning; a Norman king gloried in the appellation of fine clerk because he could spell; the sons of serfs and washerwomen became high pontiffs, put their feet on the necks of emperors through the might of education, and appalled the souls of idiotic tyrants with their weird anathemas. Naturally the priests kept the talisman of learning to themselves. How should education help them to power and pelf if the people could participate in the mystic spell? But there was another power steadily augmenting the magic purse of Fortunatas, with its clink of perennial gold. Commerce changed clusters of hovels, cowering for protection under feudal castles, into powerful cities. Burghers wrested or purchased liberties from their lords and masters. And at last there were leagues of municipalities, chains of commercial republics, in all but name, stretched across Christendom, and tripping up Tyranny at every turn. Liberties in the plural, not liberty of man; concessions to corporations from the iron fist, from grace of God, in exchange for coin or in reparation of buffets.

And still Man struggled on. An experimenting friar, fond of chemistry, in one corner of Europe put nitre and charcoal together; a sexton or doctor in another obscure nook carved letters on blocks of wood; and, lo! there were explosions shaking the solid earth and causing the iron-clad man on horseback to reel in his saddle. Much good was accomplished both in the ancient and the new establishments, but freedom of religion was scarcely dreamed of; mutual toleration was accounted a crime. It was no wonder that Dr. Faustas was supposed to have sold his soul to the fiend. Whence but from devilish alliance could he have derived such power to strike down grace of God? But sacerdotalism (political priesthood) reigned too long and went too far. There was a reformation, but it was only a leap into the light. Priesthood was triumphant after all, for Church and State maintained their incestuous union. The people obtained new creeds, if their masters professed one, or remained with the ball and chain of ancient dogma rivetted to their limbs, if their masters remained faithful to that. Whoever governs you, his religion shall be yours! *Cujus regio, ejus religio*— were ever more blasphemous and insulting words hurled in the face of mankind? Yet this was accepted as the net result of the Reformation, so far as priests and princes could settle the account. This was the ingenious compromise by which it was thought possible to remove the troublesome question of religion for ever from the sphere of politics. *Cujus regio, ejus religio*. Could it be doubted that the ancient church would seize this weapon from the Protestant hands which had forged it, and smite every people with it that struggled for emancipation? Not freedom of religion, but freedom of princes to prescribe religion to their slaves. For this so many tens of thousands had died on the battle-field or been burned and buried alive. And it was sincerely hoped and believed that humanity could be thus remanded to its dungeon, buffeted, flouted, jeered out of its rights, and the padlock placed for ever on the immortal mind. And truly, to those who reckon history by the year, who find the record of Man's progress only in political annals, how dreary must seem our fate! Unless we hold fast to the fact, that in human, as in physical history, Nature is ever patiently producing her effects through long lapses of time, by causes which have been in operation since the beginning, history is but another word for despair. But history is never hysterical, never proceeds by catastrophes and cataclysms; and it is only by remembering this, that we can comprehend its higher meaning.

But now another talisman was to change the face of the world; for the great discoveries are apt to leap from the highly electrified brain of man at identical epochs. Christopher Columbus, confiding in his own stout heart and the mariner's compass, sailed forth on unknown seas, and—behold America! Here was the chief event thus far recorded in human progress, as time, in its deliberate patience, was one day to prove. Speech, the Alphabet, Mount Sinai, Egypt, Greece, Rome, Nazareth, the Wandering of the Nations, the Feudal System, Magna Charta, Gunpowder, Printing, the Reformation, the Mariner's Compass, America—here are some of the great landmarks of human motion. As we pause for a moment's rest after our rapid sweep through the cons and the centuries, have we not the right to record proof of man's progress since the days of the rhinoceros-eaters of Bedfordshire, of the man of Natchez?

But what concerns us most nearly at present is the actual civilization of Europe and America. Europe and America—twin sisters—the one long hidden in entranced sleep within primeval forests, while the other was slowly groping its way along the path of progress; yet both indissolubly connected by an ever-palpating bond. In the fullness of time, after so many errors, crimes, and disappointments, civilization seemed to find a fresh field for its endeavours, as the discovery of this continent revealed a virgin world. It is impossible to imagine a more fortunate position than that occupied by this Republic. Nature has done its best, and it is not for physical advantages alone that she should be ever grateful. To be rid of the cumbrous machinery of military conquest; to

have escaped from all the good Lamas into whom the soul of the great Schaka successively passes, enduing them with infallibility and omniscience; to have forgotten many of these worn-out traditions of Europe and Asia, is a boon for which America ought to be daily upon her knees. But to the solemn birthday of the infant America, around whose cradle, obscure as it was, so many good spirits had invisibly clustered, one malignant fairy had not been bidden, and her name was Privilege. And even as in the story-books, she sent a curse to avenge the slight. Almost on that natal day—we know the tale too well, and have had cause to ponder it bitterly—came the accursed bark, with its freight of victims from unhappy Africa, and Privilege had silently planted in this virgin soil the seeds of her future sway. It was an accident—if anything can be called accidental in the grand scheme of creation—yet out of that grain of mustard-seed was one day to sprout an evil to overshadow this land; to poison with its deadly exhalations the vigorous atmosphere of freedom. Oligarchy grew up and held its own side by side with Democracy—until the time came for deciding whether the one principle or the other was in conformity with the eternal law.

Chemistry resolves the universe into a few ingredients. What, for example, is a man? Take a little hydrogen and oxygen, nitrogen and carbon, potash, lime, and sulphur, with a pinch or two of salt, and there is your hero or your prize-fighter, your Plato or your Washington. And political chemistry is no less subtle and rapid in its analysis. Oligarchy is resolved into the same gaseous vapours on one side the ocean and the other. So soon as it was demonstrated that the Slave power rested on Divine right; so soon as it was ascertained on authority that the Bible ordained not negro Slavery merely, but human Slavery without distinction of colour, as a divine institution; so soon as it had been proclaimed that "the Bible argument in favour of Slavery was its sheet anchor;" so soon as it had been categorically stated at the South "that Slavery is just, natural, and necessary, and that it does not depend on difference of colour;" so soon as the new Evangel had announced that "the experiment of universal liberty had failed, that the evils of free society are insufferable, and that policy and humanity alike forbade the extension of its evils to new people and coming generations," and that "there was no solution of the great problem of reuniting the interests of capital and labour so simple and effective as to make the labourer himself capital in all which statements I am only quoting literally from eminent slave-power authority—it became obvious that the identity of Privilege whether cis or trans-Atlantic was perfect. Grace of God, Right Divine, property in mankind claimed by human creatures superior to mankind, military dominion, political priesthood—what are all these but the nitrogen, hydrogen, carbon, lime, and potash, out of which Privilege is always compounded. Yet this great innocent, ingenuous American Demos rubbed its eyes with astonishment, as its great fight with Oligarchy began, to find no tears running down the iron cheek of Privilege. Why, Privilege would have been an idiot if it had wept in sympathy with the Demos. Slavery and serfdom had been abolished throughout Europe, but so long as the soil of many great empires belong to an exquisite small minority of the inhabitants, are not Wamba the witless and Gurth the swineherd almost as much born thralls to their master as if his collar was still upon their necks?

"Patriotism," said Samuel Johnson at the epoch of our war of Independence, "is the last refuge of a scoundrel." His parents believed, you remember, in the right divine of a royal queen's finger to cure the scrofula. And there have been a series of Dr. Johnsons from his day to ours, all over Europe, to denounce patriots and republicans, especially when they are causing interruptions to trade. So close an electric chain unites America and Europe, so instantaneous are their action and retroaction, that the American civil war, at least in Western Europe, became as much an affair of passionate party feeling as if it were raging on that side the Atlantic. "I had no idea," said a very eminent statesman to John Bright on two different occasions, "how much influence the example of that Republic was having upon public opinion in England, until I discovered the universal congratulation that the Republic was likely to be broken up." And yet, strange to say, in spite of the breathless interest with which the result and the daily details were watched for, it would be difficult to exaggerate the ignorance enwrapping the general mind of Europe as to the merits and meaning of the conflict. In popular periodicals and lectures of to-day you may learn much of the bays, rivers, inlets, oceans, and continents of the planet Mars; and if inclined for a vacation excursion, and could you find a conveyance thither, you might easily arrange a tour in that planet, starting from Huggin's Inlet and sailing 30,000 miles along one of its very convenient estuaries without ever losing sight of land. I know not whether the Martians have accepted the nomenclature of Dawes Continent, Table-Leg Bay, and the other designations laid down on their planet by the spirited geographers of ours, but at least they might be flattered did they know of the interest they excite on this earth. Perhaps, however, if they knew what was said of them here, they might be almost as much amazed as we used to be in America at the wonderful discoveries made by Europe concerning our politics, geography, history, statistics, national character, Constitution, and condition, during the late civil war. It was not that light was impossible. The thinkers and the workers were never misled; the brains and the bone and muscle of Europe were in the right place. Without mentioning other illustrious names which might be cited, I will remind you but of this. There was one man in England—greatest and truest of all—who made our cause his own through good report and bad report, and whose voice found an echo in every patriotic heart in this country; whose intellect

shone like the sun through the mists of passion and prejudice obscuring the cause of liberty; a man whose public speeches will be treasured on either side the ocean as models of earnest thought and pure English eloquence; a statesman whose simple Anglo-Saxon name will be always dear to lovers of liberty everywhere in future time as in the present; you know already that I mean John Bright.

And the great conflict went on while the world stood wondering. Never in human history has there been such a battle with such a stake. It was not for territory, empire, power. It was not merely for the integrity of the vast Republican heritage. These things, though precious, are of little worth compared to the sacred principle concerned in the struggle. For it was to be decided whether the great law of history which we have been tracing was a truth or a lie; whether the human race has been steadily, although slowly progressing, or whether we have been fatally drifting back to chaos. For surely, if freedom is an evil from which society, new or old, is to be saved, and slavery the great remedy and the great hope of the world, the only solution of political problems, then is the science of history the most dismal and contemptible of all imaginable studies. It was not a question for America, but for the world. The toiling multitudes of the whole earth are interested in the fate of this great republic of refuge, which receives and protects the oppressed of every race. "My countrymen, who work for your living," said John Bright at Birmingham, in 1863, "remember this; there will be one wild shriek of freedom to startle all mankind if that Republic should be overthrown." But the game was fought out, and both winners and losers are the gainers. The South, while deeming itself to have lost all save honour, will be more prosperous than it ever dreamed of, ere a generation of mankind shall have passed away. Let its "bruised arms be hung up for monuments," along with the trophies of the triumphant North, for the valour, the endurance, and self-sacrifice were equal on both sides, and the defeated party was vanquished because neither pride of colour nor immortal hate can successfully struggle against the inexorable law of freedom and progress.

I have spoken much of America. The political affairs of its sister Europe are at this moment in a more fluid state than usual. The effect of the triumph of freedom in this country on the cause of progress in Europe is plain; but it would be impossible, in the limits of this address, to take a survey of the whole field. It seems natural, however, to glance at the political and social heart of Europe—Germany. Ever since the great rising for freedom against the Roman Empire, from near the dawn of the Christian Era down to this hour, Germany has been the main source of European and American culture. The common mother of nations and empires—*alma mater felix prote*—she still rules the thought of her vast brood of children—Franks, Saxons, Netherlander, Americans, Germans,—all. Her Gothic branches, in the fifth and sixth centuries sweeping to and fro over the extinct Roman empire, from the *ultima thule* of Britain to the confines of Asia; her energetic Norman branch of pirates, seating themselves with such happy audacity on every throne in Europe, from the Williams and Henrys of the North to the Rogers, Tancreds, Godfreys, of the South and East—from the Rurics of Russia to the Roderics of Spain; everywhere, in high places and low, all-conquering Germany has stamped our civilization with her impress, and bequeathed to modern languages the treasures of her ample and varied dialects: but everywhere, separation into small national groupings was the initial characteristic of European history. Seven German kingdoms in what we now call England; as many independent dukes and sovereigns in present France; a dozen kings in Spain; in Italy; hundreds of them in Germany proper; a plurality of sovereigns, in short, in all the districts of Christendom,—thus was Europe broken into hostile and discordant fragments. And the tendency to unite these jarring sovereignties into a few solid masses has marked her later history. A thousand years ago there was a Heptarchy in half the little island of Britain. Now Europe itself is hardly more than a Heptarchy, five hundred years ago the seven Electors of the Emperor acquired complete sovereignty within their own dominions. Three centuries later, when the shameful peace of Westphalia had at last ended that conflict of demons which we call the Thirty Years' War, the disunion of Germany was completed. More than 300 sovereignties were established over the unhappy land. Over the 307 independent sovereigns reigned an Emperor, enjoying the privilege of issuing orders which none of them heeded, and of governing despotically his ancestral possessions, too feeble to resist tyranny. Such was the "Holy Roman Empire" an appellation which, as Voltaire remarked, was open to criticism on three points. It was not holy, was not Roman, and was not an empire. With those exceptions the description is perfect. After nearly two centuries more had passed away, the Congress of Vienna, as a part of the little good that it had established for humanity, at least much diminished the catalogue of petty princes in Germany. Three hundred and odd of them went up to that political guillotine, and only thirty-five escaped with life.

The German Demos, somewhat later, striving after union and strength, had partially achieved, under the lead of Prussia, a customs union. The national league, filled with larger ideas of union, resolved, as an exemplification of a principle, to free the German inhabitants of Schleswig-Holstein from the Danish crown. The great powers took the war into their own hands. Else had Democracy taken the bit into its teeth. The Schleswig-Holstein war was soon over. The provinces were taken from Denmark. Then followed the dispute for the booty. The rest of the story is familiar. The seven weeks' war; the disastrous day to Austria of Sadowa; the peace of Prague—which passed all understanding—for, behold, when the smoke was cleared away, not only

was Austria excluded from Germany, but even her allies in the defunct Bund—the Southern States—had accepted, by treaty, the military and commercial supremacy of Prussia. Thus another immense stride had been made toward German unity. In 1648, more than 300 sovereignties; in 1815, three dozen; in 1866, one, essentially, practically one. How much has liberty gained by this progress? Time will show that progress and liberty are identical. It is impossible that all this dazzling success of Prussia is to end in the establishment of one great military empire the more. The example and the retroaction of America, the success here of freedom and progress, forbid that result. The great statesman of Prussia is distinguished for courage, insight, breadth of vision, iron will, and a warm and steadfast heart. His genius consists in the instinctive power of governing by conforming to the spirit of the age. No man knows better than he to read the signs of the times.

Small is the chance of despotism in these latter days to stem the rapids. She may utter dismal shrieks, but shoot Niagara she must. The present government of Austria has placed itself conscientiously on the right road out of great perplexities. The brief history of constitutionalism in that empire is full of instruction. The experiment has been a triple one—centralism, federalism, dualism. The realm is an agglomerate of many distinct nationalities, scattered through ten kingdoms and more than thirty duchies or other principalities. The little river Leytha is the boundary between the hereditary provinces of Hapsburg and the triune realm of the holy Stephen—consisting of Hungary, Transylvania, and Croatia, but commonly called the kingdom of Hungary. After the war of 1859, the right of the Austrian people to representation and legislation was announced in general terms by the October Diploma of 1860, and an elaborate Constitution was proclaimed in the following February. A Central Parliament or Reichsrath was established for the whole empire, consisting of a House of Peers and of a Representative Chamber, chosen, somewhat as United States Senators are elected, for six years and by the Provincial Diets. The Parliament began its session and was hailed with great enthusiasm by the Germanic element throughout the west half. But beyond the Leytha, Hungary scorned the new Constitution, stiffly maintained the continuity of her own, and refused to merge her legal and historical independence in the central imperial system newly promulgated. "We can wait," said Minister Schmerling. "We, too, can wait," replied the Hungarians. And they won the waiting game. In September, 1860, the Schmerling Cabinet fell; the February Constitution was suspended by Imperial edict; the experiment of centralism was acknowledged to have failed, and a cabinet founded on what is called Federalism was formed. Federalism was to consist mainly in enlarging the powers of the provincial diets for consultative and financial purposes, and in coming to an arrangement with Hungary by means of moderate concessions.

The Diet of Hungary was summoned once more. As soon as assembled, the Magyars were found as faithful as ever to the crown of St. Stephen, as indifferent to all other crowns on the brow of their monarch. Not a thought was admitted of swerving from the ancient constitution. The light and soul of the Diet was Francis Deak, a man born in the middle classes, a practising lawyer of moderate fortune, with no personal aims, and of surpassing forensic ability, wielding by the power of genius and integrity an almost despotic sway over the proudest aristocracy in the world. The Prussian war brought the Debates to a sudden close. So soon as it was over the Hungarian Diet was once more convened. Baron Beust, a statesman of quick intellect, large political experience, ready eloquence with tongue and pen, imperturbable temper, and immense power of work, who had long been administrator of the little kingdom of Saxony, become Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Austrian Empire. Considering the experiments both of centralism and of federation to have failed, he decided on complete concession to Hungary. The Constitution was restored at last, and a Hungarian Ministry formed. At Pesth, in the midst of the most stately and picturesque pageant that had been seen in Europe for centuries—a scene so full of historical and mediæval splendour that it seems like a living chapter of Froissart or Phillippe de Commines—the king, attired in a long broca mantle, with the sacred jewelled crown of St. Stephen on his head, and mounted on splendidly-caparisoned white horse which he managed with perfect skill, amid wild shouts of Eljen from his lieges almost mad with enthusiasm, rode up the sacred mound on the Danube, and waved the ancient sword of a long line of ancestors to the four quarters of the world, in symbol of protection to the realm. Hungary was restored.

The next problem was to establish Constitutionalism on the other side of the Leytha. An *e pluribus unum* had failed. An *e pluribus duo* was resolved upon. A kind of constituent assembly of the western provinces was convoked. Then came a great outbreak of dissatisfaction on both sides the Leytha, from the Slavonic nationalities, which considerably outnumber the Germans and the Magyars combined. In Austria the leading three are the German, Hungarian, and Slavonic. The Magyars, the direct emigration out of Asia into Europe have held the wild, fruitful plains on the borders of Turkey and Asia for 1,000 years, wedging themselves firmly between the more ancient settlers of the Slavonic family. At this moment there are about 5,000,000 Magyars, 9,000,000 Germans, and 15,000,000 Slaves out of the 32,000,000 of the whole population of the Empire. But there has been no single dominant national language to absorb into itself these various tongues; and difference of speech has kept nationalities distinct, and of course promoted disunion. The system of state rights, and of consequent provincialism, is thus manifested on a vast scale. So soon as the pressure of

absolutism was removed, each nationality began to assert its own rights, its own independence, its own dialect, and to separate its aspirations and traditions from those of its sisters. Subjects which would seem more appropriate to antiquarian societies or debating clubs than to the realm of politics became popular themes for statesmen and legislators. The Magyars, a proud, chivalrous people, with much aptitude for politics, had for centuries governed twice their number of Slaves, controlling not only the whole of Hungary, but the annexed provinces of Transylvania and Croatia. In these remote, and, to the American public, obscure regions, lie the seeds of many future convulsions in Europe, to which I shall not allude on this occasion. Thirty years ago, the Magyars, alarmed, it has been suggested, by symptoms adverse to the duration of their race, determined to force their language over the whole triune kingdom. Previously, the debates in the Diet at Pesth, to which came up deputies from Transylvania and Croatia, as well as from Hungary proper, had been conducted in Latin, as a common medium in which alone Slaves and Magyars could comprehend each other. It was now ordained that Hungarian only should be used in Legislative Assemblies, in courts of justice, in municipal sessions, in all the common affairs of civic life. If there was a dispute about money matters, the tribunal would refuse to adjudicate unless accounts had been kept in Magyar, by those who knew not a word of the language. In towns where the population was exclusively Slavonic, Magyar clergymen were required to preach in Magyar language, to congregations of course unable to understand a word of their discourse. Slave children were required to learn the catechism in Magyar. Whoever resented or resisted such tyranny was punished with stripes, because the dignity of the nation required it. If the Legislature of New York should ordain today that in churches, courts of justice, legislative and municipal assemblies, schools and bible classes, the Dutch language should be used, to the exclusion, in part, of other tongues, because a very distinguished and influential portion of the population are of Netherland descent, it would be a mild exemplification of the language-policy thus forced on the non-Magyar inhabitants of Hungary, and at the same time of the inherent difficulties and evils in steady encouragement of state traditions, provincial feelings, and separate nationalities in a great country. Certainly if members of the Legislature could only understand each other by using a dead language, it would seem natural enough for the dominant nationality to enforce its own dialect on the rest. But unfortunately the Magyar is most difficult to acquire, and as different from Slavonic. Dualism was denounced as unjust, illegal, monstrous—a logical self-contradiction. To divide an empire into two halves, and still to retain its existence, was declared to be like squaring the circle—a geometrical impossibility. On the other hand, the German party, swallowing their grief at the extinction of centralism, warmly supported the policy of Government. The imperial arch may be said, therefore, to rest on the two columns of Germanism and Magyarism—upon the two dominant nationalities in which the Chancellor expects firmest support—some of the most progressive and eloquent German representatives in the old Reichsrath having seats in the Beust Cabinet. Still more significant are the abolition of the Concordat, and the liberation of education and marriage from the exclusive control of the Catholic priesthood, or of any other priesthood. The law of last December establishes free liberty for all opinions—liberty of the press, liberty of faith, liberty of marriage, liberty of education. More just, enlightened, progressive legislation than this could not be expected in New York, Ohio, Massachusetts, in any part of this Republic. *E plaribus duo* is estimated; the attempt to square the political circle has a fair prospect of success.

The cause of human progress is benefited by the experiment now making in Austria, and the friends of civilisation and freedom should wish it God speed. A double Ministry, out of which a third one is evolved for imperial purposes only. Such a scheme seems delicate and complicated for rough work. But dualism, combined with personal union under one sovereign, is rather a phrase than a fact, the two halves of the empire being practically conjoined and dependent on each other, and the two great subjects of war and foreign affairs being essentially in one hand. But, alas! progress must be fettered and halting everywhere, under the military rule prevailing over continental Europe. Reflect upon these little figures in simple arithmetic: France has 1,200,000 soldiers, Italy has 500,000, Prussia about 1,000,000, Austria 800,000, Russia nearly 1,000,000. Thus, merely the Pentarchy of the Continent—its five leading Powers alone—not counting the middle and lesser Powers, and saying nothing of Great Britain, keep nearly 5,000,000 of men perpetually on foot, while this great Republic has about 40,000 men. No epigram could be terser. We know from recent experience how much it costs to keep up great armies. And we have proved to the world that where great principles, or where the national existence is at stake, every citizen becomes a soldier, that immortal commanders start out of obscurity into fame, and that great armies resolve themselves again into the mass of the people, becoming ennobled by their military experience, and even better citizens than before. But here is the heart of life taken systematically out of all these citizens in every monarchy. For a period varying from fifteen to nine years—the whole of youth and the cream of middle age—these men lose their family, their home, their country, becoming citizens only of that dangerous military commonwealth which holds potentates and subjects alike in its iron grasp. Is it really the final result of European civilisation to decide which nation shall have the most populous armies and the biggest guns?

I have dwelt long, by way of illustration, on recent events in Central Europe. I should have liked to say something about Spain, and Italy, and France, but time fails me, and perhaps one or two examples are as useful

as a score. It is impossible, however, not to make a passing allusion to the Presidential election which has just occurred in Great Britain, almost simultaneously with our own. I say Presidential election, because, on the vote just taken, it has been decided that Mr. Gladstone, and not Mr. Disraeli, is to preside over affairs in England for the next political term, be it long or short, as conclusively as if their names had been voted for on a general ticket. There the First Lord of the Treasury is Prime Minister for Her Majesty the Queen; here the President is Prime Minister to His Majesty the People. The British Parliament, which governs 30,000,000 of citizens and 150,000,000 of subjects, which by a statute paper at any moment can alter the succession to the crown, convert the monarchy into a Commonwealth or a Despotism, prescribe the creed of the church, make or unmake the President, Prime Minister—or whatever you prefer to call him—has been hitherto a representative of land, and not of man. The best club in London; exclusive, full of distinguished and eloquent gentlemen; delightfully situated on the Thames, with charming terraces and bay windows on the river; an excellent library, superior restaurant, within five minutes' walk of all the public offices, and with the privilege of governing a splendid empire into the bargain, it is no wonder that men were willing to pay well for seats in the House of Commons, and it is a sure mark of progress that the average expense of seats has been steadily diminishing. The good old times are gone for ever when boroughs advertised themselves for sale in the public journals, and when a working majority of the House held their seats on the nomination and at the pleasure of less than 200 landholders—about two members on an average for each landholder. It is certainly to the credit of the British people, and proof of their indomitable love of liberty, that they have moved steadily forward against a government thus constituted, and without civil war have achieved such triumphs as Catholic emancipation, the Corn Law repeal, the Reform Bill of 1830, and the Reform Bill just coming into operation. Who doubts that the new English Household Suffrage Bill is the fruit of the Appomatox apple tree? Who imagined in 1862 that power would be transferred in England from land to people without bloodshed, and that it would be done by Tories?

England is a landed aristocracy. Twenty millions of men live in England—30,000 men own England. The pyramid stands on its apex. In America is a landed democracy. Every man votes, and every man may be a bondholder who is willing to go west for a homestead. Our experiment has often been pronounced a new and a bold one. It is an experiment, but scarcely a bold one. It is simply to see if the pyramid can be made to stand on its base. Thus far it has stood, although Privilege was amazed, the other day, that it was not toppled over, feeling that no other government could have resisted such a shock as was dealt to our fabric. There are movements all over Europe, as I hope to have proved by pregnant examples. Through the long past there have been political lullabies for the infant man: Divine right, infallibility, charters to the people, instead of charters from the people; universal suffrage combined with universal bayonets; above all, the magnificent platitude that government always exists with full consent of the governed. The European emigrant, the forlorn outcast, it may be, of older civilizations, finds already accomplished here the revolution which he has "dreaded, but dwelt upon" as the darkest of crimes. But that emigration, amounting to 3,000,000 Europeans every ten or twelve years, has been in one direction, and on a comparatively small scale.

Two centuries before the Christian era many millions of men were occupied, as we have all read in the school-books, ten years long in building a wall. That wall stands to this day. It is 1,500 miles in length. It is twenty-five feet high, and so broad that six cavalymen can ride abreast upon it. It is sometimes carried over mountains of a mile's perpendicular height. Its masonry is so conscientious that it is said to be impossible to thrust a nail between the massive stones of which it is composed. There are towers and bastions for armed men at regular intervals through all its prodigious length. This wall was built, as we all know, by Trin-Shee-Hwang-Tee, founder of the dynasty of Trin, as a protection against the incursions of the Tartars. But what is this stupendous piece of mason-work, bristling with armed men, which has done its best for 2,000 years to protect one-third of the human race from the invasion of their fellow-creatures, compared to that air-drawn barrier, invisible, impalpable, yet, until recent events, impregnable which has barred the road to emigration southward, and which we call Mason and Dixon's line? The European wanderer, pushing westward after landing on these shores, finds an enormous plain stretching between the Rocky and Apalachian Mountains from the Gulf to the Arctic, and containing below the 45th parallel a surface of unexampled fertility of 1,500,000 square miles in extent. There is no feudal system, no state church to prescribe or proscribe his religious creed and prohibit the education of his children. The most commodious building in every town is usually the school-house, in which his children are gratuitously educated, in common with those of the richest, citizens, where all are converted into Americans together; not taught to harp upon nationalities or to wrangle of creeds. He finds Catholics, Protestants, Hebrews, side by side in mutual respect and affection; illustrious men not more advanced and believed by those of their own faith than by those of a different church. But the most tempting semi-tropical region, producing the great staple on which so large a part of the world's industry depends, has not cultivated much more than one per cent, of the soil—a region three times as large as France, which might yield that precious plant in profusion, feed and clothe untold millions, and maintain empires. The cotton crop

has languished far behind its possibilities, because, while there was no limit to the demand, an increase to the supply of labour was sternly forbidden, few emigrants daring to cross that awful barrier. We stand on the threshold great events. A change in the condition of mankind is impending.

*"A multitude, like which the populous North
Pour'd never from her frozen loins to pass
Rhone or the Danube, when her barbarous sons
Came like a deluge on the South,"*

is gradually collecting in distant regions. Is it possible that those vast and fruitful plains, which have so long been panting in vain for culture, are to lie fallow still, when the famishing labour of the world is anxious for a summons? No country I ever prospered long where labour was dishonoured. Look at Spain, where two and a half centuries ago the most effective population of the land—500,000 full-grown men and women—were expelled from the country at the dictate of the Archbishop of Toledo, because they were industrious and because they were Moors—an achievement of such stupendous idiocy that a wiser churchman, Cardinal Richelieu, afterward declared it to be the most audacious and barbarous ever recorded by history; and think of Spanish misfortunes from that day to this! On remote Bohemian, Moravian, Swabian, Swedish mountains and plains human creatures are toiling life-long, from squalid cradle to pauper grave, for a daily wage of ten cents, each. Down among dismal coal mines, in various parts of Europe, men, women, and children are banished, weeks and months long, from the blessed sunlight, from the warm precincts of the cheerful day, from home affections, from education, from civilization; companions of the fossilized reptiles which perished hundreds of thousands of years ago, overshadowed and begrimed by the charred and carbonized forests of the primeval world, moulting from childhood to old age for a pittance barely sufficient to support life, that they may pile up still higher the magnificent fabric of feudal pomp which has so long doomed them and their fellows to a living burial. Is it to be imagined that such step-children of European civilization would not be wooed from their dismal caves into the genial climate, the virgin forests, the exuberant savannahs of the south, and be converted from gnomes and bobolds into men, so soon as the long trance has been broken there, labour raised from degradation, and the great laws of Democracy accepted?

Thus far I have trespassed on your patience, while endeavouring to trace, from what we know or imagine of history, proofs of that law of progress to the disbelievers in which history can teach nothing. My faith in that law, and in the welfare of the Republic in proportion to her conformity to that law, is absolute. That all mankind are capable of progress I as devoutly believe. None can be debarred from the inalienable right to intellectual and moral development, which is the true meaning of the pursuit of happiness, as proclaimed in our great statute. And hope may come to all. In some of the Western portions of this country, amidst the profusion of nearly all the gifts of heaven, there is a deficiency of pure water. But American energy is not to be balked by dissembling nature of that first necessity of life. Artesian wells are sunk through the sod of the prairies, through the loam, through the gravel, through the hard-pan, which is almost granite, until at last, 1,000 or 1,500 feet beneath the surface, the hand of man reveals a deep and rapid river coursing through those solitary, sunless depths, at a speed of ten miles the hour, swifter than Ohio, or Mississippi, or Hudson, or any of the bountiful and imperial streams of this country, flowing as they do through picturesque mountain scenery, stately forest, or enamelled meadow, amid towered cities or cultivated fields. And when the shaft has reached that imprisoned river, and the rent for the first time has been made through its dungeon-wall, the waters remembering the august source, on far distant mountain-tops, whence ages ago they fell, leap upwards to the light with terrible energy, rising in an instant far above the surface of the earth, and pouring forth their healthful and fertilising current to delight and refresh mankind. And with even such an awakening are we gladdened when half-forgotten humanity bursts, from time to time, out of the depths in which it has pursued its joyless, sunless course, moaning and murmuring through long centuries, but never quite forgetting its divine and distant origin. Such was the upward movement out of intellectual thralldom which we call the Reformation when the shaft of Luther struck the captive stream; such an awakening, but a more significant and hopeful one, has been heralded for this whole Republic, East and West, North and South, and for all humanity, by the triumph of the right in the recent four years' conflict in which all have been the conquerors.

WALKER, MAY & CO., Printers, 99 Bourke Street West, Melbourne.

Standard Historical and Political Works.

MOTLEY. THE RISE OF THE DUTCH REPUBLIC: a History, by John Lothrop Motley, 3 vols., crown 8vo. 21s

Popular edition, 1 vol., crown 8vo. 7s

MOTLEY. The History of the United Netherlands; from the Death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce, 1609, with portraits, 4 vols., 8vo. 67s 6d

Cabinet edition, 4 vols., crown 8vo. 27s

DE TOCQUEVILLE. Democracy in America, translated by Henry Reeve, 2 vols., 8vo. 24s

MILL. Principles of Political Economy, by John Stuart Mill, 2 vols., 8vo. 34s People's edition, crown 8vo. 6s

MILL. Considerations on Representative Government, by John Stuart Mill, crown 8vo. 2s 6d

MILL. An Essay on Liberty, by John Stuart Mill, crown 8vo. 2s

BRIGHT. Speeches of John Bright, M.P., on Various Questions of Public Policy, 2 vols., 8vo. 28s 6d

HEARN. The Government of England; its Structure and its Development, by W. E. Hearn, LL.D., 8vo. 16s

BUCKLE. History of Civilisation in England and France, Spain and Scotland, by Henry Thomas Buckle., 3 vols., crown 8vo. 27s

LECKY. History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe, by W. E. H. Lecky, M.A., 2 vols., 8vo. 31s 6d

LECKY. History of European Morals, from Augustus to Charlemagne, by W. E. H. Lecky, M.A., 2 vols., 8vo. 31s 6d

MACAULAY. History of England from the Accession of James II., by Lord Macaulay, 8 vols., crown 8vo. 54s People's edition, 4 vols., post 8vo. 18s

MERIVALE. History of the Romans under the Empire, by C. Merivale, LL.D., 8 vols., post 8vo. 54s

PRESCOTT. Complete Historical Works of W. H. Prescott, 5 vols., post 8vo. 28s 6d

FISCHEL. The English Constitution, by Dr. Fischel, translated by R. J. Shee, 8vo. 10s 6d

HALLAM. View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages, by Henry Hallam, LL.D., 3 vols., crown 8vo. 21s

Popular edition, 1 vol., crown 8vo. 7s

HALLAM. The Constitutional History of England, from the Accession of Henry VII. to the Death of George II., by Henry Hallam, LL.D., 3 vols., cr. 8vo. 21s.

LIDDELL. The History of Rome from the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Empire, by Dean Liddell, 2 vols., 8vo. 31s 6d

Student's edition, crown 8vo. 8s 6d

GIBBON. The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, by Edward Gibbon, with Notes, 8 vols., 8vo. 67s 6d

Students' edition, crown 8vo. 8s 6d

CREASY. The History of the Rise and Progress of the English Constitution, by Sir Edward Creasy, post 8vo. 8s 6d

PEARSON. The History of France from the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Second Empire, by W. II. Pearson, M.A., post 8vo. 8s 6d

SMITH. The History of Greece from the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest by W. Smith, LL.D., post 8vo. 8a 6d

DE LOLME. The Constitution of England compared with the Republican Form of Government and the other Monarchies in Europe, crown 8vo. 4s

GUIZOT. History of Civilization, from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution, by F. Guizot, 3 vols., crown 8vo. 12s

HEARN. Plutology; or, the Theory of the Efforts to Satisfy Human Wants, by W. E. Hearn, LL.D., 8vo. 16s

SMITH. The Wealth of Nations, by Adam Smith, with Notes by J. R. McCulloch, 8vo. 18s

KNIGHT. A Popular History of England to the Present Time: an Illustrated History of Society and Government, by Charles Knight, 8 vols., 8vo. £4 8s 6d

RAWLINSON'S Ancient Monarchies, Chaldea, Assyria, Babylonia, Media, and Persia, illustrated, 4 vols. 8vo. £3 12s

TYLOR. Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization, by E. B. Tylor, illustrated, 8vo. 13s 6d

The Social Future of the Working Class. A Lecture DELIVERED TO A MEETING OF TRADES' UNIONISTS, MAY 7, 1868.

BY

Edward Spencer Beesly,

Professor of History in University College, London.

"The working class is not, properly speaking, a class at all, but constitutes the body of society. From it [unclear: proced] various special classes, which we; may regard as organs necessary to that

AUGUSTS COMTE.

REPRINTED FROM THE "FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW." Second Thousand. London: E. Truelove, 256, High Holboren. 1869.

(Price One Penny.)

The Social Future of the Working Class.

This lecture was the last of a series of three delivered but urine, by request of the Council, to meetings convoked by that body. The first two were by Dr. Congreve and Mr. Frederic Harrison.

WE live in a day when social questions are for the first time contesting precedence with political questions. In the first French revolution the distinction was not apparent; at all events it was not recognised even by sharp-sighted observers, though we, looking back to those times, can detect the signs of it. During the reign of Louis Philippe from 1830, that is, to 1848—the distinction became every year more marked. It is the fashion to speak of the revolution of 1848 as a very small affair—as a feeble imitation of the old revolution. If looked at from a political point of view, in the narrowest sense of that term, it certainly was a much smaller affair than the old revolution. But to those who have realised in their minds that there has been in truth but one revolution, which began in 1789 and has been going on ever since, and that the year 1848 marks its transition from the purely political to the social phase,—to such persons, I say, the last epoch will seem even more momentous than the first. The attempt of 1848 was a failure, no doubt. But the history of the French revolution was not closed in 1848, as most of us here present will live to see.

In England we have travelled the same path, though hitherto without such violent shocks. We are all of us, French and English alike, moving rapidly towards the most fundamental revolution Europe has yet undergone; a revolution in comparison with which the great political changes in the time of our grandfathers, and even the great religious changes three centuries ago, were, I had almost said, insignificant. I will not pretend to say how far workmen may have clearly realised to themselves this prospect. I am inclined to think that not many of them have more than a vague conception of it, although they are instinctively working towards it. But the middle class have no conception of it at all. I am not speaking of the stupidly ignorant part of that body, but of its more enlightened and active members. They sincerely believe that the series of political changes which they commenced in England forty years ago is nearly completed. When they shall have abolished the State Church, reduced taxation somewhat, obtained the ballot and equal electoral districts, or something like it, they think reform will be completed, and that England will enter upon a sort of golden age. They do not contemplate any serious change, either political or industrial. Politically, we are still to be governed by Parliament. In industry we are to have the reign of unlimited competition.

Now we can all of us understand that some men, either from education or mental constitution, do not believe in progress at all. They think that all change is for the worse, unless it is a change backwards; and they are convinced that nothing but firmness is wanting to resist change. There always have been such men, and we can understand them. But what is less easy to understand is that there should be men who believe heartily in progress, and yet shut their eyes deliberately to the goal whither we are tending. The truth is that their belief in progress does not rest on any reasonable basis. It is nothing better than a superstitious optimism, a lazy, semi-religious idea that the world must have a natural tendency to get better. As for what getting better means, that they settle by their own likes and dislikes. Consequently the middle-class man interprets it to mean a reign of unlimited competition and individual freedom; while the workman understands it to be a more equal division of the products of industry. Although the workman's circumstances have led him to a truer conception of progress, perhaps he has not arrived at it on much more reasonable grounds than those on which the middle-class man has arrived at his. For, after all, it does not follow because we long for a certain state of society that therefore we are tending towards it.

The lot of the poor is a hard lot; there is no denying that. With a very large number of them life is absolute misery from birth to death. Though they may not actually starve, they are more or less hungry from one week's end to another; their dull round of toil, occupies the whole day; their homes are squalid and frightful, seldom free from disease, and the heartrending incidents of disease, when aggravated by poverty. For them life is joyless, changeless, hopeless. "They wait for death, but it cometh not; they rejoice exceedingly and are glad when they can find the grave." Those who have mixed with the very poor, and have been startled by the strange calmness with which they contemplate and speak of death, whether of themselves or their relatives, will not say that this picture is much over-drawn. But it is not of this poorest class that I now wish to speak. I say that the lot of the skilled artizan earning his 30s. or 35s. a week (when he is not out of employment) is a hard lot. Perhaps it may seldom or never happen to him to go for a day with his hunger only half satisfied. But his position compared with that of a non-workman is one of great discomfort. People often seem to forget this. It is not

uncommon for rich men, when addressing an audience of workmen to say, "Sly friends, *I* am a working man. I have been a working man all my life. I have been working with my brain as you have with your hands." Yes, but there is just that difference. The one man has risen, say, at eight in the morning, from a comfortable bed, has come down-stairs to a comfortable breakfast, read his newspaper, reached his place of business towards eleven o'clock, and then worked perhaps hard enough for some hours, but in a comfortable office, and with interest in his work so intense that he perhaps prefers it to any amusement, and then back to his comfortable dinner and bed. The other man has risen perhaps before daylight, has toiled ten or twelve hours, it may be under a broiling sun, or a chilling rain, or under other conditions equally disagreeable, and at work which cannot have very much interest for him, first, because it is monotonous, secondly, because the product will not be his when he has produced it. He has snatched his coarse food at intervals during the day, and has returned at night to an uncomfortable home. I think rich people are too apt to forget that, though habit counts for much, a poor man's muscles, lungs, and stomach, are, after all, not very unlike their own, and that no amount of custom makes such a life otherwise than disagreeable and even painful to him; and that the main question for him in reference to civilisation will be, how it alleviates his condition. How are we to answer that question? Everyone is familiar with the hymns of triumph that are raised from time to time on the platform and in the press. We need not enter into particulars, because no one disputes that, so far as they go, they do point to progress of a certain kind. No one disputes that the production and accumulation of wealth is an element of progress; but it is only one element, and if even this is confined to a comparatively small section of the community, it must be admitted either that society as a whole is not progressing, or that its progress must be proved by somewhat better evidence than the statistics paraded in budget speeches and newspaper articles.

"The moral value of this toilsome month to myself has been the lesson of sympathy it has taught me with the labouring man. The fatigue and disgust and secret trials of the over-worked brain are bad enough, but not to me more severe than those which follow the sick and jaded body to a sleepless bed. I have realised the sweat of the brow and can feel how painful his earnings must be to whom grasshopper has become a burden."—*Kane's Arctic Explorations*, p. 320.

There is no question about the material progress of the non-work-man class. There are many thousands of houses in London infinitely more commodious and luxurious than the palaces of Plantagenet kings. But there is very great question whether the workmen generally have made any real progress in comfort. Some of them have, no doubt I he skilled artizan in London gets enough to eat. He is perhaps no better lodged than his forefathers, but he dresses better, and he has greater opportunities of enjoying himself and moving about to better himself. But among the agricultural labourers what state of things do we find? In many parts of England they are positively worse off than they were a hundred years ago. In the Eastern Counties, where agriculture is carried on by the newest lights of science, the horrible gang-system has come into existence within the present century. Nor is such misery confined to agricultural labourers. It has been proved in official reports that the workmen in such extensive trades as shoe-making, silk-weaving, and stocking-weaving, are on an average worse fed than the Lancashire operatives were during the cotton famine.

Public Health; Sixth Report, for 1863, pp. 13, 14.

Now, wretchedness of this terrible kind does not exist even among barbarous nations and savage tribes. The child of the North American Indian, or the Caffre, or the Esquimaux, does not begin to work in a mill or in an agricultural gang almost as soon as it can walk. It gets better food than the English child, and leads a healthier and more enjoyable life. The West Indian negro has been treated as an irreclaimable savage because he will not toil like an English labourer, and the reason assigned is that he has plenty to eat and drink without working hard for it. I fancy most English labourers wish they could say the same. Really, if progress and civilisation mean nothing but an increase of wealth, irrespective of its distribution, Rousseau had much reason to prefer the state of nature. It is childish to remind the poor man that his ancestor under the Plantagenet kings had no chimney to his hut, no glass in his windows, no paper on his walls, no cheap calico, no parliamentary trains, no penny newspapers. He was no worse off in these respects than the Plantagenet king himself, who was equally without chimneys, glass windows, calico, railways, and penny newspapers. There are parts of the world now where the labourer is still in that condition. But he gets sound and healthy sleep out of the straw spread on the floor of his windowless hut, which is more than three or four families huddled together in a single room in St. Giles's can do, though they may have a glazed window and a chimney. A poor Englishman might be ashamed to walk about in a good stout sheepskin; but he is often clad in garments much less warm and durable. What sort of progress is this, in which the larger part of the community remains as miserable, if not more miserable, than in a state of barbarism? If progress is necessarily so one-sided, it were better I say it deliberately—it were better it ceased. It were better that all were poor together than that this frightful contrast should exist to shake men's faith in the eternal principles of justice.

Happily, we are not shut up to so discouraging a conclusion. If we look at the whole history of our race in Western Europe, instead of studying one short chapter of it alone, we shall soon see what its progress has been.

The labouring class have steadily advanced in dignity and influence. Once they were slaves, with no more rights than horses and oxen. Then they were serfs, with certain rights, but still subject to grievous oppression and indignities. Then they became free hired labourers, nominally equal with the upper class before the law, but in practice treated as an inferior race, and themselves looking on the rich with much deference and awe. *Now* we have come to a time when the workmen are almost everywhere standing on their rights, and resisting what they deem unfair or oppressive. They have learnt the secret of combination. With freedom and dignity has come confidence—confidence in each other. They have grasped the idea that the main object of government and industrial organisation should be *their* comfort and happiness. What is more, everybody is beginning to hold the same language. Every proposal publicly made, whether to destroy or to create, is represented as for the good of the lower classes. The very employers who are trying to destroy your trade societies profess to be doing it out of pure love for you. How astonishing and incomprehensible would all this have been—I do not say to the ancient slave-owner, or to the mediæval baron—but to the wealthy men of the last century. Is not this progress? What if a minority only of the workmen have as yet derived any benefit from the increased production of wealth? Is it nothing that the arms are being forged with which all shall at length get their share? Material improvement has always begun, and always will begin, not with those who need it most, but with those who need it least: and the higher classes of workmen are now making the experiment which the lowest will repeat after them.

Once firmly grasped, this truth throws a flood of light on history, and makes clear what at first sight is so obscure—the unbroken, continuous progress of society. We see that even in the so-called dark ages, when the splendour of Roman civilisation appeared to be extinguished by the barbarian—when science, art, and literature were lost and forgotten, and the world seemed to have retrograded ten centuries—even then, in that dark hour, our race was accomplishing the most decided step forward that it has ever made. When the philosophers and poets and artists of Greece were lavishing their immortal works on small communities of free men—when the warriors and statesmen of Rome were building up the most splendid political fabric that the world has seen—the masses were sunk in a state of brutal slavery. But when savage tribes, with uncouth names and rude manners, had poured over Europe, when a squalid barbarism had superseded the elegance and luxury of ancient society, when kings could not read, and priests could not write, when trade and commerce had relapsed into Oriental simplicity, when men thought that the end of a decayed and dying world was surely near—then were the masses, the working men, accomplishing unnoticed their first great step from slavery to serfdom.

What I have already said amounts to this: that the improvement of the condition of the working class is the most important element of human progress so important that even if we were to make it the sole object and test of our public life we could not justly be said to be taking a one-sided view of political and social questions. I shall endeavour presently to draw a picture of the workman's life, as it ought to be, and, as I believe, it will be in the future. But I must first examine some of the means by which the transition is being effected.

I will put aside the various schemes of Socialists and Communists which have found so many supporters on the Continent. Widely as they differ from one another, I believe they all agree in demanding that the State shall intervene, more or less, in the direction of industry. Now that opinion has never found much favour in England, nor is there at the present time any large body of workmen who support it. In France the first idea of every reformer or innovator is to act through the Government. This tendency arises partly from the jealousy with which all Governments in that country have repressed voluntary association, but partly also from the logical and orderly character of the French mind, which abhors anything partial or patchy either in thought or action. But in England, where there has always been considerable facility for private and associated action, it is our way rather to depend upon ourselves than to wait till we have a Government of our way of thinking. Hence the only two methods which have any serious pretensions to promote the elevation of workmen in England have both of them sprung, not from the brains of philosophers, but from the practical efforts of workmen themselves. This is shown by the very language we employ to describe them. In France the labour question has meant the discussion of the rival schools, the Economic School, the school of Fourier, the school of Proudhon, the school of Louis Blanc, of Cabet, of Pierre Leroux, and so on. In England we do not talk of schools, but of Unionism and Co-operation, which began in a practical form, and have continued practical. There can be no doubt that all workmen who care for the future of their class are looking to one of these two methods for the realisation of their hopes. Here, as on the Continent, there is no lack of thinkers with elaborate schemes which, in the opinion of their authors, would ensure universal happiness. But whereas the French philosophers, whom I have mentioned, had each his thousands of ardent disciples among the workmen, our theorists cannot count their disciples by dozens, and are therefore not worth taking into account. But Co-operation and Unionism are real forces, and to pass them over in silence would be to deprive this lecture of all practical value and interest for such an audience as I am addressing.

The first thing to be noticed about Co-operation is that the word is used for two very different things. There is the theory, and there is the practice. The theory, as you know, is that there should be no employer-class, that

the workmen should divide the profits of production amongst themselves, and that whatever management is necessary should be done by salaried officers and Committees. Co-operation, however, in that sense, does not get beyond a theory. The noble-minded men who founded the celebrated mill at Rochdale did indeed for some years manage to put their principles in practice; but even their own society at length fell away from them, and began to employ workmen who were not shareholders at the market-rate of wages; and I believe there is not in England, at the present moment, a single co-operative society in which workmen divide the profits irrespective of their being shareholders. Co-operation, in this sense, then, may be dismissed from consideration with as little ceremony as the Socialist and Communist theories before alluded to. Like them it supposes a degree of unselfishness and devotion which we do not find in average men, and it does not attempt to create those qualities, or supply their place by the only influence that can keep societies of men for any length of time to a high standard of morality—the influence of an organised

The co-operation which actually exists, and is an important feature of modern industry, is something very different. We must strip it mercilessly of the credit it borrows from its name, and its supposed connection with the theory above described. It is nothing more than an extension of the joint-stock principle. In what respect does the Rochdale mill differ from any other joint-stock company? A considerable number of its shares are already held by persons who do not work in it, and it is very possible that in course of time all, or most of the workmen employed in it, will be earning simply the market-rate of wages. A certain number of men, by the exercise of industry, prudence, and frugality, will have risen from the working class into the class above? How is the working class the better for that? What sort of solution is that for the industrial problem? We set out with the inquiry how the working class was to be improved, not how a few persons, or even many persons, were to be enabled to get out of it. We want to discover how workmen may obtain a larger share of the profits of production, and the Rochdale Co-operative Mill, which pays workmen the market-rate, has certainly not made the discovery. The world is not to be regenerated by the old dogma of the economists masquerading in Socialist dress.

The history of Co-operation is this. The noble-minded men who first preached the theory in its purity, were deeply impressed with the immoral and mischievous way in which capital is too often employed by its possessors, and instead of inquiring how moral influence might be brought to bear on capitalists, they leaped to the conclusion that capitalists, as a separate class, ought not to exist. In making this assumption they overlooked the distinction between the accidental and permanent conditions of industry. Collective activity among men has had two types—the military and the industrial, the latter of which has gradually almost superseded the former. Military organisation has undergone many and great changes, from the earliest shape in which we find it among savage tribes down to its most elaborate form in our own time. But its one leading characteristic has remained unchanged. There has never been a time when armies were not commanded by generals with great power and great responsibility. Wherever there has been the slightest attempt to weaken that power and diminish that responsibility, there it is admitted that the army has suffered and the work has been so much less efficiently done. Whether the soldiers were mere slaves as in Eastern countries, or free citizens as in the republics of Greece and Rome and America, or mercenaries fighting for hire as has often been the case in modern Europe, the principle of management has always been the same. Discipline was as sharp among the citizen soldiers of Grant and Sherman as among the conscripts of Frederick and Napoleon. Such a thing as the co-operative management of an army has never been heard of.

Now in the other type of collective activity—the industrial—a similar organisation has constantly prevailed. The analogy is striking, and it is not accidental, for the conditions are fundamentally the same. Fighting (and working are the two great forms of activity, and if you have to organise them on a large scale, it is not strange that the same method should be found best for both. And workmen will do well to notice this analogy, and insist on pressing it home to the utmost of their power; for the more logically it is carried out, the more striking and overwhelming are the arguments it supplies for their side of the labour controversy. There is not a phase of that controversy which it does not illustrate, and invariably to their advantage. As one instance out of many, I may mention the sanction afforded by military practice for a uniform rate of wages to the rank-and-file of labour—an argument which was put by one of the Trades' Union Inquiry Commissioners to the Secretary of the Master Builders' Association, and which completely shut his mouth on that question. But it is for another purpose that I am now referring to this analogy. Special skill and training, unity of purpose, promptitude, and, occasionally, even secrecy, are necessary for a successful direction of industry just as much as of war. "A council of war never fights" is a maxim which has passed into a proverb, as stamping the worthlessness of such councils. Yet councils of war are not composed of private soldiers, but of skilful and experienced officers. They are more analogous to our boards of railway directors, whose incapacity, I must admit, does not take exactly that form. Whether the efficiency of our railway management would be improved by an infusion of stokers and plate-layers into the direction, I will leave it to the advocates of Co-operation to say.

Another no less important advantage of the old industrial system over Co-operation is that it transfers the risk from the workman to the employer. Capital is the reserved fund which enables the employer to carry on his business with due enterprise, and yet to give a steady rate of wages to the workman. Great as have been the changes through which industry has passed—slavery, serfdom, and free labour—this fundamental characteristic has remained unaltered. In all ages of the world, since industry began to be organised at all, the accumulated savings which we call capital have been in the hands of comparatively few persons, who have provided subsistence for the labourer while engaged in production. The employer has borne the risk and taken the profits. The labourer has had no risk and no share of the profits. Though in modern times there appears to be some desire on the part of the master to make the workman share the risk, he will soon come to see that such a policy destroys the only justification of capital, and thus strikes at the root of property itself. The workmen will help him to see this by their combinations, if he shows any indisposition to open his eyes. It is one among many ways in which they will teach him in spite of himself what is for his own good. In point of fact, in the best organised trade—that of the engineers—the rate of wages is subject to little, if any fluctuation.

The separation, then, between employers and employed, between capitalist and labourer, is a natural and fundamental condition of society, characteristic of its normal state, no less than its preparatory stages. We may alter many things, but we shall not alter that. We may change our forms of government, our religions, our language, our fashion of dress, our cooking, but the relation of employer and employed is no more likely to be superseded in the future by Communism in any of its shapes, than is another institution much menaced at the present time—that of husband and wife. It suits human nature in a civilised state. Its aptitude to supply the wants of man is such that nothing can compete with it. There may be fifty ways of getting from Temple Bar to Charing Cross; but the natural route is by the Strand; and along the Strand the bulk of the traffic will always lie. And so, though we may have trifling exceptions, the great mass of workmen will always be employed by capitalists.

Now this was what the founders of Co-operation refused to see; and in their enthusiasm they fancied they could establish societies, the shareholders of which would voluntarily surrender to non-shareholders a large part of the profits which their capital would naturally command. But the shareholders were most of them only average men; they were not enthusiastic, or their enthusiasm cooled as the money-making habit crept over them. The Co-operative theory was not bound up with any religious system, or supported by any spiritual discipline; and they soon fell into the vulgar practice of making the most of their capital. What is the lesson to be learnt? Whatever there was of good in the movement belonged not to the industrial theory, but to the social spirit of the men who started it. If those men had been employers, or if any employers had had their spirit, the workmen would have reaped the same advantages without any machinery of Co-operation. Therefore we must look for improvement, not to this or that new-fangled industrial system, but to the creation of a moral and religious influence which may bend all in obedience to duty. When we have created such an influence, we shall find that it will act more certainly and effectually on a small body of capitalists than it would on a loose multitudinous mob of co-operative shareholders.

Before leaving the subject of Co-operation, let me say that, while I cannot recognise its claims to be the true solution of the industrial question, I heartily acknowledge the many important services it may render to the working class. Even as applied to production, in which I contend it can never play an important part, it will do good for a time by throwing light on the profits of business. As applied to distribution in the shape, that is to say, of co-operative stores, its services can hardly be exaggerated. It not only increases the comfort of workmen, by furnishing them with genuine goods and making their money go further, but it gives them dignity and independence by emancipating them from a degrading load of debt. Moreover, it sets free, for the purpose of reproduction, a large amount of labour and capital which had before been wasted in a badly arranged system of distribution.

If we turn now to the other agency by which the labouring class in this country is being elevated, I mean Trades Unions, we shall find more enlightened ideas combined with greater practical utility. Unionism distinctly recognises the great cardinal truth which Cooperation shirks—namely, that workmen must be benefited as workmen, not as something else. It does not offer to any of them opportunities for raising themselves into little capitalists, but it offers to all an amelioration of their position. Co-operation is a fine thing for men who are naturally indefatigable, thrifty, and ambitious—not always the finest type of character, be it observed in passing—but it does nothing for the less energetic, for the men who take life easily, and are content to live and die in the station in which they were born. Yet these are just the men we want to elevate, for they form the bulk of the working class. They are in very bad odour with the preachers of the Manchester school, the apostles of self-help. To my mind there is not a more degrading cant than that which incessantly pours from the lips and pens of these wretched instructors. Men professing to be Christians, and very strict Christians too—Protestant Christians who have cleansed their faith of all mediæval corruptions and restored it according to the primitive model of apostolic times, when, we are told, "all that believed were together, and had all things

common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need"—these teachers, I say, are not ashamed to talk of making money and getting on in the world, as if it were the whole duty of a working man. Thus it comes to pass, that while they are bitter opponents and calumniators of Unionism,

"God grant that the work-people may be emancipated, from the tightest thralldom they have ever yet endured. All the single despots, and all the aristocracies that ever were or will be, are as puffs of wind compared with these tornadoes of Trades Unions. But I have hope. The masses seem to me to have less common-sense than they had a year ago."—*Letter of Lord Shaftesbury to Colonel Moude.*

they patronise Co-operation, because it enables their model workman to raise himself, as Lord Shaftesbury expressed it not long ago, "*into a good and even affluent citizen,*" a moral elevation to which it is clear a primitive Christian never attained. But you who are workmen, and have a little practical experience of the thing, you do not want me or anyone else to tell you that the men who raise themselves from the ranks are very often not distinguished by fine dispositions or even by great abilities. What is wanted for success of that sort is industry, perseverance, and a certain sharpness, often of a low kind I am far from saying that those who raise themselves are not often admirable men; but you know very well that they are sometimes very much the reverse—that they are morally very inferior to the average workman who is content with his position, and only desires that his work may be regular and his wages fair. Now the merit of Unionism is that it meets the case of this average workman. Instead of addressing itself to the sharp, shifty men, who are pretty certain to take care of themselves in any case, it undertakes to do the best that can be done for the average man. And not only so, but it attends to the man below the average in industry and worthiness: it finds him work, and insists on his working; it fortifies his good resolutions; it strengthens him against temptation; it binds him to his fellows;—in short, it regulates him generally, and looks after him. Nor is even this the full extent of the difference in this respect between Co-operation and Unionism. While the benefits of the former are exclusively reaped by shareholders, the union wins its victories in the interest of non-unionists just as much as of its own members.

I noticed as a fatal error of Co-operation that it regards the relation of employer and employed as a transient and temporary arrangement which may and will be superseded, whereas it is permanent, and destined to survive all attacks. It is an eminent merit of Unionism that it recognises this important truth. The practical good sense of workmen has here shown itself superior to all the cleverness of philosophers. They have instinctively grasped the maxim that we shall best serve the cause of progress, whether political or social, by striving not to displace; the actual possessors of power, but to teach them to use their power for the interests of society.

Comte Pol. Pos. i. 163 (p. 173 of the translation by Dr. Bridges).

And there is this further advantage of a practical kind, that Unionism is not obliged, like the schemes of the philosophers, to hover impotently in the air, as a mere speculative phantom, till such time as it can command the assistance of the State to get itself tried in practice. A few dozen men can commence the application of it in their own trade any day they please. Nor is it a cut-and-dried scheme in which every detail is settled beforehand with mathematical exactness; it is of infinite elasticity, and can adapt itself spontaneously to the circumstances of each case.

It is desirable that the workman's wages should be good, but it is still more desirable that they should be steady. A fluctuating income in any station of life is, as everyone knows, one of the most demoralising influences to which a man can be exposed. When an outcry is raised, against the unions because they maintain that wages ought not to fall with every temporary depression of trade, it always seems to me that in so doing they are discharging precisely their most useful function. I have already alluded to the duty of the capitalists in this respect, and Unionism supplies exactly the machinery required for keeping him up to his duty, until a religious influence shall have been organised which will produce the same result in a more healthy and normal way. No doubt unions might offend deplorably on their side against this principle of a steady rate of wages. It is conceivable that they might screw out of the employer every year or every month wages to such an amount as would leave him only the bare profit which would make it worth his while to continue in business. It is manifest that on those terms he could not amass such a reserve fund as would enable him to tide over temporary depression without reducing wages. Every fluctuation in trade would cause a corresponding fluctuation in wages, which would vary from month to month. If Trades Unions were to act in this way they would lose their principal justification. They are charged with doing so now, but the charge is perfectly groundless. Probably in no case do they extract from the employer anything like the wages he could afford to give if he was disposed. I do not believe that unions, extend them as you will, will ever be strong enough to put such a pressure on the employers. I believe that an organised religious influence will hereafter induce employers to concede to their men, voluntarily, a larger share of their profits than any Trades Union could extort from them. An additional security that unions will never go too far in this direction is to be found in the fact that some masters, whether from larger capital, greater business ability, or higher reputation, make much larger profits than others. But unions do not pretend to exact higher wages from such masters. The tariff, therefore, is evidently ruled by the

profits of the least successful employers.

It might have been supposed at first sight that employers would have looked with more favour on Unionism, which leaves them in full possession of their capital, their authority, and their responsibility, than on Co-operation, which proposes to supersede them altogether. But, as you all know, the contrary is the case; and there could not be a more instructive test of the relative efficiency of the two methods. Unionism maintains that capital has its duties, and must be used for a social purpose. Co-operation shrinks from asserting a doctrine so distasteful to the propertied classes, and seeks to evade the necessity for it by the shallow fallacy that everyone is to become a capitalist. Although everyone will not become a capitalist, no doubt some will, and the net result of the co-operative movement will be that the army of capitalists will be considerably reinforced in its lower ranks. Will that army so reinforced be more easy to deal with? An exaggerated and superstitious reverence for the rights of property, and an indifference to its duties, is the chief obstacle to the elevation of the working class. The fewer the possessors in whose hands capital is concentrated, the more easy will it be to educate, discipline, and, if need be, gently coerce them. But when the larger capitalists have at their back an army of little capitalists, men who have sunk the co-operative workman in the co-operative shareholder, men who have invested their three or four hundred pounds in the concern, and are employing their less fortunate fellow-workmen at the market rate of wages, why, it stands to reason that the capital of the country will be less amenable to discipline than ever. A striking example is to be seen in France at the present time. You know that the immediate effect of the old revolution was to put the cultivators in possession of the soil. A vast number of small proprietors were created. Doubtless many advantages resulted from that change. France got rid of her aristocracy once and for good. The cultivators identified themselves with the revolution which had given them the soil, and defended it fiercely against the banded sovereigns of Europe. If the people had not been bribed with the land, the revolution might have been crushed. But there has been another result from it, of more doubtful advantage. The whole of this class of small proprietors is fanatically devoted to the idea of property; and in their fear that property should be attacked they have thrown their weight on the side of conservatism, and against further political and social progress. The wealthy middle class plays on their ignorance and timidity. All who desire to initiate the smallest social reform, who express any opinion adverse to the tyrannical power exercised by capital, are denounced as Communists and apostles of confiscation. The small proprietors are worked up into a frenzy of apprehension, and fling themselves into the arms of any crafty impostor who talks big words about saving society, thus the artizans and small proprietors, men whose interests must be essentially the same, for they are all alike workmen living by the sweat of their brow and the labour of their hands, are pitted against one another, and the middle class alone profits by the dissension. If the manufactures of this country were to get into the hands of a number of small shareholders, simple workmen would soon find the rein tighter and the load heavier. Their demand for the repeal of unjust laws would encounter a more stubborn resistance; the progress they have been making towards comfort and dignity would be abruptly checked. Fortunately, as I have already endeavoured to show, there is no likelihood that so-called Co-operation will ever drive the capitalist employer out of the field.

Such are the reasons for which I hold Unionism to be by far the most efficient of all the agencies that have as yet been largely advocated or put in practice for the purpose of elevating the working class, and preparing it for its future destinies. The French workmen have much to teach us; but I think in this matter they might take a lesson from our men with advantage. I hope they will signalise their next revolution—for which, by the way, I am getting rather impatient—by abolishing all those laws which so iniquitously obstruct their right to combine. Indeed, Unionism cannot be said to have had a fair trial in England until it is established in the other countries of Europe also.

It remains to consider what the destinies are for which our workmen are thus preparing themselves, and to picture to ourselves what their condition will be when society shall approximate more nearly to its normal state. We may do so without indulging in Utopias or extravagant estimates of our capacity to shape the course of human development, because we are not postulating springs of action in individuals, which, as a matter of fact, do not exist, or do not exist in sufficient strength—we are not spinning theories out of *à priori* notions of what society ought to be, but we are feeling our way by an examination, on the one hand, of the permanent facts of our nature, and the conditions imposed upon us by the external world; and, on the other hand, of the steady, continuous progress of society in the past. And if it has occurred to anyone that I have been a long time coming to what professed to be the subject of this lecture—namely, "the *future* of the working class"—I must plead, in justification, that I have in effect been dealing with it all along, and that nothing now remains but to give some practical illustrations of the conclusions already arrived at.

That the position of the workman will ever be as desirable as that of the wealthier classes seems, as far as we can see, highly improbable. Some people are shocked when such a proposition is plainly enunciated. They have a sort of hazy idea that the external conditions of our existence cannot be inconsistent with the perfection and happiness of man. They have been taught that this is a world where only *man* is vile, and it sounds to them

immoral to talk as if there was any insurmountable obstacle to an ideal state of society except what they are accustomed to term our fallen nature. The fact is, however, that this is very far from being the best of all possible worlds, and we must look that fact in the face. Human society might arrive much nearer perfection, both moral and material, if there was not so much hard work to be done. It *must* be done by some; and those to whom it falls to do it will inevitably have a less pleasant life than others. But though to annul or entirely alter the influences of the world external to ourselves is beyond our humble powers, we can generally either modify them to some extent, or, what comes to the same thing, modify ourselves to suit them, if only successive generations of men address themselves wisely to the task; just as an individual may by care preserve his health in a pestilential climate, though he can do little or nothing to alter the climate. And so, though there will probably always be much to regret in the workman's lot, we may look forward to improvements which will give him a considerable amount of comfort and happiness. I will enumerate some of these which we may reasonably expect will be reached when present struggles are over, and when employers and workmen alike have learnt to shape their lives and conduct by the precepts of a rational religion.

Employers, though exercising their own judgment and free action in their industrial enterprises, will never forget that their first concern must be, not the acquisition of an enormous fortune, but the well-being and comfort of the labourers dependent on them. Hence there will be an end of that reckless speculation which sports with the happiness, and even the life, of workmen and their families—displacing them here, massing them there, treating them, in short, as mere food for powder in the reckless conflicts of industrial competition. We shall no longer see periods of spasmodic energy and frantic over-production first in one trade, then in another, followed by glutted markets, commercial depression, and cessation of employment. For capital being concentrated in comparatively few hands, it will be possible to employ it with wisdom and foresight for the general good; which is quite out of the question while the chieftains of industry are a disorganised multitude, swaying to and fro in the markets of the world as blindly and irrationally as a street-mob at a fire. Thus the workman will be able to count on what is more precious to him than anything else—steady employment, and an income which, whether large or small, is, at all events, liable to little fluctuation. The demoralising effects of uncertainty in this respect can hardly be overrated. Large numbers of workmen at present, from no fault of their own lead as feverish and reckless an existence as the gambler. When this state of things ceases, we may look forward with confidence to a remarkable development of social and domestic virtue among the working class.

To give the workman due independence, he ought to be the owner of his abode, or, at all events, to have a lease of it. In some instances at present we find men living in houses belonging to their employers, from which they can be ejected at a week's notice. This is often the case among colliers and agricultural labourers, and what grinding tyranny results from it, I need not tell you. It is not desirable in a healthy, industrial society that labour should be migratory. Ordinarily, the workman will continue in the same place, and with the same employer, for long periods, just as is the habit with other classes. Fixity of abode will naturally accompany fixity of wages and employment. Here, again, we may expect an admirable reaction on social and domestic morality.

A diminution of the hours of work is felt by all the best workmen to be even more desirable than an increase of wages. All of you, I am sure, have so thoroughly considered this question in all its bearings, that I am dispensed from dwelling on it at length. I merely mention it that it may not be supposed I undervalue it. If the working day could be fixed at eight hours for six days in the week, and a complete holiday on the seventh, the workman would have time to educate himself, to enjoy himself, and above all to see more of his family.

Let us next consider how far the State can intervene to render the position of the workman more tolerable. That ought to be the first and highest object of the State, and therefore we need have no scruple about taxing the other classes of the community to any extent for this purpose, provided we can really accomplish it.

As I have had some experience of the criticism (always anonymous) which seizes a detached passage and draws from it inferences directly excluded by the context, I desire by anticipation to protest against any quotation of the above sentence apart from at least the three which immediately succeed it. Taken by itself (although even so it is guarded by a strictly adequate proviso) it might be misunderstood. In the context the proviso is carefully and fully expanded into an argument on social grounds against excessive taxation of the rich. Arguments from the individualist point of view I entirely reject, as I trust my audience did.

But of course it must be borne in mind that by injudicious action in this direction we might easily defeat our own benevolent intentions. For instance, it is conceivable that such taxation might become so heavy as to approximate in effect to the establishment of Communism, and the springs of industry and frugality, in other words the creation of capital, would be proportionately affected. Again, the State must not afford help to workmen in such shape as directly or indirectly to encourage on the one hand idleness, and on the other a reckless increase of the population. For example, it must not interfere to lower the price of food or houses; because common sense and experience alike show us that such interference would rapidly pauperise the class it was intended to benefit. But there are, I believe, many ways in which it may add most materially to the comfort and happiness of the poor without at all relieving them from the necessity of exercising prudence and industry.

As regards their physical comfort, it may carry out sanitary regulations on a scale hitherto not dreamt of. It may furnish them in London, and other large towns, with a copious supply of good water free of expense. It may provide medical assistance much more liberally than at present. I would add, it may exercise a close supervision over the weights and measures of the shopkeepers and the quality of the goods they supply, did I not hope that the spread of co-operative stores may render such supervision unnecessary. The State may also do much to make the lives of the poor brighter and happier. It may place education within their reach; it may furnish an adequate supply of free libraries, museums, and picture galleries; it may provide plenty of excellent music in the parks and other public places on Sunday and summer evenings.

I think that a London workman in steady employment, earning such wages as he does now, working eight hours a day, living in his own house, and with such means of instruction and amusement as I have described gratuitously afforded him, would not have an intolerable lot. His position would, it is true, be less brilliant than that of his employer. But it does not follow that the lot of the latter would be so very much more desirable. His income, of course, will be lessened in proportion as his workmen receive a larger share of the profits of production. He will live in greater luxury and elegance than they do, but within limits; for public opinion, guided by religious discipline, will not tolerate the insolent display of magnificence which at present lends an additional bitterness to the misery of the poor. His chief pleasure will consist, like that of the statesman, in the noble satisfaction of administering the interests of the industrial group over which he presides. But the responsibilities of this position will be so heavy, the anxiety and the strain on the mind so severe, that incompetent men will generally be glad to take the advice that will be freely given them, namely, to retire from it to some humbler occupation. The workmen, on the other hand, will lead a tranquil life, exempt from all serious anxiety; and although their position will be less splendid than that of the employers, it will not be less dignified. For in that future to which I look forward, the pressure of public opinion, directed, as I have several times said, by an organised religion, will not tolerate any idle class living by the sweat of others, and affecting to look down on all who have to gain their own bread. Every man, whether he is rich or poor, will be obliged to work regularly and steadily in some way or other as a duty to society; and when all work, the false shame which the industrious now feel in the presence of the idle will disappear for ever. I am addressing an audience, which, whether it calls itself Republican or not, has, I am sure, a thoroughly Republican spirit, and a keen sense of the insolent contempt with which labour is regarded by those whose circumstances exempt them from performing it. You will therefore agree with me that of all the changes in the workman's condition which I have enumerated as likely to be realised in the future, this is by far the most precious—that his function will be invested with as much dignity as that of any other citizen who is doing his duty to society.

There are some men who are inclined to be impatient when they are asked to contemplate a state of things which confessedly will not be of immediate realisation. They are burning for an immediate reformation of all wrong in their own time. They think it very poor work to talk of a golden age which is to bless the world long after they are dead, buried, and forgotten. They are even inclined to resent any attempt to interest them in it, as though dictated by a concealed desire to divert them from practical exertions. "Tell us," they say, "how *we* may taste some happiness. Why should we labour in the cause of progress if the fruits are to be reaped only by posterity?"

I do not wish to speak harshly of workmen who have this feeling. There has been too much of such hypocritical preaching in times past, and it is not strange if they have become suspicious of exhortations to fix their eyes on a remote future rather than on the present. So conspicuously unjust is their treatment by the more powerful classes, so hard and painful is the monotonous round of their daily life, that the wonder is, not that some men should rebel against it, but that most should bear it with calmness and resignation. Nevertheless, it is necessary to say firmly, and never to cease saying, that such language as I have alluded to belongs to a low morality. Moreover, it defeats its own object. For whatever may be the case with individuals, the people will not be stimulated to united action by arguments addressed to its selfishness. The people can only be moved to enthusiasm by an appeal to elevated sentiments. If leaders of the worst causes find it necessary to invest them with some delusive semblance of virtue that may touch the popular heart, shall we who have put our hand to the sacred task of helping and accelerating social progress, shall we deal in cynical sophisms and play on selfish passions? We owe it to our race that we should leave this world in a better state than we found it. We must labour for posterity, because our ancestors laboured for us. What sacrifices have we to make compared with some that have been made for us? We are not called on to go to the gallows with John Brown and George William Gordon, the latest martyrs in the cause of labour; or to mount barricades, like the workmen who flung away their lives in Paris twenty years ago next month. Is their spirit extinct? Were they men of different mould from us? Or did they enter upon that terrible struggle on some calculation of their personal advantage? No! but so short a time had wrought them up to an heroic enthusiasm which made it seem a light thing to pour out their blood if they might inaugurate a happier future for their class. And shall we who live in times less stormy but not less critical for the cause of labour, shall we complain if the fruits of such small sacrifices as we may make

are reserved for another generation?

The worst of this unworthy spirit is, that the exhibition of it is an excuse to the self-indulgent and frivolous for their neglect of all serious thought and vigorous action. One is sometimes ready to despair of any good coming out of a populace which can fill so many public-houses and low music-halls; which demands such dull and vulgar rubbish in its newspapers; which devours the latest news from Newmarket, and stakes its shillings and pots of beer as eagerly as a duke or marquis puts on his thousands. This multitude, so frivolous and gross in its tastes, will not be regenerated by plying it with fierce declamation against the existing order of society. You will more easily move it by appealing to its purer feelings, obscured but not extinct, than by taunting it with a base submission to class injustice. The man whose ideas of happiness do not go much beyond his pipe and glass and comic song, knows that the sour, envious agitator will never be a bit the better off for all the trouble he gives himself; and he sees nothing to gain by following in his steps. But there are few men so gross as not to be capable of feeling the beauty of devotion to the good of others, even when they are morally too weak to put it in practice. And though a man may lead an unsatisfactory life, it is something if, so far as his voice contributes to the formation of public opinion, it is heard on the right side. This is the ground we must take if we wish to raise the tone of workmen. We must place before them, without reserve, the highest motive of political and social action—the good of those who are to come after us. We must hold out no prospect of individual advantage or reward other than the approval of their own consciences.

Those who complain most bitterly of the slow rate of progress towards an improved industrial state, would sometimes do well to reflect whether their own conduct does not contribute to retard it. The selfish spirit follows us even into our labours for others, and takes the form of vanity and ambition. Probably all of us have had frequent occasion to observe how the cause of labour has suffered from ignoble jealousies and personal rivalries. Yet it is the greatest spirits who are invariably most ready to take the subordinate position and to accept obscurity with a noble satisfaction. The finest type of theocratic government, the lawgiver of the Hebrew nation, was ready to be blotted out of God's book, so that the humblest and lowest, the rank-and-file of his people, might enter the promised land. The greatest of the apostles wished that he himself might be accursed from Christ, if at that price he might purchase salvation for an obscure mob of Jews. "Reputation," said, the hero of the French revolution, "what is that? Blighted be my name, but let France be free." So speaks a Moses, a Paul, or a Danton, while petty ambitions are stickling for precedence, and posturing before the gaze of their contemporaries. Devotion, forgetfulness of self, a readiness to obey rather than an eagerness to command—if a man has not these qualities he is but common clay, he is not fit to lead his fellows. Let us school ourselves into a readiness not merely to storm the breach, but to lie down in the trench, that others may pass over our bodies as over a bridge to victory. It is a spirit which has never been found wanting whenever there has been a great cause to call it forth; and a greater cause than that of the workmen of Europe advancing to their final emancipation, this world is not likely to see again.

THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF THE WORKING CLASSES. A Lecture delivered to a meeting of Trades' Unionists, March 25th, 1868, by FREDERICK HARRISON, M. A. PRICE 3d.

On the Studying and Teaching of Languages: Two Lectures Delivered in the Marischal College of Aberdeen.

By John Stuart Blackie,
Professor of Humanity.

Edinburgh: Sutherland Knox, George Street. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co. Aberdeen: George Davidson. MDCCCLII.

Prefatory Note.

THE subject treated of in the following Lectures has occupied my attention, at different intervals, for many years. Having been sent abroad at an early age, my attention was called to the contrast between the extraordinary facility by which Foreign Languages are acquired in the country where they are spoken, and the slow, painful, and unsatisfactory process by which they are often inculcated in Schools, and by private teachers. I could not but perceive that there was something wrong in many of our common methods; and, when afterwards called to take an active part in the business of Academical instruction, I set myself, with all diligence, both to inquire into the philosophical principles of the art of teaching—too often neglected by those who style themselves "practical men"—and at the same time to make various experiments in the business of my own class, by which I might test the truth of theory. The results of these investigations and experiments I communicated on different occasions to two of our leading Journals; but being still unsatisfied with the manner in which I had treated the subject, and desirous, in a matter of no small Educational importance, to put my most mature thoughts into a complete and systematic shape, which might be beneficial to the rising generation of

Teachers, I determined to deliver an Academical Lecture on the subject. This Lecture was delivered at the opening of last Session, in Latin; and it was my intention, at that time, to publish it immediately, with English notes, explaining more fully what had been only touched on in the text. Circumstances however occurred to delay the publication of that discourse; and, at the opening of the present Session, I took up the subject again, and delivered a similar Lecture in English. Both these Lectures now appear; the one as an encouragement to the Academic use of the Latin language in our philological classes, which, I think, has fallen into unwise desuetude; the other, as not only more popular in its form, but I hope more complete also, both in its philosophical deductions, and its practical inferences. The one is in no wise a translation of the other; the only bond of connection between them, in fact, being that they were written by the same man, on the same subject, at about a year's interval. In order to ensure as much variety as possible in the phraseology, and in the illustration (for the main ideas must be substantially the same), I did not look into the Latin, after its delivery, till after I had printed the English.

I have only further to remark, that the English Lecture was not written till after delivery. This, to those who heard it, will explain how it contains some things that were not said in the class, and exhibits a greater amplitude of exposition in the text, and variety of bookish references in the notes, than would have been suitable, or even possible, in its original shape. As for the Latin, I do not pretend to write a curiously faultless style; but if I write well enough to prove, to the satisfaction of all fair judges, that I am a good practical workman in my own craft, I desire no farther praise.

ABERDEEN,

30th January, 1852.

MARISCHAL COLLEGE.

On the Studying and Teaching of Languages:

A Lecture

Delivered in the

Marischal College of Aberdeen, Session 1851-2.

By John Stuart Blackie,

Professor of Humanity.

Greek script

ARISTOTLE.

On the Method of Studying and Teaching Languages.

IN the present Lecture, I propose to inquire whether there be any certain and universally applicable principles in the Method of Studying and Teaching Languages; or rather, assuming, from the regularity of a pervading intelligence visible everywhere in the universe, that such principles exist, I purpose, more curiously than is commonly done, to lay them bare, by analysis, and to classify them comprehensively. The frequency of great pretensions in this department of the art of education, combined with the ignorance, stupidity, or obstinacy of not a few regularly-trained teachers, and an unreflecting habit of routine that seems endemic among official men in our country, are reasons strong enough to justify me in stepping distinctly forward to declare what, by long thought and experience, I seem to have ascertained to be true in this matter. If I err in any point, those who have thought more deeply on the subject, and made more various and long-continued experiments, will oblige me by sending their corrections.

For the sake of distinctness, as well as that we may be sure of proceeding in a scientific manner, I will divide the whole inquiry into two parts:—

- THE PROCESS OF NATURE IN THE LINGUISTIC TRAINING OF THE YOUNG; OR (IF THE PHRASE BE PREFERRED) IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FACULTY OF SPEECH IN RATIONAL BEINGS.
- THE PROCESS OF THE DIDACTIC ART, OR OF PEDAGOGY, AS IT IS SOMETIMES CALLED, IN THE SYSTEMATIC ARTIFICIAL INCULCATION OF LANGUAGES.

That this is the proper method of inquiry there can be no doubt. For man, in order to teach his fellow man, must first be taught by Him who is the teacher of all that are capable of learning—that is God; and Nature is the

permanent living scheme of the Divine operations, which must be understood and imitated by all of us, the creatures of God, who will work to any purpose. Any other procedure, as it begins with dreams, so it must end in drivel. The multitudinous babblement of all kinds with which the reasoning world is full, comes from no other source than the substitution, in some form or other, of the private crotchet of the individual (which, no doubt, contains its own fragment of truth) for the grand and complete scheme of universal Nature. Let us, therefore, by all means, endeavour carefully to analyze, and, if possible, exhaust, the living process of nature acting by congenital, divinely-implanted, instinct, before we venture to invent a machinery, or pile up an architecture, from our own resources.

The natural process of acquiring the faculty of speech, as it appears in the instinctive learning of the mother tongue, seems to contain the following distinct elements:—

- The articulate utterance of certain sounds in the hearing of young persons capable of learning and attending.
- The accompanying of these articulately uttered sounds with the direct and frequent exhibition of certain objects;
- these being objects in which the learner has naturally a constant living interest.
- The frequent repetition of these sounds by the speaker, and their frequent iteration by the learner.

Such, so far as I can see, are the only main and essential elements in the natural process by which the faculty of speech is acquired; for, as to the art of reading, and systematic grammatical study, these, though very useful in most cases, are by no means indispensable to the highest achievements of natural eloquence. Nations, whom we are apt to look down upon as half savage, have often a more vivid and forcible style of expression, and a more strikingly pictorial language, than the most civilized nations, who glory in the use of learned dictionaries and grammars. 'Tis doubtful if Homer, with all the burning glow of his Ionic soul, and the light of his sunny imagination, knew how to read or to write. Memory certainly, on the exercise of which the power of language so much depends, is often more weakened than strengthened, as Plato wisely foresaw, by the use of paper and written notes, now so common. Excluding, therefore, from our first consideration, the artificial appurtenances of reading and writing, we proceed to ask—On the existence of what qualities in teacher and learner does the progress of a young person in acquiring a spoken language depend?

It is certain, to begin with, that man is a speaking animal, and that all men, who are originally complete, may be taught to speak, and do, in fact, exercise, in a greater or lesser degree, the faculty of language. Phrenologists talk of an organ of language in the human brain; but, if such an organ exists, the fact must not be so understood as to imply that a particular personal gift is requisite for the learning of language; as for music, a special talent is demanded, for poetry, and for many other arts. Music is a special gift, given to more men indeed than our neglected æsthetical education may lead us to conclude, but not therefore a general faculty. Man is not a singing animal, though many men sing, and more might be taught. Some men even have ears which are affected by the sweetest harmonies, just as pleasantly as by any other noise. But, in the faculty of speech, common to the race, there exists every variety of quality and degree. The progress made by the infant learner in acquiring his mother tongue depends, therefore, in the first place, on the amount of his capacity for linguistical expression; and this depends, not only on the shape of his mouth, and the susceptibility of his ear, but also, and much more, on the sensibility of his mind, and the activity of his imagination. Persons without ideas may talk much, but they can never have a rich command of language. A susceptible boy must, in the nature of things, acquire the faculty of speech sooner than a dull one. He has more to speak about, and, therefore, unless intercepted by some premature moodiness, he will speak more. But, even with the finest faculty from nature, the amount of linguistical expertness developed in a boy will depend also, in a great measure, on the character and accomplishments of the persons with whom, in his earliest years, he is almost exclusively associated. Man is essentially an imitative animal; and speech essentially an imitative art. The old Egyptian monarch, a precocious experimenter in Comparative Philology, when, in ignorance or forgetfulness of this, he removed two infants from the society of men, that he might learn what language they would speak when left to themselves, only forced them to learn the word *os*, from the goats whom their keeper milked. So the finest endowments for language in the world will bear small fruit, if the mother of the infant Cicero be taciturn, the father mute, and the nurse a mumbler. Quintilian accordingly advises that the education of orators should commence in their cradle; and he advises well. The school will have a hard task, if the nursery and the parlour daily teach contrary doctrine; and sorely taxed will that learned professor be who has daily to undo the work of an ignorant or a careless schoolmaster. Nay, certain things in language, as daily experience shows, if they are once thoroughly learned, cannot, without a miracle, be unlearned, as, for instance, the broad Scottish accent, the high Cockney key, and other things of the same kind. So great, in this department, at least, is what a certain shallow sophist calls "the overwhelming weight of external circumstances." Our minds, in respect of language, are not only a sheet of blank paper, according to Locke's much-perverted simile, but they are composed of a tissue so delicate and fine, that, when certain impressions are once received, you cannot erase

the character without tearing the scroll. Beware therefore, whosoever would educate the young to a pure quality of speech—beware of the first encroachments on the sensitive retentiveness of the ear; for depend upon it, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the master here, to those who are once fairly under his influence, will become their maker and their moulder.

Let us now enquire what effect the artificial machinery of Books has in modifying the linguistical development of the child.

Art, as was well remarked, in answer to Rousseau, is of the very nature of man. This is very plain; strength, courage, beauty, love, hatred, and all that host of strong instinctive powers by which the great movements of the world are originated, and its history acted, belong to nature, in the larger and more philosophical sense of the word; while steam-engines, railways, books, and other notable inventions, belong to art. What civilized man has, as distinguished from the savage, he has from art, not from nature. Books belong to one grade of civilization; printing to a higher; and cheap printing to the highest. The desire to give a stereotyped permanency to the fleeting impressions made by speaking on the ear, gave rise to the invention of letters. Their use is wonderful; provided always, (what Plato had in view, as above hinted) we allow not the tool to lord it over the workman. What then does the raw student of language learn from books? Principally, I think, two things. *First*, through books the more vague sense of hearing has its impressions fixed, and made more permanent by the aid of the more definite sense of sight. *Second*, the use of books opens to the young scholar a wider range of ideas, and supplies him with a richer store of words. If, indeed, his father is a very intelligent man, and speaks much with his children, the use of books, in this second regard, maybe more easily dispensed with; but how few fathers are very intelligent! how few of those who are so have time to devote to the systematic education of their offspring! and again, how few even of the most intelligent parents can answer all the questions that a curious child may reasonably ask! Hence, the young talker ought to be well supplied with books—with Peter Parley and Mrs. Trimmer, if possible; but by all means with Robinson Crusoe, and Jack the Giant-killer. These are the proper food of juvenile eloquence.

As to grammar, and such like formal appliances of scholastic wisdom, they are of less consequence in the early development of the linguistic faculty;

"Verum ut Grammatices pracepta fateor necessaria, ita velim esse quam paucissima, mdo sint optima."
ERASMUS, de ratione studii. Works Ludg. Bat. 1703, Vol I. P. 512. *"Optima tantum primum ac simplicissima praeipienda sunt."* IDEM, de instituendis pueris. Vol. I. p. 512.

but, as the understanding is more evolved, it will not be wise altogether to neglect them. Grammar, indeed, is more effective as a training of the unripe understanding, as a sort of "juvenile logic" (so we are fond of wording it in Aberdeen), than as a stimulus to the expansion of the power of expression. Nevertheless in the teaching of the dead languages, where practice is not easily obtained, and of the modern languages less commonly spoken, it materially shortens the labour of the learner to have systematically imprinted on the memory the grand fundamental types of verbal flexion, and syntactic dependence, which compose the peculiar organism of each tongue. And, even in the case of the mother tongue, the systematic study of grammar, if it give no additional richness or readiness of expression, cannot fail of ensuring greater accuracy and neatness—qualities which the most luxuriant verbal genius is not entitled to despise. The main object of grammar, when philosophically taught, is to bring the understanding and the logical faculty into play, as an accessory tool, to assist the mere memory, and the imagination, which are the natural faculties by which language is acquired. Taught by a mere word-monger and syllable-splitter, therefore, it will infallibly fail of its effect. There is no subject of puerile inculcation that more imperatively calls for a good teacher—none which must more frequently content itself with a bad one. Grammar, and all abstract sciences, are naturally odious to the young; if they are to be relished and digested (without which there is no proper teaching) they must be taught cunningly, with liveliness, and with moderation.

When the understanding of the learner is fully developed, the Study of grammar, strictly so called, will naturally expand itself into what is called PHILOLOGY, in the modern sense of that word, according to which it may be defined the science of language, as the organ of human thought, viewed philosophically and historically. In its philosophical phase, this science is either a branch of Psychology, or verges very closely on it; in its historical phase, Philology unfolds the genesis of those laws of speech, which Grammar contemplates as a finished result. Each particular language has its own Philology, its own history, and its own organism—the study of which makes up the special science of that language; while the philological laws of several languages, or of all languages compared together, give rise to a more comprehensive science, called Comparative Philology. The results deducible from this study are often of the most curious and interesting nature, and lead to conclusions full of importance, with regard to the history of the great human family, and the connection of its various races. Comparative Philology, therefore, taken in connection with Physiology, Archaeology, and early history, gives rise to a new science, known in modern times, under the name of Ethnology. The study of these sciences furnishes materials of the highest kind, that the understanding can bring to the aid of the ear and the

tongue, in the acquirement of the grand art of language.

Hitherto the aids furnished to the practical study of individual languages by the scientific analysis of various cognate tongues, have been confined almost exclusively to highly cultivated adults; but, there is every reason to hope that, as the mechanism of language becomes more generally understood, and a race of teachers shall have been trained, more skilled in the philosophy of teaching, the method of comparative analysis will be found most extensively applicable, even to elementary teaching.—[See a paper on "the comparative advantages of some methods of teaching Latin and Greek": by JOHN ROBSON. Classical Museum, No. XIV.]

It is never to be forgotten, however, that, after all that books and science can do, the study of every language remains still a practical art; perfection in which is to be attained principally by use. Not the man who is most curious in dictionaries and grammars, but he who hears, and speaks, and reads, and writes, most largely and most sympathetically, will, in a given time, know the language best; and, in order to avoid pedantic blunders—unhappily too frequent—the careful teacher must constantly recur, from these artificial and secondary aids, furnished by abstract books, to the great concrete method of Nature, by living imitation. But, the procedure fit to be adopted by the systematic teacher of languages, belongs to the second division of our subject, to which we now proceed. We are to inquire into

II.—THE PROCESS OF THE DIDACTIC ART, OR OF PEDAGOGY, AS IT IS SOMETIMES CALLED, IN THE SYSTEMATIC ARTIFICIAL INCULCATION OF LANGUAGES.

Here the conditions under which the work is done are in two very important points different; which will, of course, necessitate a corresponding difference of method. These points are,

- The existence of a greater maturity of intellect, and with that, a higher faculty of expression, on the part of the learner.
- The existence of a systematic purpose and plan, and a deliberate graduated procedure, on the part of the teacher.

These two advantages appear to tell strongly in favour of the more mature, as contrasted with the infantine and childish learner of languages; and in fact, if along with these special advantages of his age and position, the systematic student of language does not lose sight of the great method of nature, there is no question, but that a young man of sixteen, with fair talents, will learn more of a foreign language in three months, than a mere child, in twice as many years. Of this we have daily proof in the case of those young persons, who, residing for half a year in a foreign country, and daily forced to hear the language of the country spoken, return home with a fair practical command of the tongue, without much help from grammars and systematic teaching. If, further, a young man be sent over to Germany, for instance, without knowing a word of the German language, and forthwith commence attending regular lectures on some subject in which he takes an interest, and of which he has some previous knowledge; and if to this practice of daily putting himself within the living vocal element of the language, he adds an hour or two a-day of regular grammatical study, and systematic reading, in this case, as I know, by experience, three months is a sufficient space to give him both a practical command, and a scientific hold of the tongue, such as, by perverse methods, and under less favourable circumstances, he could not have acquired in six years. But mere puberty does not of itself assert such superiority; and the boy, with his instinctive and random method of acquiring his mother tongue, often completely outstrips the youth of sixteen, with his portentous apparatus of grammars and dictionaries, and tutors, public and private, and learned professors. Now, of this notable result, part, no doubt, is to be traced to the fact, that in the long and familiar process by which the mother tongue is acquired, the mind acquires a habit and a set, which makes it painful for it to attempt the familiar use of any other form of expression; just as we see persons of a certain age, by mere repetition of what was originally indifferent, acquire a habit of walking, sitting, or dressing, in a certain way, with which they will as soon part as with their skin; but before the age of thirty, at least, there is elasticity and flexibility enough in most minds, to adapt themselves, without much trouble, to a new form of expressing thought, provided only a right method be adopted, and care be taken, either to find or to create favourable circumstances. Here lies the difficulty: every study requires the student to move in a certain element. As Geology cannot well be studied by those who never saw a mountain or a quarry; nor Mineralogy, without stones; nor Botany, without flowers; so, the faculty of speech cannot be acquired without habitually moving in the element of articulated words. In this isolated island of Great Britain, we are generally backward at languages, because we have little converse with those who speak them. Our opportunities of learning foreign tongues, compared with those of a Hungarian for instance, a Dutchman, a Russian, or a German, are few; nor do we compensate for this deficiency by the high character of our professional teachers. How often are they stupid! and, where not stupid, how often careless, aimless, and planless! or, on the other hand, how often, when the understanding is brought into fine training by a scientific and systematic teacher, is the development of the great linguistic instincts of nature lost sight of, or unduly subordinated! The eye, the ear, the tongue, the memory, the imagination of the learner, are not stimulated to any natural healthy action; his interest is not excited; his affections are not engaged; so that with ten times the amount of profound labour, not one tenth part

of the result is attained, that Nature, in her wisdom, causes us to pick up by chance. Consider only, what a small amount of available Latin and Greek the majority of boys carry off with them from a septennial, or it may be a decennial course, of formal linguistic inculcation at School and College! 'Tis really startling. The Utilitarians, and some men of far higher cast than these,

"Nothing can be so little calculated to advance our stock of knowledge, as our inveterate mode of education, whereby we all spend so many years in learning so little. I was, from the age of 6 to that of 20, learning *Greek* and *Latin*, or, to speak more truly, learning nothing else. The little Greek I had sleepeth, if it be not dead, and can hardly rise without a miracle; and my Latin, though abundant enough for all useful purposes, would be held in great contempt by those people who regard the classics as the scriptures of taste."—SOUTHEY. *Life*, iii. p. 96.

"Our people are the most prosaic people in the world, but the most faithful; and, with curious reverence, we keep up and transmit, from generation to generation, the repetition of what we call the education of a gentleman."—Tbackekat, (*Pendennis*, c. 3.)

have some reason to cry out that so much time has been lost in "cramming the memory with dead vocables"—while the young soul lies otherwise, so far as formal teaching goes, all grey, and blank, and barren. This is a matter of great practical importance; and therefore, we shall be excused for looking into it with somewhat of a curious detail.

I.—Reverting to the first step in the process of the natural method laid down above, (p. 2,) we shall find that the teacher of the classical languages is too much in the habit of forgetting it altogether, or placing it in undue subordination. The teacher of a living language will not so readily commit this mistake: to him recourse is generally had by persons whose object is both to speak the language themselves, and to understand it when spoken by others; in which circumstances, that he shall speak readily and pronounce well, is his prime recommendation. But the main object of the classical teacher being to enable the learner to read written books, and by means of such reading to prosecute learned researches privately, he is only too apt to imagine that his disciple must learn what he learns principally by the eye and by the understanding, and so the teacher needs not trouble himself much with frequent vocal appeals to the ear. But there is hasty logic here, and not a little carelessness. For, first of all, it is plain that by neglecting the education of the ear in the teaching of the dead languages, we leave unemployed one great avenue, and that the original natural avenue, to the knowledge of language: we throw ourselves altogether on the artificial and secondary, and (in matters of sound) less dramatic machinery of the eye and the understanding. The consequence will be, unavoidably—for Nature is never mocked—a great deal of unnecessary trouble, with a comparatively meagre result. A striking exemplification of this we see, unfortunately too often, in the method of teaching PROSODY, as it is practised even in the best schools.

I cannot pretend to an extensive acquaintance with the methods of teaching practised in English Schools. These Institutions, indeed, with characteristic exclusiveness, often forbid the entrance of a stranger into their classes; and in this way I was prevented from seeing the system at Rugby, though I went there for the purpose of getting information. I only speak, therefore, of evils which have come under my eye every where in Scotland, and specially in Aberdeen. As little do I pretend to have examined all the Grammars, Greek or Latin, that have been published, and are now used in this country; but the only one known to me that strongly enforces the, natural method of teaching Prosody urged in the text is that of Dr. PEITHMAN, London: Orr & Smith. 183.0, 2d Edition.

Prosody is neither more nor less than part of pronunciation, that part namely, which prescribes, according to the use of each particular language, the longer or shorter duration of the voice upon each component syllable of a word. Thus, when I say, the word Female is, according to the technical style of Prosodians, a Spondee, I mean that in uttering this word both the syllables are extended or prolonged by the dwelling of the voice for a longer time on each syllable, than is the case in such words as VENOM, where both the syllables are short, and the whole word composes what, in Prosodial phrase, is called a Pyrrhic, the antipodes of a Spondee. Now, common sense will teach any man, that, if this be so, as it unquestionably is, the plain, direct, and natural method of teaching Prosody, is to pronounce every word properly, according to the quantity of the several syllables of which it is composed, and, by frequently repeating this impression on the ear, to make it permanent.

"The EAR CAUSES the tongue to move; the ear is the root of the memory."—*Nature displayed in her mode of teaching language to man*. By N. G. DUFIEF, 2 Vols. 8vo, 6th Edition, London: 1823. DUFIEF, as a man of one idea, and a Frenchman, rides his hobby with a little too much sound and fury; but nowise teacher will scorn to look into his book.

This is, in fact, the way by which we learn the Prosody of our native tongue, learn to make the same vocal utterance *a*, short in the word Hal, and long in the word Hall. But if we inquire into the method by which learned schoolmasters and professors have often taught Prosody, we shall find that, from whatever source they derived their method, it certainly was not from Nature, or from common sense. Their method is this: For the

first three or four years of the pupils' indoctrination, they leave the matter, in a great measure, to chance, or to a "systemless system," which, like higher things in higher places, has reigned in the schools, by the sole right of a stupid tradition, for centuries; then, after the ear has remained either altogether uncultivated, or, what is far worse, perversely cultivated, (for the schoolmaster must speak), through this triennial or quinquennial space, suddenly a new revolution is made to the juvenile understanding, and, in the shape of a formal science of harsh and crabbed rules, the proper pronunciation of syllables in the abstract is now for the first time taught, while the improper pronunciation by the boy's tongue, and by the master's, is allowed to retain its old established sovereignty in the concrete! Here is wisdom. NIHIL EST TAM ABSURDUM QUOD NON FECERIT ALIQUIS GRAMMATICORUM.

I advise the classical teacher who is not a coward, and who has not by the long habit of teaching forgot the not less important art of learning, at once to break with this system of traditionary perverseness, and to teach Latin and Greek Prosody, as he himself learned the Prosody of his mother tongue, by a direct and frequent appeal to the ear. Let the proper quantity of every syllable of every word go along with that word, the first time the pupil uses it. Let Prosody be a living practice with which the study of language begins—not a dead theory with which it ends. Let there be no time lost in teaching that painfully by rules afterwards, which may be learned without rules by agreeable practice at first. If, for instance, you pronounce the syllable Os, at the end of a Latin word, regularly long, your pupils, by the nice instinct of the ear, will pronounce it long also, and will be saved in after years a just expenditure of vexation at the stupid science of Prosody, with which pedants so perversely torture them. Take another step also, in the path which Nature points out, and, instead of confining your pedagogic superintendence to the more lazy art of hearing lessons, come actively forward your self, as often as possible, and use the tongue, that you are teaching practically before your pupils.

On this point the Hamiltonians are strong. "Instead of *teaching*, our modern master of languages orders his pupil to learn, and thinks he discharges his duty when he punishes him for not doing so. Thus the burden of tuition is thrown on the pupils, instead of being sustained by the teacher."—*The Gospel of John*. By JAMES HAMILTON. London, 1824.

Believe me, if you will but try, with any small amount of courage and common sense, it is as easy to speak Latin or Hebrew, as to speak English.

See a curious account in Morhof's Polyhistor, of Clenard's method of teaching Latin by lively and sportive conversation, translated by me in my article "*on the teaching of languages*."—*Foreign Quarterly Review*, No. LIX., p. 170.

Begin with what you know, and perseverance will soon carry you a length of which you have no conception. Never be content with knowing profoundly that such and such curious rules are to be found lying there on the bookshelf. The language is not yours, till you have it in your ear, and on your tongue. However thoroughly you have studied the art of self-defence, conceit yourself not a fencer till you can use the foil.

II.—Going back to the second great step of the natural process of language-teaching, (p. 3,) the direct and frequent exhibition of interesting objects with which the words are to be associated, we find that here also the classical teacher labours under very serious disadvantages. These arise, no doubt, in a great measure, from the nature of his subject; but so much the more is it necessary that he should be aware of them, and seriously set himself to do what he can for their remedy. The subjects of which classical books treat, are, in general, remote from our common field of observation and interest: we read of names that are far from our feelings, and of things and places that no longer exist. Now there are two methods which the classical teacher can employ in order to diminish this evil. To paint up and gar-nish his grey Philology, which speaks only to the ear and the understanding, he will call in the aid of various-visaged Archaeology, which speaks principally to the eye. By means of drawings, plans, and vivid imaginative descriptions, he will bring the many-coloured life of the Greeks and Romans bodily before the eye of the modern student.

Fabulas et apologos hoc discet libentius ac meminerit melius, si horum argumenta scite depicta pueri oculis subjiciantur, et quicquid oratione narratur, in tabula demonsretur.—ERASMUS.

The eye of a boy—unless it be dulled by long-continued groping through Latin dictionaries—is naturally quick and eager. The teacher should provide food meet for it.

Quod judicabit maxime gratum pueris, maximeque cognatum et amabilem ac, ut ita dicam florulentum, id potissimum magister propona.—ERASMUS.

Again, in order to excite the pupil's interest in what is past, the teacher should omit no opportunity of connecting it with the present. In teaching ancient geography, for instance, he ought not to cram the boy's memory with obsolete names only, but he must bring strikingly before the young imagination the glowing features of Nature, as they exist now in the regions known by those storied designations. A classical teacher, when he can afford it, ought to travel, and see the present state of those countries of which he has to speak so much. "*When I was at Babylon, and stood upon the tower of Belus*"—dropt accidentally from a professorial mouth, will cause a pricking in the heels of the dullest boy, and make him limp through his Curtius for the

moment, with a less painful feeling of lameness. The young have a strong appetite for reality; and the teacher who does not make use of that appetite is not wise.

But the great advantage of teaching languages by means of objects or pictures of objects, is, that this is the only method which immediately and effectively breaks the scholar from the evil habit of continuing to think in his mother tongue, while he is studying, or assuming the attitude of studying, a foreign one. According to the method of Nature, the student of language, from the very first hour of his education, begins to form a living habit of associating such and such familiar objects, directly with such and such recurring sounds; whereas, according to our common school methods, a new language is too frequently acquired only through the intervention of the mother tongue, which, pre-occupying the train of thought, renders it a cumbrous and painful operation for the organs of speech, when required to perform their proper function, in reference to the new language. This is not merely an evil thing in itself, by preventing the accomplishment of ready expression in a language which the student may otherwise well understand; but it acts as a positive bar to the easy and frequent iteration of the vocables once received into the ear; and, of course, becomes a powerful and constantly acting cause in retarding the young linguist's progress. Every Professor in a Scottish University must, I am sure, have made the observation—how slow even good students often are in giving the Latin *extempore* for some of the most common English words; their learning is seldom forthcoming at the call; they have to go and hunt for it. Nor is this strange. For the fact is that, during five years of a course of grammar, though they may have been taught to apply the rules expertly, they have never been taught to use the language; they have been accustomed to make a laborious search for it always through strange English idioms, and perplexing dictionaries. Now, this evil is at once cured, if the classical teacher, instead of sticking like a limpet to his Accidence, and working always pedantically through books, will, on the very first day of a Latin course, start with the direct naming and pointing out of any interesting objects or pictures of objects that may command the eye of the scholar. For this exercise the mother tongue does not require to be used either by teacher or learner; for the teacher has merely to name the thing in Latin, and the learner has, in the first place, merely to repeat the sound accurately; afterwards, short sentences will readily be made, describing first one part of the object, and then another, till the scholar shall be able, without the precedent of the master, and without ever thinking of an English phrase, to pour forth a full and free description of the whole object, in elegant and idiomatic Latinity. In this manner the ear will be daily and hourly besieged by the sounds of the foreign idiom, coming directly from the tongue of the teacher with all the fresh and plastic power of a vernacular; and the tongue will have daily and hourly practice in the pleasant art of playing with a new instrument. Only it requires a dexterous and lively instructor to use this method effectively—an accurate man too, and a man of a certain amount of honesty, and moral courage. A clumsy fellow and a coward, or a shallow pretender—such as too many of our teachers have been—need never attempt it.

I have one more remark to make on this part of the subject. Why are classical teachers generally so exclusively "classical" in their sphere of thought, and in the books which they use? Why are they so averse, for instance, to NATURAL HISTORY, and those sciences whose subject is real visible objects, and not words expressive of things that cannot be handled? If I were a schoolmaster, so far from feeling any of this jealousy of what the Germans call "real" sciences, I would encourage them, not only as introducing a pleasant variety into the monotony of grammatical training, but as a signal aid in the acquisition of the Latin and Greek languages. Everybody knows that the whole terminology of these sciences is borrowed from one or the other of those tongues; and the cunning philologist, if he has no better reason, may wisely admit them into the school curriculum for this cause only, that they open another and most inviting passage for the smuggling of Greek vocables into the brain.

Those teachers who wish to use Natural History or visible objects of any kind as a means of varying the common meagre routine of a "Grammar School" in the old style, will find much assistance from the famous German school-book, the *ORBIS PICTUS*, (Reutlingen, 1838,) being merely the modern and improved shape of the *JANUA LINGUARUM* (Lon. 1662.) by AMOS COMENIUS. Concerning this celebrated teacher, (whose motto was "RES NON VERBA,") I may refer the German scholar to RAUMER'S admirable *Geschichte der Pædagogik*, where full information may be had on the didactic principles and practice of all the most famous teachers of modern times, from the revival of letters down to Pestalozzi.

Boys who come to College, with no vocabulary but what they have learned from Cæsar and Livy, are often sadly puzzled when they make their transit (as is the order with us), in the second session, to the Natural History class. I would have this science, so interesting to the young, taught for two hours a-week, during the last three years of the Gymnasial course. To this, classical monopolists will, of course, object, urging that their time would be curtailed; but they have more time than they know how to use wisely—as their method of teaching Prosody sufficiently declares.

III.—But the grand reason why so little linguistic progress is made by boys in schools and colleges is plainly this, that not a few of the students have no interest at all in what they are about, and even the best

scholars have a very secondary and a very interrupted interest. A child has a constant and strong interest in its toys, and in the objects of the external world that daily surround it; hence it pleasantly and readily learns the names of these objects. With the grammar school boy, however, and the university student, it is too often quite the reverse; and the progress is in this case as slow and painful, as in the other case it is rapid and delightful. Of this radical evil, there are several causes, some of which certainly may be remedied,—others, it seems likely, will remain. I shall mention four, which principally strike me.

The master, in the first place, is sometimes dull and stupid, or a precise and wiry pedant, who is unable to deal sympathetically with young minds. The interest, whatever there be in the school work, cannot come from him, from whom certainly it ought to come, in a grand all-sweeping stream, as certainly as the warlike inspiration of a great battle, ending in victory, comes from the commander-in-chief. Alexander with his thousands conquered Darius with his millions on the field of Arbela, simply because he was Alexander. So, if you find one school where the scholars are alert and exact, while in another they are somnolent and loose, you may depend upon it the cause of this difference is to be sought for in the master, not in the boys. Those, therefore, who wish their sons to be inspired with a love of learning, should, above all things, look to it that they provide him with an intelligent, active, lively, and blithe-hearted teacher. How much, then, are we to blame in Scotland for the low status in which we have hitherto kept the teachers of youth! As matters now stand, it is extremely difficult, say rather, in most cases, impossible, for the teachers, even in the best grammar schools of our most flourishing cities, to assert their position as gentlemen. They are practically a proscribed race. Say what you please of your respect for education and educators, your daughter understands better what you mean, and she will not "lower herself by marrying a schoolmaster." And no wonder. For your respected pedagogue, profoundly versed in Homer and Demosthenes, has only £100 or £200 a-year, while your daughter cannot live comfortably under five hundred pounds—or, at least, four. When will this respectable Scotch world learn that to diffuse sunshine and rain on the youthful budding mind is as respectable, and as useful a vocation, as frowning punishment upon thieves, or looking sternly on the rack-rented tenants of a thriftless landlord? In my opinion, it requires talent of as high an order, and moral character much higher, to make a young man love learning, as to shoot a Sikh, or to cut down a Caffre. But the world has hitherto been of a different opinion; and, till it choose to alter this opinion, we must expect to find inferior teaching of languages, as of everything else, predominant in the schools. Your smart son will be of the same opinion as your daughter. He will be an advocate; he will be a doctor; he will be a preacher; nay, he will prefer to earn a precarious guinea from Chambers and Hogg, from Blackwood and Tait, rather than sink his position in society, by becoming a school-master. The only way to remedy this evil is, to raise the £200 a-year to £500; and teaching will at once become a gentlemanly profession.

But the scholar may be at fault, as well as the teacher. He also is sometimes dull and stupid, or, it may be, inconstant and erratic; consequently incapable of having his attention fixed, or his interest excited, even by a lively teacher. For this evil I know no remedy, except one which certainly would succeed in some cases, though in others it would prove inefficacious. I mean change of study. That some youths cannot have their faculties stimulated through the medium of Latin and Greek, or any other language, may, from the known diversity of human capacities and tastes, as they appear in after years, be assumed as a fact. "The boy is father of the man." Let the hopeless dunce of the Grammar School be tried with Natural History, with Geography, Drawing, Music, Turning, Fencing, and perhaps, he will display the latent instinct which your portentous machinery of grammars and dictionaries has hitherto smothered.

"Dunces have nothing to do with Greek and Latin; for studies that yield neither delight nor improvement, are not only superfluous, but hurtful."—DR. BEATTIE, *on the usefulness of classical learning*.—Wise-most wise; but half-starved Schoolmasters and under paid Professors are not over-apt to make any regulations that have a tendency to prevent dunces from "having to do with Greek and Latin." Parents also are not without folly; and therefore, the eye of a wise teacher in this country is continually vexed by seeing dull hoys, year after year, employed in being drilled through a course of study that is not merely superfluous to them, but positively hurtful.

There is too much of a routine in our Schools and Colleges. The optional principle, now at length, after much stiff fight with pedantry, being introduced into Oxford and Cambridge, is founded on nature, and ought not despotically to be disregarded by schoolmasters.

Again, it sometimes happens that even a clever teacher wants sense to put proper books into the hands of the learner. He knows what interests himself, but does not always sufficiently consider what is likely to interest the youthful mind. Perhaps he is a Ciceronian, who will not read the most interesting books in the language, because the tenses are not used always in the same sequence that was most affected by the ear of the great orator. For this evil I know no remedy, but such as will naturally spring from a general elevation of status, and consequent enlargement of ideas, in the whole teaching body.

Lastly, under this head, persons are often sent to study the classical languages, and to read the works of the

highest classics, at an age when it is impossible even for clever boys—not to mention the slow majority—to read them with intelligence and sympathy. Here lies the great defect of the Scottish system of classical education. I do not know how it is elsewhere; but I know that in Marischal College, Aberdeen, young men generally abandon their classical studies at that very age, when, according to the laws of nature, they become first susceptible of what is most sublime and beautiful in composition. Puberty has more to do with the intelligence of a Greek chorus, than even Passow's Lexicon, or Porson's Hecuba. Our whole system of teaching Greek in Scotland, and our academical system generally, as based on classical study, must be fundamentally remodelled, before Scotland can ever hope to send forth a race of scholars, thinkers, and theologians, whom Europe shall respect. We have degraded ourselves from our proper position by doing school-work at the Universities; and the proper University work is not done at all. Under a healthy system, no person would think of coming to college before the age of seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen; and I think also, that the age for commencing Greek and Latin might, with great propriety, be postponed for a year or two in the schools. The mind is not ripe, even for the elements of those studies, before the age of eleven or twelve; and the time previous to that might be much better employed in giving the puerile mind that general culture belonging to a man and an Englishman rather than to a scholar, which, when classics are commenced earlier, is only too apt to be neglected. For your regular Greek and Latin man, as I have known the creature, is the greatest of all monopolists, and will tolerate nothing in the school-world but himself, and his grammar.

IV.—Another great defect in the systematic inculcation of languages is the want of a proper machinery for the frequent iteration of the strange sounds with which the learner is to become familiar. Think only of the number of times the most common words are repeated before a child, and by the child, during the first six or seven years of its existence! That it has learned so much by mere accident, and altogether without plan, will then appear nothing wonderful. Contrast with this grand iterating process of nature, the common process of studying language, either privately, or in a grammar school, and you will no longer think it strange that grammatical science, with all her stiff and wiry appliances, after six or seven years' hard labour, has produced so poor a result,—a result so exceedingly meagre in many cases, that men, who would seem particularly wise, are not ashamed to say, that the object of studying Latin grammar for such a length of time in a grammar school, is not to learn the Latin language, but to have the crude understanding properly drilled by the only logic of which the puerile mind is capable! Thus people learn to sing, we suppose, not that they may produce sweet sounds, but that they may strengthen their throats! But, whatever may be thought of this wisdom, one thing is plain, that the classical teacher, who really wishes his pupils to learn the classical languages, and not merely to be drilled by grammatical rules, must set his mind to work for bringing into play every possible sort of method, whereby the once-impressed sound may be repeated. Every trade has its tricks; and I have no doubt that, when the philosophy of education shall be more deeply looked into than has yet been the case in this country of traditionary routine, schoolmasters will find that they are yet far from having exhausted all the devices that an imitation of the method of nature furnishes for the attainment of this necessary repetition. One thing only I will notice here, as it has special reference to the system of teaching Greek in our Scottish Universities, and involves an evil so clamant, that sensible men have long ago determined that it shall no longer be tolerated. I mean the practice of teaching the elements of Greek, for five or six months of the year, in our Universities; a practice which, besides other evils, is directly adverse to that continuity of the natural process of repetition which, in the first stages of linguistic progress, is absolutely indispensable. Not to mention that it is altogether degrading to Professors in a University to teach the elements of Greek at all, it is quite obvious that, at whatever stage of progress the students shall have been left at the expiry of the first Session, they will be found (having been left to themselves), at no further stage six months afterwards, when the second year of their curriculum commences; nay, of this we may be sure from universal experience, and from the very nature of the case, that the great majority of them will have retrograded considerably. They have been out of training for a period as long or longer than they were in it; and what this means let pianists, and rope-dancers, and prize-fighters tell. Then, when they return to College, and commence the second fit of their Hellenistic drill, they have so many new subjects of study—as, in Marischal College for instance, Mathematics and Natural History—that any real progress in the languages (except with one or two who study privately), is not to be looked for; and the fact is that the great majority, even of the good scholars, only keep up the small measure of Greek which they have got during the first year of the course, for the sake of leaving College with the title of A.M., and passing the entrance trials (happily now at length existing in some Divinity Halls), and Presbyterial examinations. The proper remedy for this gross absurdity is not, as some may be ready to suppose, the lengthening of the Academical Session, though to this I am in no wise opposed, *provided the general Academic standard be raised,*

If the standard be not raised, I oppose the lengthening of the Session decidedly, as having a direct tendency, in the present puerile state of matters, to convert the Professors in arts more and more into mere schoolmasters.

but the banishment from the Universities of the elementary teaching of Greek, and the remitting of it to the

schools, to which it properly belongs. Then the first Greek class will be able to start with the reading of the higher Greek authors; and the second Greek class may with safety assume the discursive form of learned prelection, which is the main feature that distinguishes Academical teaching from the elementary inculcation of schools. Till this be done, it is in vain to hope, as I have already said, that Scotland shall ever produce a generation of scholars, thinkers, and theologians, whom Europe may look on with respect. We shall remain, what we have hitherto been, as Dr. Chalmers, with his usual deep insight, expressed it, "weak throughout, because weak radically."

From this combined view of the essential elements of the natural method of learning languages, and of the most common defects in their systematic artificial inculcation, we may draw out the following practical rules for the study of languages, and with that conclude.

Practical Rules for the Study of Languages.

I.—Never commence the study of a language without the assistance of a master (where it can be had) who understands both the science and the practice of his department of Philology. If you cannot find a good master answering this description, then, if your object in studying the language be purely speculative and scientific, (as for the purposes of comparative Philology and Ethnology,) choose the master who is most profound in the science of the language; otherwise, that is, if your main object be, as is generally the case, the practical use of the language, choose a master who is clever in its practice, and supply what he wants in scientific knowledge, by the private study of grammars and philological treatises.

II.—Study a living language, if you by any means can, only in the place and among the people where it is spoken.

"Ad linguae cognitionem plurimum habet momenti, si inter bene loquaces discipulus educatur."—ERASMUS

You will thus save yourself a great deal of time and trouble; and every expense of labour will tell with a tenfold power.

III.—If you cannot command this advantage, you must seek the society of natives of the foreign country whose language you would learn, living in your own country; as, for instance, of Germans or Greeks, (for Greek is not a dead language, as some ignorantly suppose,) in London or Manchester; and in default of these, you should associate yourself with other learners for the purpose of frequent expression, writing, and conversation, in the foreign phrase, if possible all under the eye of a dexterous teacher. Familiarity with a language, and a ready command of its stores, is, with most people, more easily attainable in the social way, than in the way of solitary study.

IV.—In your use of books, do not practise silent reading merely, but read as much as possible aloud, thus filling your own ear with the greatest possible amount, so far as depends on yourself, of the living fulness of the language.

V.—Make your book supply the place of a speaking model by shutting it at intervals, and declaiming any part of its contents that may strike your fancy, as nearly as possible in the words that are written; or you may shape these words to your own ideas, as they may happen to suit, and adapt your thoughts in short sentences as they occur to the language of the author whom you are reading. You will thus make for yourself a sort of speaking practice in the monologic form, (as Demosthenes used to declaim to the waves,) with the constant assurance that you are using only the best words in the best way. You will likewise habituate your mind at once to seize on the foreign idiom, as the direct living tool of thought—without that constant cumbrous and confounding interposition of the mother tongue, which must be mercilessly interdicted, before the easy command of any foreign idiom can become possible.

VI.—Closely connected with these monologic exercises, is the habit of committing passages of considerable length, especially poetical passages, verbally to memory, much encouraged in some of the English schools,

The famous GASPAR SCIOPPIUS in his "*Conshltatiores de scholarum et stadiorum ratione*—Amstel: 1660, recommends, that after the first two months of linguistical study, occupied in committing to memory the paradigms of declensions and conjugations, young Latinists should, during the next eight months, occupy themselves "*memoriae wandardis mille acducentis sententiis in Mercurio nostro bifingui.*" To this I have little objection, provided descriptions of interesting external objects be largely mixed up with the maxims; for hoys are not capable of mere moral philosophy.

and the exercise of translation and re-translation recommended by the famous Roger Ascham.

"The way is this. After the three Concordances learned, as I touched before, let the Master read unto him the Epistles of *Cicero*, gathered together, and chosen out by *Starmius* for the capacity of children.

"First, let him teach the child cheerfully and plainly the cause and matter of the letter; then, let him construe it into English, so oft, as the child may easily carry away the understanding of it; lastly, parse it over perfectly.

This done thus, let the child, by and bye, both construe and parse it over again; so that it may appear that the child doubteth in nothing that his Master taught him before. After this, the child must take a paper book, and sitting in some place, where no man shall prompt him, by himself, let him translate into English his former lesson. Then shewing it to his Master, let the Master take from him his Latin book, and pausing an hour at the least, then let the child translate his own English into Latin again in another paper book. When the child bringeth it turned into Latin, the Master must compare it with *Tully's* book, and lay them both together; and where the child doth well, either in choosing or true placing *Tully's* words, let the Master praise him, and say, *Here you do well. For, I assure you, there is no such whetstone to sharpen a good wit, and encourage a will to learning, as is praise.*

"But if a child miss, either in forgetting a word, or in changing a good with a worse, or misordering the sentence, I would not have the Master either frown or chide with him, if the child have done his diligence, and used no truandship therein. For I know by good experience, that a child shall take more profit of two faults gently warned of, than of four things rightly hit; for then the Master shall have good occasion to say unto him, *Tully would have used such a word, not this; Tully would have placed this word here, not there; would have used this case, this number, this person, this degree, this grader; he would have used this mood, this tense, this simple rather than this compound; this adverb here, not there; he would have ended the sentence with this verb, not with that noun or participle &c.*

"In these few lines, I have wrapped up the most tedious part of Grammar, and also the ground of almost all the rules, that are so busily taught by the Master, and so hardly learned by the scholar in all common schools; which after this sort, the Master shall teach without all error, and the scholar shall learn without great pain; the Master being led by so sure a guide, and the scholar being brought into so plain and easy a way. And therefore we do not contemn rules, but we gladly teach rules, and teach them more plainly, sensibly, and orderly, than they be commonly taught in common schools. For when the Master shall compare *Tully's* book with the scholar's translation, let the Master at the first lead and teach his scholar to join the rules of his Grammar book with the examples of his present lesson, until the scholar by himself be able to fetch out of his grammar every rule for every example; so as the Grammar book be ever in the scholar's hand, and also used of him as a dictionary for every present use. This is a lively and perfect way of teaching of rules; where the common way used in common schools, to read a grammar alone by itself, is tedious for the Master, hard for the scholar, cold and uncomfortable for them both."

The former of these exercises ought not to be pressed equally on all, because there is the greatest possible variety in the method whereby the memory acts in different individuals, but will prove of immense advantage to some, and very useful to most.

Jacotot's method of learning a whole author (say Fenelon's *Telemachus* for French) by heart had the advantage of frequent repetition, and of not confounding the learner by a variety of inconsistent styles, (see Rule viii. *infra*;) but it is liable to the objection mentioned in the text, of being unsuited for certain memories, besides being apt to be in the end not a little wearisome, even to those with whose mental constitution it best agrees.

The latter cannot be too much recommended to those who wish to attain an idiomatic accuracy, and are not able to obtain the assistance of a skilful master.

Translation may be practised two ways—(1.) Into plain good idiomatic English, but with the most exemplary accuracy.—(2.) Into literal English, retaining the foreign idiom—the Hamiltonian method. For the purposes of re-translation, both these methods should be practised, and the two idioms carefully compared with one another, even in the minutest points. See some excellent practical directions on this subject by J. Price in the *Classical Museum*, Nos. 24-5-6.

VII.—In your choice of books be determined more by what interests yourself, and what you decidedly like, than by what you may think you are bound to admire, because the world has stamped it as classical.

"*In eam igitur partem est adjuvanda natura in quam suapte aponte prima est.*"—ERASMUS.—"*Nee quia CICERONEM nomino, eo praescripsero omnibus lectionem Tullii, ut unico duel Nihil crim invita faciendum Minerva.*"—GERARD JOANNES VOSSIUS de ratione studiorum, Trajecti ad Rhen: 1658.

The world may be, and in these cases generally is, quite right; but in the thorny matter of acquiring a new language, all needless difficulties are carefully to be eschewed; and the only question for you, as a learner, is, what books, or what style of books you can read (provided always they are not too difficult for your grade of grammatical acquirement,) with the greatest amount of interest, profit, and delight. If you love the book, you will read it much, and read it often; by doing so, you will master the vocables it contains in a speedy and agreeable way. And though it is proper, as a general rule, to commence with an easy writer (such as *Xenophon*, in Greek,) and proceed to a more difficult, (*Thucydides*,) yet such is the power of passion and enthusiasm—*amor omnia vincit*—that quick progress is ensured more by beginning with a difficult task, which you are eager to undertake, than with an easy book to which you are indifferent. In this view also, it may be

useful to hint, that students of any particular profession, such as Theology or Medicine, who, it may be, have neither time nor taste for studying the classic writers, strictly so called, may easily maintain a familiarity with the classic languages, by reading Greek or Latin books, whose name is legion, appertaining to their particular business. It has often struck me as strange, that this very obvious device for combining linguistical with professional study, should be so little practised.

VIII.—Read the same author, as much as may be, continuously from beginning to end; because the continuity of subject is favourable to the continuity of interest; and also, because every author has a style in which he more or less repeats himself, and, by doing so, of course aids you in the natural process of repeating his phraseology. Those teachers who are continually jumping from book to book do their scholars ill service; and books of motley extracts from different authors, except in a few special cases, (as in Anthologies of lyric poetry,) and used with discrimination, are not to be commended.

"With regard to the use of miscellaneous extracts, which were so much used a few years ago, most experienced teachers will concur with me in thinking that we have done wisely in substituting for them the continuous perusal of Attic or Atticistic works."—DONALDSON: Preface to *ARRIAN* in *Farker's Classical Texts*: London, 1847.

IX.—With regard to the use of grammars and exercise books, it is absolutely necessary, in the first place, that the common flexions of noun and verb should be accurately imprinted on the memory; (without this indeed, and also some knowledge of the irregular verbs, it will generally be found impossible to use a dictionary readily;) and the indolent disposition or irregular temper, that refuses to submit itself systematically to this memorial drill, will generally be found incapable of making great progress in Philological study.

"Man soll die *Grammatica* den Kindern wohl einbilden. Denn we solches nicht geschicht, is! alies Lernen verloren nnd vergeblich. Es sollen auch die Kinder solche *regulas Grammaticæ*, auswendig aussagen, dass Sie gedrungen undgetrieben werden die *Grainmatica* wohl zu lemen."—MARTIN LUTHER. *Raumer's geschichte der Paedagogik*, p. 175.

As for DU-FIEF, HAMILTON, OLLENDORF, and the whole troop of those who have made a noise as patent language-inculcators, they are all right, in so far as they have brought the much-neglected practical method of nature by direct living imitation prominently forward; all wrong, in so far as they would dispense with the use of dictionary and grammar, and other systematic aids to the scientific knowledge of language,

On the method of Ollendorf and some others that have achieved a temporary notoriety, I have spoken somewhat more at length in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, as quoted above. With regard to the Hamiltonian System, so far as it facilitates the progress of the student, by interpreting the author for him, instead of forcing him, by help of grammar and dictionary, to interpret it for himself, this method was practised ages before Hamilton, by the great Byzantine refugees, who taught Greek in Italy, by publicly prelecting from the text of some classical author: and the same method is extensively practised by the living Philological professors of the German Universities, who, however, in this, as in other departments of intellectual action, are apt to fail in practical effect, by an over curious minuteness about trifles. With regard to our Scottish usage in this respect, I have been informed that the late eloquent Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow—Sir Daniel Sandford—with that happy instinct which characterised his teaching, practised this method of translating publicly from famous Greek authors, with great effect; but I rather think the prevailing tendency with Scottish classical teachers, whether in school or college, is to make the scholar do all, and to do nothing for him. Now, if the Hamiltonian system be justly chargeable with making the learning of languages too easy, and not bringing the intellectual activity of the learner enough into play, surely there is a stiff pedagogic severity on the other side, which refuses to remove the brambles from a road, that of itself will always be rough enough for the delicate feet of the majority. ROBSON, in the essay we have quoted, approves of the use of interlinear translations, after the Hamiltonian fashion, in the earlier stages of linguistical progress; and special vocabularies, prepared expressly for the author read, seem to serve pretty much the same purpose. Certainly the Hamiltonians were right in exclaiming against the cruelty of sending mere tyros, in their first stage, at large into the wide sea of such dictionaries as we have been accustomed to use.

Besides the mere forms and flexions, it is also highly desirable to make a regular study of the syntactical laws of the language and its peculiar idioms. But this is not in all cases absolutely necessary, as quick persons, especially if acquainted with the general laws of syntax from the accurate knowledge of one language, will readily pick up most of these idioms from practice, and form, as they go on with their reading, a syntax for themselves. But with regard to the use of systematic grammars and exercise-books, two cautions are of the greatest importance:—*First*, that they should never be used as things independent, and by themselves, but only as a continuous running comment on the daily practice of hearing, speaking, and reading:—*Second*, that they should be taken according to a certain wise and calculated gradation, as may be necessary for the purposes of an ascending practice. Of this principle many schoolmasters, in the days not far gone, when the world slept, showed a woeful ignorance; and I fear that the effects of that long opiate are yet but too clearly visible in many

places; but the best and most recent classical school grammars used in Germany and among ourselves, are constructed strictly and consistently on the principle that the grammar is to be learned, step by step, so far only, as it affords materials that can immediately be turned to use.

This principle is distinctly enunciated in the preface to the 1st Edition, (Hanover, 1837), of Kühner's *Elementary Greek Grammar* of which the 10th German edition (1851), is now before me; and strongly supported by ROBSON, in the paper above quoted. Of course, as the pupil can find no book sufficiently simple for the commencement of his reading exercises, a graduated series of exercises, both for reading and writing, must be prepared by the teacher; and it is here that his practical mastery of his profession; will be most severely tested.

Nothing that is not to be used, and that immediately, ought to be taught. For the language was not made for the sake of the grammar, but the grammar for the sake of the language.

X.—When the grammar has been well studied, and a stock of words acquired by frequent and various reading, original composition, in as free a style as possible, may be tried. Attempts at this should, indeed, be made occasionally by the student in the earlier parts of his course; and, with regard to these attempts, a wise master or his own feeling of his power will be the best director. It is best, as a general rule, to commence with free *viva voce* descriptions, (afterwards carefully written down), of visible objects, such as the map of a country, objects in Natural History, archaeological drawings, or models from the antique, and so forth. But it is altogether perverse, and a painful inversion of the process of Nature, to attempt writing or discoursing largely in any language without a large stock of words to start with, which can only be got by a course of large and various reading; for to pick words out of a dictionary is fretful, and the choice slippery, sometimes blind. In the early stages of mere syntactical exercise, the student should always be supplied with the proper vocables, or at least be able to gather them from his previous reading; but, with regard to original composition, properly so called, the best way to commence is the way previously hinted, viz., to take a favourite author, or a book on a favourite subject, as a model, to shut the book at intervals, and to write what will flow from the pen, as the traces of the phraseology are yet fresh in the brain. Thus, for instance, if you wish in the easiest way to speak or write Greek, take a map of Greece, and hang it on the wall; then take Strabo, and read his description, first of the whole country, and then of any particular division, as Attica; note, with a pencil, the words and phrases that particularly belong to geographical description, or make a collection of them on a separate paper. Then shut the book, and try how much of the description you can go through without the assistance of the original books, or your paper of jottings. Supply what is deficient; and repeat the exercise to-morrow and next day, till you are perfect. You will thus find yourself, in a very short time, able to describe any map or real district of country, in classical Greek, with perfect fluency and accuracy. From simple description, you may proceed to spontaneous imitative outbursts of oratorical argument and invective, for which you will find the most admirable materials in Cicero, Livy, or Demosthenes, according to your taste.

I cannot refrain here from quoting the admirable remarks of VOSSIUS, in the treatise above referred to. After recommending the system of translation and re translation for the earlier stages, he proceeds to speak of the finishing processes in the formation of a good Latin style, as follows:—

"*Posterior exercitatio est, quando puer epistolam, vel historiolam sumit, non disconvenientem multum suis rebus: atque cum mutatis aliquibus suo accomodet instituto, e. g. Cicero varios in epistolis consolatur: ex harum una, vel pluribus consolatur fas erit se excerpere, etiam verbatim periodos totas. Sic ex Tullio melius discet likeamenta sermoris Romani, et formare ipsius orationis corpus. At majoribus jam viribus est opus, quando in argumento multum diverso imitatio fit eaque instituitur, ut non alleri pene omnia, sed multa etiam nobis debeantur: et quae ex altero desumpta, ea etiam nostra plane videantur, quia, at artificiosi fures solent, iis novam plane formam tribuimus.*"

The steps from this free imitation to a perfectly independent and manly use of a foreign language, so as Latin was wielded by Wolf and Herrman, are not difficult. Anything like writing slavishly from some chosen model (as Bembo and some other Italian stylists did from Cicero), is, in the most advanced stages of linguistical culture, to be carefully avoided. 'Tis better to stumble occasionally on your own legs, than to live only as the correctly pictured shadow of another man's movements.

XI.—Bear in mind, that though the practical command of any language, whether living or dead, is and must remain in a great measure an empirical art, yet he has no conception of the peculiar function of a teacher of youth, nor of his own duty to himself as a rational learner, who does not strive from the very beginning of his linguistical course, to take along with him as much philosophical principle, as the necessity of practice will conveniently allow. Study therefore, always, not only to know the standard rules of a language accurately, but to obtain an insight into the metaphysical principle from which they proceed; and farther, be studious to compare the idiom of one language with that of another, not only as one of many facts in the phenomenon of human utterance, but as an index to the various and cunningly-complicated play of thought in the human mind. Strive after a really scientific ETYMOLOGY; a branch of philological science, which, when cultivated with the

requisite learning and subtilty, and not without a constant wise caution, is the only true key to the organic structure of language; and, at the same time, wonderfully simplifies the laborious processes of memory, by embracing a number of otherwise chaotic details, under a common law of order. A good etymologist, in fact, will learn a dozen words, for every one that an empirical student acquires; and learn them not only on the tongue, but in such a way as through them to feel himself planted on the loftiest pinnacles of speculation, and close to the central glowing-heart of humanity.

XII.—Lastly, remember that the study of language, with all the aids which the profoundest philological science can afford, is not a study that in the nature of things can be carried on independently, and of itself. Words are but the signs of things; and the best dictionary in the world can convey to your mind no distinct conception of the sign, till you have, by a living experience, thoroughly penetrated the nature of the thing signified. "*Die Philosophie*," says GOETHE, "*muss geliebt und gelebt werden*;" and so must Philology. Unless your imaginative susceptibilities have been properly stimulated, neither FACCIOLATI, nor FREUND open to you the true secret of the genius of Virgil or Ovid. Aristotle's Analytics will be dumb to the man who will not take the trouble to analyze the process of thinking in his own mind; and the Politics of the same great thinker will be unintelligible to the profoundest scholar, to whom the parties of Church and State, and the war of great social principles, at the present hour, are indifferent. In general, your capacity of scholarship, after the first rudimentary drill, will depend on your capacity of soul. A narrow intellect, a cold heart, and a meagre imagination, will never get beyond "the grammatical flats and shallow's "of the vulgarest school-learning. Endeavour, therefore, to bring out the whole vital power within you harmoniously and luxuriantly. Sacrifice not the fleshy consistency of an arm or a leg, much less the inner heart of your moral and religious nature, "out of which come the issues of life," to the enormous growth of a brain, or the preternatural volubility of a tongue. Strive with all laudable ambition to make yourself a scholar, but with a holier jealousy watch to keep yourself a man. Your erudition, however much you may have of it, or however little, will then be not appropriated merely, but assimilated; will make itself felt as the pulsing life-blood of a vital organism, not as a sapless architecture of cards.

De Linguarum Discendarum Ratione: Orationem

In Academia Mariscallana Abredonensi.

Habuit Joannes S. Blackie,

Lit. Hum. Professor.

Kal. Nov.

MDCCCL.

"Now NATURE is not at variance with ART, nor ART with NATURE."

RELIGIO MEDICI

De Linguarum Discendarum Ratione.

NON dubitabam, optimi juvenes, quin futurum esset ut et mihi et vobis rem gratissimam facerem, si alterius anni academici spatium decursurus, patrii sermonis faciliore usu paullisper spreto, Latinae orationis apparatu tanquam togâ acadêmica me involvissem. Errant enim vehementer, qui-buscunque in partibus repunt grammatae, qui linguam Graecam Latinamque docentes, omnia in curiositate regularum minutaque de apicibus diligentia, in fidei aurium consuetudine profluentique vegeti sermonis ilumine, nihil ponunt. Mihi vero harum rerum minime incurioso (neque enim artificii artificium suum parvi ducere fas est) multorum annorum usu penitus persuasum est, in linguis discendis omnia potius in quotidiana loquendi audiendique exercitatione, fidelique aurium consuetudine poni; et in hac sententia, reclamitante vel ignarorum vel ignavorum turba, fidenter persistam. Haec enim consuetudo si adsit, omnia ardua plana fient; si desit, omnia plana ardua. Vos igitur, quae verba, hodierno die, de ratione studiorum sum jacturus, iis, ut non temere leviterque jactis, dociles aures praebeatis: ego quae sum dicturus, pro temporis locique ratione, dicam praecise.

Et primum quidem liceat vobis faustum ad studia reditum gratulari; liceat ni tentes quos pro vobis fertis adspectus, laetos oculos, vultusque aestivalibus rusticanos laudare. Pertinet enim illud etiam ad studiorum rationem ut corpus in firmam valetudinem excrescat, ut, rite jactis fundamentis, non cito lapsurum ad fastigia perducatur aedificium. Atque, ut vera dicam, si feriae non essent, ipsa illa studia quae mihi tantopere sunt in deliciis, puterent. Quot et quantos, per hanc aestatem, pulcherrimos rerum adspectus errabundus contemplabamur! quales agrorum ubertates, pratorum viriditates, marium splendores, magnificas urbium descriptiones sum miratus! quales horridorum vastitates jugorum, rudesque immanium saxorum solitudines liis pedibus sum pervagatus! Quae omnia, longiore feriarum continuatione, insolentia quadam Fatorum indulgentia Professoribus Scotiis concessa, non solum corpora roborant, valetudinemque firmant, sed academico, quod aiunt, pulvere exeusso, animum recolunt, ornant, amplificant. Quam feriarum utilitatem vobis etiam, optimi studiosi,

contigisse rusticanus ille color, ruboresque me docent salutare: Deumque optimum maximum, qui hoc nobis pulcherrimum donum, corporis sanitatem concessit, ut id in multos posthac annos perpetua bonitate protrahat ex intimis praecordiis precor.

Agite vero, ut, quod mihi proposui, paucula in vestros usus de ratione studiorum proferam; et, ne longius evagetur oratio, his me cancellis circumscribam, ut, quod maxime hujus loci est, de linguarum penitus addiscendarum ratione disputeret. Hac de re mihi saepenumero cogitanti, multaque haud vano conatu tentanti, haec fere occurrebant quae studiosos, ad raetam vel celerrime, vel accuratissime perducere viderentur.

(I.) Omnis linguarum peritia, si viam a natura ipsâ designatam spectes, sonorum sermonisque imitatione continetur. Quocirca non bene facit qui, in haec studia incumbens, in secreto se ángulo, procul a vivi sermonis usu continet. Adhibendus ante omnia est linguarum magister, qui voce praebeat, et justo exemplo linguam ad justam imitationem conformet. Hoc nimirum modo ora puerorum in patrii sermonis miram quandam facilitatem finguntur; quorum pedibus cum insistimus, naturam ipsam ducem habentes, baud longe a veritate aberrabimus. Errât igitur velie- menter, in hoc potissimum studio, qui ipse se erudit. Quanquam enim in xeonditis philosophiae disciplinis multura valere soient qui liominum consuetudinem non modo non petunt, sed aversantur et fugiunt; tamen in linguarum studio omnia, quotquot a grammaticis jaentur artis praecepta, a quotidiano liominum usu hausta sunt; ipsa per se nullam vim habent. Adhibeatur igitur a linguarum studiosis magister; adhibeatur optimus quisque, ne depravata loquendi consuetudo in aures temere incurrens, radices agat, atque inveterascat; adhibeatur non unus tantum, sed, si fieri poterit, plures et pluvimi; ut, ex quam maxima loquentium turbâ, novarum voeum in insuetas aures quam celebratissima sit incursio. Scilicet linguae peritos, ut de magnis viris ait Seneca, non schola facit sed contubernium.

(II.) Discipulos igitur, postquam circa se congregatos videt magister, illico bine initium docendi sumat, ut omnium rerum, quarum species in discipulorum oculos incidunt, nomina, clarâ et distinctâ voce proferat, atque, ut oculi auribus subveniant, in tabula nigrâ exscribat. Quae nomina, fideliter in aures immissa, in schedulas etiam suas excipiant discipuli, eademque memoriae mandata, clarâ et distinctâ voce reddant continuo ac repercutiant. Quâ in exercitatione duae potissimum res ad pueros recte instituendos maximam vim habent: primum ut ne a longinquo petitarum rerum nomina a magistro in medium proferantur, sed earum quae in promptu sunt, quaeque a discipulorum captu non longius abhorrent, ab ipsâ rerum natura, ut ita dicam, omnibus in oculos, velint nolint, per quotidianum vitae usum injectae. Quo in loco quam graviter peccent ludimagistri nemo non novit: quorum multi, si rogati sint ipsa scholarum suppellex docendique arma, quibus vocibus Latinis Graccisque signentur, stupebunt. Nimirum omnia isti in librorum regulis, sicut dixi, ponere soient, nihil in frequenti aurium usu, consuetudineque loquendi. Deinde intentissima a magistro adhibenda est cura ne quid prave, neque a discipulo neque ab ipso, pro- feratur, ne, exempli gratiâ, dicatur B#NUS (*boamis*) cum dici debeat B#NUS (*bonnus*), ne dicatur N#S, (*tioos*) cum dici debeat N#S (*nose*). Quo in loco error in tantum apud paedagogos inveteravit, ut irridear fortasse (ut fit) qui quae recta sint dicam. Qua docendi pravitate factum est, ut, cum summo turn docentium turn discentium, labore, milita quae puer didicerit aliquando dediscat necesse sit adolescens. Rem per se facillimam, bis saltern qui viae a natura ipsa designatae insistunt, pravi paedagogi efficiunt durissimam; adeo ut, pravâ institutione impediti retardatique, vel docti professores in levissimis saepe rebus misere haereant, turpiterque labascant.

(III.) Antequam autem longius progrediamur, necesse est grammaticum adhibeamus, atque ex spinosa ejus disciplinâ paradigmata quaedam et regulas non tangamus tantum leviter sed penitus perdiscamus. Nulla est enim, quamvis rudis lingua atque hórrida, quae nihil sit nisi incondita verborum strues, caecis coacervata incrementis: sed vocalém omnium linguarum materiem informat admirabilis illa, hominum generi divinitus instillata MENS, quae ad insitam quamdam unitatis notionem omnia fingit, efficitque id quod nos trates, Graecorum exemplo, appellant Greek script Hunc igitur linguae cujuslibet organismum facilius ex sapientum praeceptis, scilicet ex grammaticorum regulis arripuerit discipulus, quam ex immani verborum armamentario ipse sibi digesserit: ita tamen ut quotidianus ille, de quo diximus, loquendi usus non supplantetur regulis (quod fieri mireris) sed ut firmetur, ut ordinetur. Quemadmodum enim ad geologiae cognitionem doctissimorum virorum praecepta sine continuatâ glebarum saxorumque contrectatione nihil valent, sic in linguis discendis, sine vivido aurium usu, torpent grammaticorum regulae et frigescent. Namque illud, quod jam monui, semper tenendum est, quicquid magnifice jactant philologi, linguarum studium magna ex parte iis rebus contineri, quae artem potius efficiunt quam scientiam. Cavendum igitur est a ludimagistris, ne grammaticae regulae, quae non tradi sed et inculcari volo, viam, ut ita dicam, discentibus praeripiant: sed quicquid ex scientiae fontibus hauritur, id in largum exercitationis campum redundare oportet et luxuriare: quam unam rectissimam docendi methodum tantum abest ut servent linguarum doctores plurimi, ut quoties os aperuerint, suis ipsorum regulis contradicant.

(IV.) Sequitur ut, de librorum lectione, quae mihi ex usu cognita sunt et probata, in medium proferam. Quo de loco, ne plura consector, sic breviter statuo; non temere legendos esse libros, eos videlicet qui magistri vel commodo inserviant vel iudicium titillent, sed eos potissimum, quos discipuli capere possint, et ad quorum

lecturam, amore quodam ingenerato, et, si fieri poterit, vehementi animi impetu ferantur. Quam docendi regulam qui spernit perinde facit ac si quis cibum non esurienti stomacho sed languenti et nauseanti objiciat. Magno igitur in errore versantur qui in puerorum institutione eos potissimum usurpant libros, quorum quam maxime limata perpolitaeque sit oratio, nullum neque puerilium animorum captus, neque divinarum istarum mentis permotionum rationem liabentes. Quod si scriptor, quem ad legendum discentium animi impellantur, polita utitur oratione, bene se habet: sed majores progressus fecerit qui minus politum scriptorem magno cum amore legerit quam qui politissimum languens. Exturbetur itaque e scholis penitusque exolescatputidum illud Ciceronianorum fastidium, qui "classicos," tantum et "puros," et "Augustanos" (sic aiunt) scriptores puerorum manibus teri volunt. Imo vero ea potius a studiosis discipulis legenda sunt quae et cum aviditate quadam adsumantur, et concoquantur cum voluptate. Postponatur igitur in junioribus erudiendis Curtio Tullius, Plutarcho Sophocles, Herodoto atque Homero omnes.

(V.) Jam vero de scribendi exercitatione quae sentiam accipiatis. Quo de loco sententiam dicturus, nihil quod ad meam rem faciat, neque aptius invenire possum neque exquisitius, quam illud Baconi nostri per omnium ora, celebratum. *"Reading makes a full man; Speaking makes a ready man; Writing makes an accurate man."* Quod summi philosophi plaecitum, ut de omni liberationis institutionis genere dictum sit, tamen ad banc ipsam, de qua loquimur, lingua-rum institutionem vel maxime accommodatum est. Alterum huic persimile dictum, apud Germanorum ingeniosissimum Joannem Paulum Richterum inveni. *"Never read on a subject, till you have thought yourself hungry on it; never write on a subject, till you have read yourself full of it."* Quae, in nostram rem traducta, hue pertinent ut, in linguis inculcandis, sicut in aedificiis struendis, prius materies sit caedenda, quam fabri aut architecti adhiberi possit artificium. Ut in heibarum incrementis rami et folia necesse est prius explicentur, quam ab agricolâ, falcis callido, circumcidantur, sic ubertate quâdam dilatari oportet orationem, quam ad emunctae naris iudicium postea sis amputaturus. Quod si aliter feceris, accurata quidem et ad unguem exacta puerorum themata extorquebis, sed orationem, quae varia debet esse et copiosa, tenuem efficies atque exsanguem, jejunam atque exilem. Ego vero turn demum curiosam scribendi diligentiam adhiberi posse existimo, quum per multam variorum scriptorum lectionem, quotidianamque cum audiendi, turn loquendi, exercitationem eum sibi vocum thesaurum congesserint atque ad manum habeant studiosi, ex quo quae ad orationem scriptam necessaria sint, prompte callideque promant. Nimirum legendi audiendi et loquendi minus experti pueri, incompositam Lexicorum molem, vit themata exprimant, rimantes, misere se torquebunt frustra et sudabunt. Prudens linguarum magister, meâ quidem sententiâ, in scribendi exercitationibus, lexica, quam parcissime pueris permittet, sed lectionem potius quam frequentissimam urgebit, omniaque scribi ad normam eorum quae lecta sint aut audita jubebit. Illud porro in disceptationem jure venire potest, utrum ex exemplo Anglice scripto scribendi usum ordiri debeat discipulus, an suae mentis sensa, peregrina oratione vestita, profundere ultro. Ac mihi quidem, rem ex rerum naturae legibus perpendenti, videtur, in ipso statim studiorum limine, ejiciendum esse ex discentis animo patrium sermonem, quantum fieri poterit, atque eliminandum. Patrius enim sermo, si usquequaque se interponat, quomodo fieri potest ut non et loquendi et scribendi facilitatem mirum quantum impediât acconturbet? Assuescat igitur linguarum studiosus, a prima usque discendi horâ, in res ipsas, quaecunque inciderint, alieni sermonis nomina imprimere, eaque toties memoria recolere, usque dum rebus, tanquam nativus corpori vestitus, coliaereant: ita ut, exempli gratiâ, linguae Graecae studiosus simul oculos in caelum erexerit, illico vox Greek script sponte exiliat, nullo Anglice vocis *Heaven* auxilio adhibito. Pari ratione omnem coagmentatae scriptionis exercitationem ex cogitandi exercitatione proficisci volo: ut non pannos operose consuentis, sed gladiatoris gladium callide ventilantis instar, linguam usurpet studiosus. Neque tamen negaverim, qui Latine Graeceve scripta Anglice reddiderit, eademque, mediocri temporis intervallo interposito, rursus in Latinam Graecamve dialectum, quanta maxima adhibitâ accuratione, verterit, cum ex hujusmodi exercitatione eximios studio-rum fructus esse percepturum: sed non hic haerendum: omnique studio enitendum est, ut in largiorem campum expatiari, alisque orationis plaudere liberius et triumphare videamur.

(VI.) Et haec quidem habui quae de audiendi, loquendi, et scribendi exercitationibus dicerem. Illud addam; quaecunque in linguis arripiendis adhibeantur exercitationes, eas vanas esse futuras, nisi iterentur sedulo et continentur. Hoc quoque praeceptum e naturâ ipsâ hausit, quum viderem ad mihi rabilis illam patrii sermonis facilitatem, qui a pueris, nulla adhibita doctrina, celerrime arripiatur, non nisi continuatâ quadam et nunquam intermissâ iteratione effici. At nostrates (quamquam erubescere referens) in linguâ Graecâ inculcandâ, quantum ab istâ Naturae bene institute simplicitate declinarunt! Per quinque mensium spatium in Graecas literas rudes incumbunt pueruli; deinde per septem menses, ab omni magistrorum euratione liberi, rusticantur et nihil agunt; postea intermissa paulisper resumunt studia, disjectaque prioris anni membra recolligunt; rursus deinceps per septem menses otiantur; et postremo, curriculum academicum decurrentes, tantâ novorum studiorum varietate obruuntur, ut quae adhuc paucissima in cerebris restant Graecitatis frustula turbentur misere et dissipentur. Quem rei academicae informan statum utinam deus aliquis reformet radicitus, atque recudat! Ego, qui tantarum rerum molem attingere reformido, linguae Graecae studiosos jubeo, (per iniquam dico Scoticarum

Academiarum rationem justis studiorum fructibus destitutos defraudatosque,) divinae istius dialecti quotidianam consuetudinem ita colere, ut, aut Athenas se conférant (quod iter jam per naves vaporarias, viasque ferratas facillima factu res est) aut, si id minus possint, Athenis editas Ephemeridas, aliosque quam plurimos recentiorum Graecorum dialecto conscriptos libros, ad ipsorum artificium pertinentes, importent et diligenter pervolvant. Is enim minime sum, qui in medicinara aliamve qualemcunque scientiam impigre incumbentes juvenes, revocandos putem, eo scilicet consilio, ut nodosa Aeschyli carmina atque Epinicia Pindari, iniirmis eheu! dentibus tenerisque gingivis, confidant. Cui igitur, per aliorum studiorum occupationem, splendescenti priscae poeseos ponto se immergere non licuit, is ex tenuioribus, at Graecis tamen, aquulis hauriat, quas amplissimus in renatis Athenis bibliopola, Andreas Coromela est suppeditaturus. Mihi certe, quera usus et experientia docuit, penitus persuasura est desideratissimam illam Graecae linguae consuetudinem, multo facilius ex apertioribus recentioris Graecitatis thesauris hauriri, quam ex longinquis quibusdam et situ obsitis, qui a viris doctis, non justam semper verborum modestiara servantibus, celebrantur tantopere et decantantur. Sed de his hactenus.

(VII.) Reliquum est ut praesentissirai ad linguarum studium adjumenti mentionem faciam, quod ex altioris philologiaepenentralibus est promendum. Scilicet, recentioribus temporibus, cum multae exstiterunt prorsus novae atque inauditae, sed altum spirantes scientiae, turn linguarum inter se comparado radices tam altas egit, et in tantam ramorum amplitudinem est diffusa, ut viri ingeniosissimi, quales sunt HUMDOLDT, BUNSEN, DONALDSON, LATHAM hue ingentem animi vim, cum maxima laboris impensa, intendant. Non igitur nunc etymologicâ Greek script ut Graecâ voce utar, cuivis temere ludere licet, quemadmodum Platoni et Ciceroni aliisque summis apud veteres viris, quemadmodum universae Lexicographorum turbae, ante JACOBUM GRIMM ilium, ludere licebat; sed, ad exemplumherbarum, quas recentior Botanice insuagenera ordinesque, admiranda prorsus calliditate, disposuit, linguarum quoque physiologia quaedam curiosa exorta est, et in largum sese pandens descriptio, quae magno harum rerum studiosis adjumento esse debeat. Hujus igitur altioris philologiae fructus impigre vindicet atque in partes vocet bene institutus linguarum praeceptor, et, inter docendum, verborum origines, incrementa et cognationes exponat diligenter explicetque: quod si callide fecerit, non modo rebus per se eonfuis et mira strage vastis eximium ordinein divinamque pulchritudinem adferet, sed acuet ingenia puerilia, dulcique praelusione altissima theologiae summaeque artis metaphysicae mysteria praesignificabit. Quin et humani generis historiae altiores in linguis latitant radices; quarum in indagatione, maximam partem nova ilia scientia versatur, quam appellant Ethnologiam. Quorum multa, etiamsi puerorum captum superent, at linguarum praeceptor, sine summâ suâ injuriâ, ignorare non potest. Quo magis omnes linguarum studiosos hortor ne unius alteriusve linguae contenti abeant, sed quam plurimas aggrediantur. Quemadmodum enim in liquida quavis mistura, quo crebriora coagulandi puncta sparguntur, eo celerius universus ille liquor in solidam sese formam, exquisito compactan! artificio, mutabit; eâdem plane ratione, quanto pluius aliquis, altioris saltern philologiae peritus, attigerit linguas, tanto reliquas facilius est arrepturus.

(VIII.) Antequam hanc qualemcunque disputationem ad finem perducam, unum addiderim; non exipsis verbis, quantavis diligentîâ exstructis, perfectam linguarum cognitionem hauriri posse, sed ex earum rerum perceptione intellectuque quae verbis exprimantur. Verba enim sine rebus tantum valent, quantum sine sanguine ossa, sine corpore umbra. Quocirca in bibliothecarum doctis pluteis, pulverisque adspergine illâ, blattarum tinearumque deliciis, ne nimias spes ponatis auctor sum. Neque enim aut summi viri Aristotelis bistoriam animalium intelliget qui Graeee scit, sed qui et Zoologiam tenet; aut Virgilium intelligit, qui nudas literarum formas colligit notionesque excipit, sed qui consimili quodam vis poeticae afflatu contactus, ea sentit legendo quae scribendo senserit poeta. Vos igitur non mera verba, inanesque vocum repercussiones, sed res ipsas, vocesque rerum adumbrationes, atque emblemata, quaeritote.

Abebdeen: D. Chalmers and Co., Printers to the University.

The following appeared in the 'Dunfermline Press,' on the 4th of July, 1868:—

"A correspondent, who found fault with our animadversions on 'Spiritualism,' as contained in an article, entitled 'Imposture and Credulity,' which appeared in the 'Press' of June 13th, sends us the following letter on the subject, from William Howitt, of London. As some of our readers will no doubt like to hear what so eminent a *litterateur* has to say on so keenly contested a subject, we make no apology for occupying so much valuable space with his communication. The letter, it will be observed, is addressed to our Alva correspondent, who is himself an enthusiast on the subject":—

Sir,—I am much obliged to you for a copy of the 'Dunfermline Saturday Press,' containing the letter of "A Working Man," and the Editor's remarks upon it. The "Working Man" is perfectly right, both in his facts and arguments. It is true that Spiritualism, since its revival in America about twenty years ago—for it is only a revival, having existed in every age and country before, and numbered intellects of all those ages and countries—has made more rapid, and at the same time steady progress, than any other cause' whatever—Christianity not excepted. In that short space of time it has attracted *twenty millions* of adherents. And by what means? Not by violent and fanatic agitation; not by vehement preaching and partizan canvassing;

but simply by a calm and sensible examination of its facts. The editor of the 'Dunfermline Press' says that a cause is not to be decided by numbers. True, but numbers and intellect and Character combined must determine the value of any cause. And who are the men who have in every country embraced "Spiritualism? The rabble? The ignorant? The fanatic? By no means; but the [unclear: st] intelligent and able of all classes. [unclear: w] such is the case, surely it becomes [unclear: u] "majority of reflecting men"—to [unclear: us] words of your editor—to reflect on the facts. Let numbers go for nothing; [unclear: a] when the numbers add also first-rate [unclear: pr], pre-eminent abilities, largest experience of men and their doings, weight of moral, religious, scientific, and political character,—then the man who does not look into what these declare to be truth, is not a reflecting, but a very foolish and prejudiced man. Now, it is very remarkable that, when we proceed to [unclear: enumer] the leading men who have embraced Spiritualism, we begin also to enumerate the pre-eminent intellects and characters. In America, you justly say that the shrewd and honest Abraham Lincoln was a Spiritualist. He was a devoted one. So also were, and are, the hon. Robert Dale Owen and Judge Edmonds; so was Professor Hare; you are right in all these particulars. In fact, almost every man in the American Government is a Spiritualist. Garrison, whom the anti-Spiritualists were so lately and enthusiastically feting in England, for his zealous services in the Extinction of negro slavery, is an avowed Spiritualist. Horace Greely, the editor of 'The Tribune,' a man whose masterly political reasoning has done more than any other to direct the course of American politics, is a devoted Spiritualist. Long-fellow, the poet, now in England, and just treated with the highest honors by the University of Cambridge, and about to be feted by the whole literary world of England, is, and has long and openly been, a Spiritualist. But I might run over the majority of the great names of America. Turn to France. The shrewd Emperor, the illustrious Victor Hugo, the sage and able statesman Guizot, one of the most powerful champions of Christianity, are Spiritualists. So is Garibaldi in Italy. In England you might name a very long and distinguished list of men and women, of all classes, Spiritualists. If you had the authority, you might mention names which would startle not a little those who effect to sneer at Spiritualism. It is confidently said that a Spiritualist sits on the throne of these realms, as we do know that such do sit on those of the greatest nations in Europe. We know that members of some of the ducal houses of Scotland and of the noble houses of Ireland and England, are Spiritualists. Are all these people likely to plunge their heads and their reputations into an unpopular cause, without first looking well into it? But then, Say the opponents, the scientific don't affect it. They must greatly qualify this assertion, for many and eminent scientific men have had the sense and the courage to look into it, and have found it a great truth. The editor of the 'Dunfermline Press' remarks on your observations regarding Robert Chambers, that Chambers' 'Journal,' of the 13th May last, has a certain article not flattering to Spiritualism. True, but not the less is Robert Chambers an avowed Spiritualist, and boldly came forward on the Home and Lyon trial, to express his faith in Mr. Home. The editor might quote articles in the 'Times,' the 'Standard,' the 'Star,' and the 'Daily Telegraph' against Spiritualism; yet it is a well known fact that on all these journals some of their ablest writers are Spiritualists; but it is not always prudent for a man to say what he is. This is not an age in love with martyrdom. But as to the scientific men: the editor is very ill informed when he says that Faraday "speedily stripped Spiritualism of its mystery." Nothing is better known throughout all London circles than that Faraday, on that occasion, made a gross blunder, and became the laughingstock of even scientific men for it. He attributed the turning of tables to involuntary muscular action in the persons who, at *seance*, put their hands on them. But immediately, tables not only moved, but rose into the air, out of the reach of any hands. I, and thousands, have seen them do so often. Such things are more common than the rising of balloons. Nor was the moving of tables the only phenomena, knocks were heard on floors, on wall, on ceilings, quite out of reach. Everyone who has seen the Davenport—and all Europe has now seen them—knows that instruments fly about visibly in the air, quite beyond touch of hands. In the *seances*, in London, attended by men and women of the highest intelligence and tact, flowers, fruit, birds even came through locked doors and barred shutters; spirit hands are felt; spirit voices are heard, music is played on instruments that no hand can touch, drawings, writings, and singing are done by no visible persons. And who witness all these things from day to day? Scientific men, eminent lawyers, and literary men. It was the knowledge of these things which made Faraday see what a fool a wise man may make of himself, and which made him take care not to commit himself a second time. But people you say, continue to remark—"If scientific men *mould* hut examine these things." In the first place, I have always asserted that scientific men are not the men to decide such questions. They have their prejudices and their theories, which disqualify them. They have no instruments to lay hold of spirits; they mock at all their retorts, their galvanic and electrical batteries, and their chemical tests. In all ages the learned have been the opponents of new ideas. They poisoned Socrates, they crucified Christ, they declared him and St Paul mad. When Newton promulgated the doctrine of specific gravity, they jeered at it; and his biographer says, that at the time of his death not forty persons out of England believed in it. When Solomon De Caus, in France, discovered the power of steam they shut him up in the Bicetre as a madman. Columbus was declared a madman by the learned men of Spain, for asserting that there was a great continent westward. When Franklin sent the account of the identification of

lightning with electricity to the Royal Society of London, it refused to print it; and it was not till Dr Fothergill published the paper that it reached the community at large. In his turn, Franklin treated Mesmer as an impostor; and, in fact, we might run over a whole volume of proofs of the total unfitness of scientific men as a class, to judge of new facts and ideas. And yet numbers of scientific men have embraced Spiritualism. Dr Hare, mentioned by you was a great electrician, rated by the Americans little, if any inferior to Faraday. He did exactly what people now want scientific men to do. He thought Spiritualism a humbug, and went regularly into an enquire to oppose it But it did as it has done in every case that I have heard of, where scientific men have gone candidly and fairly into the examination, after two years of testing and proving, it convinced him of its truth, if Elliotson, a very scientific man, and for years violently opposed to Spiritualism, so soon as he was willing to enquire, became convinced, and blesses God for the knowledge of it. Dr Ash burner, his fellow-editor of the 'Zoist,' has also long; been an avowed Spiritualist. Mr Alfred Wallace, a scientific man, and excellent naturalist who was on the Amazon with Mr Bates, has published his conviction of its truth. Sir Charles Weatherstone, some time ago, on seeing some remarkable phenomena in his own house, declared them real. And just now, on the Home and Lyon trial, the public have seen Mr Varley a man of first-rate science, the electrician to the Electric and International and the Atlantic Telegraph Companies, come forward and make affidavit of his having investigated the facts of Spiritualism and found them real. Now, alter such cases, why this continual cry out for [unclear: examinatio] by scientific men? Scientific men [unclear: o] the first stamp have examined and reported that it is a great fact, Scientific men by the hundred and the thousand have done it, and yet the crowd go [unclear: o] crying for a scientific man. Why? [unclear: Simp] because it is much easier to often their mouths and bleat as sheep do in a flock, than exert their minds and their senses It is time that all this folly had an end There are now more Spiritualists that would populate Scotland seven times over at its present scale of population, and surely the 'testimony of such a multitude including statesmen, philosophers, his torians, and scientific men too, is as abso lately decisive as any mortal matter can be And pray, my good friend, don't troubled yourself that your neighbors call you mad You are mad in most excellent company All the great men of all ages who have introduced or accepted new ideas were mat in the eyes of their contemporaries. As [unclear: a] have said, Socrates and Christ and St Paul were mad; De Caus was mad Thomas Gray, who first advocated Rail ways, was declared by the 'Edinburgh; Review,' mad as a March hare, They are the illustrious tribe of madmen by whom the world is propelled, widened as by Columbus, and enlightened as by Bacon, Newton, Des Cartes, and the rest of them who were all declared mad in their turn. And don't be anxious about Spiritualism, From the first moment of its appearance to this, it has moved on totally unconcerned and unharmed, amidst every species of opposition, misrepresentation, lying, and obstruction, and yet has daily and hourly grown, and spread, and strengthened, as if no such evil influences were assailing it. Like the ocean it has rolled its billows over the slimy creatures at its bottom, and dashed its majestic waves over proud man who dared to tread within its limits; and whence comes this? Obviously from the hand which is behind it—the hand of the Great Ruler of the Universe. For my part, having long perceived this great fact, I have ceased to care what people say or do against Spiritualism; to care who believes or does not believe; who comes into or stays out; certain that it is as much a part of God's economy of the Universe as the light of the sun, and will therefore go on and do its work without our efforts to oppose or advance it.

Yours faithfully,

WM. HOWITT.

P.S.—I do not enter into the Plome and Lyon question; whatever may be the real merits of the case, Mr Home, as you say, is but one small atom in the great system of Spiritualism. Its truth in no degree depends on the individuals who profess it, any more than does *Christianity on its individual professors*.

What is a Miracle?

[Reprinted from "The Medium and Daybreak," June 24, 1870.]

To the Editar of the Worth, Wilts Herald.

"Sir,—Will you permit one greatly interested in your able article upon Dr. Newton's visit to Swindon, to say a few words, which irresistibly suggest themselves, upon the gifts usually considered miraculous? I suppose most of us were taught in our youth that miracles were things of the past—of a past that had for us not only a historical, but a religious interest, but still of a past that was dead and gone. We were also taught that a miracle was a 'wonder' out of the natural order of things, above and beyond the laws of nature, and, in fact, a breach of those laws. It must, therefore, we were told, be a *super-natural* event. It seems to me important, in these days when healing powers are claimed and discussed amongst us, to ascertain if such teaching be true, historically and philosophically; and, lastly, if it be calculated to increase or to diminish our faith in the power and presence

of God as a living God in the earth.

"I rejoice to see that you have given many well chosen instances of the frequent appearance of the healing power through the Christian centuries. If I take up my Bible, I find that our Saviour distinctly promised that power, together with such other gifts, not only to His disciples, but to the Church of the Future, without limitation of time or country, faith being the condition of their reception. He even assured them that when He should be gone to His Father, when He should have vanquished death and ascended on High to 'receive gifts for men,' that He would so pour upon them His spirit and influence, that they should be able to do 'greater things' than those they had seen Him do. So, that though that time has not yet come, it is scriptural to hope that an age may arise when the earth may so be filled with an enlightened faith, when the knowledge of God may so 'cover it' that Christ, exalted as He is to the Highest Heaven, may be able to pour down upon men, and they be able to receive such a fulness of His power that marvels of love and mercy may be accomplished, superior even to those He was able to perform while in the flesh in the condition of the world's faith in that period. The Apostles not only exercised the gifts of healing and other powers called miraculous themselves, but they evidently considered them the heritage of the Christian Church. They exhorted their converts to desire and pray for 'spiritual gifts,' preparing them to expect them to be various in different individuals, subject to the sovereign will of God. St. Paul distinctly enumerates, these desirable gifts: prophecy, healing, speaking with tongues, discerning of spirits. It never seems to have occurred to him to suppose that these gifts would cease with the Apostles or their century, It would be as reasonable to say that the Apostles believed that all their teaching applied only to their own time, as to say that the possession of these powers was limited to it by them.

"The early history of the church proves that they existed, and were believed in by the Fathers. Indeed, whoever will take the pains to study the subject, will find an unbroken succession of persons so gifted, from the days of the Apostles till our own. There may have been seasons of darkness and eclipse of faith; times when materialism was so rampant that the spirit was quenched, and when, as of old in Israel, the 'word of the Lord was precious (or rare), and there was no open vision'. But, nevertheless, now and again, in spite of the world, the flesh, and the devil, there arose a prophet, or a healer, as a witness to the truth that spirit is greater than matter, and kindred with Him who 'is a spirit.' The legends of the saints of the Roman Church, though they may contain exaggerations and in some cases impositions, are yet most often those of the lives of persons of high aspirations and great holiness, possessing frequently those spiritual gifts mentioned by St. Paul as objects of desire and prayer. Since the Reformation, and amongst Protestants, there have been the French prophets, the Irvingites, and others too numerous to specify; and, in the Roman Church of our own day, the celebrated priest, Prince Hohenloe. Such is a very cursory view of the question from its religious and historical side. Allow me to glance, though briefly and very imperfectly, at its philosophical view.

"The teaching that healing power or any similar endowment is contrary to natural law, and a breach of it—the speaking of such events as *miracles* and *supernatural*—has done much to raise doubts, often most painful and agonizing doubts, in minds of the highest intellect and earnestness.

"Doubt is not a moral crime. It is the most terrible of trials. If there be a sin at all in the matter, it too often rests with those who check investigation, and insist upon the arbitrary reception of that against which reason and conscience revolt. To a person to whose mind God has been revealed as 'not a man, that he should repent,' but as one 'without variableness or shadow of turning,' the idea of a breach of law is contrary to his highest conceptions of God. The God in whom he believes is incapable of suspending or breaking, as a mere exhibition of power and caprice, laws which, as the outcome of His nature, must be perfect.

"Moreover, physical study shews him that as a fact law is unalterable and inviolable. So that when required to hold a theological opinion at variance with his test perceptions of God, and with his scientific knowledge, he naturally and rightly refuses it. He would rather disbelieve in miracles, than disbelieve in God's perfection. And so he gets called an infidel. And though, because faithful to the reason and conscience through which God has revealed Himself to his being, he is far from deserving that opprobrious name; he yet loses much, by rejecting, together with the unreasonable form in which the dogma has been presented, its inner meaning or soul. He rejects not only all idea of breach of law; but in refusing to accept the facts and truths contained in the doctrine of miracles, denies the occurrence from time to time of events indicating the possession of powers by the human soul which link it with the unseen; and fails to realise the grand harmonious working of the laws of a personal God—some higher, some lower—but all His, and all natural and orderly; some physical, some spiritual, but all in their course, and all pulsing with His presence in whom we live and move and have our being, 'and who is not far from any one of us.'

"The only solution of the difficulty appears to be the recognition of a gradually ascending scale in the realm of law, rising from the most palpable and demonstrable form of physical law to a more subtle and ethereal but equally inviolable form. The higher naturally subjects the lower. Miracles, or apparent deviations from the ordinary, tangible, and visible forms in which law manifests itself, can only be referred to the operation of a higher law, or rather to a higher form of the one great principle of universal law. One of the most earnest as

well as popular writers of the day has explained clearly that one law, or one phase of law, holds good, and is infallible, until crossed and contradicted by another. He says something to this effect: By the law of gravitation an apple having fallen from the tree will inevitably reach the ground. But how if I put out my hand and prevent it falling? Has law been broken or destroyed? Not at all. But another and a superior form of it has intervened. The law of my will has interrupted, it is true, the ordinary course of nature, but my will acts through the agency of physical law, and not independently of it, or in opposition to it. With all reverence the same may be said of the Divine Will. The law of what the Apostle calls 'spiritual gifts' appears to be a law so subtle and so ethereal as to be 'border land, so to speak, between the domains of matter and mind—linking them together, harmonising them so completely that it is hard to say where the one ends and the other begins, and throwing floods of light upon the old battle grounds of the philosophers. For want of a better name, we call this law *magnetic*. Magnetism is an all-pervading, *world* principle, a *finer* and higher form of electricity. Some substances and some beings are more susceptible to its influence than others. Some absorb and some impart it. Some persons are as it were, enveloped and clothed in it, and can emit its efficacy to others. It is life-giving, and therefore it can heal, soothe, and restore. It is the atmosphere, rarer and purer than the heavier gaseous air about us, in which alone spirits out of the flesh and clothed in an ethereal and magnetic body can communicate with us be they our kindred and brethren within the veil or higher angels sent on missions to earth. Through it they can influence us in dreams, by inspiration, and, under certain conditions, make themselves visible to us. We see as yet 'through a glass darkly,' and know but little of these conditions. The knowledge of magnetic law, its circumstances and extent, is yet in its veriest infancy. Firmly, however, and rejoicingly do we believe that we dimly see the principle of the physical or *semi-physical* law through whose agency it has pleased God to act in the region called 'miraculous,' but which in reality is as little so as any other manifestation of the creative mind. In one sense, everything is a miracle. In another, nothing is miraculous. Everything is *supernatural* in one sense, for all comes from the Great Divine Mind which guides nature. Yet in another sense, there is no supernatural, for all his workings are harmonious, gradual, orderly, and natural. There is nothing sensational or magical in his laws.

"The difficulty in receiving the miracles of the Bible has been to many very great, because they supposed themselves required to believe that mind and spirit had subdued matter without the action of physical law. And this in a region of physical facts they considered impossible. This appears, from his celebrated 'Essay,' to have been Professor Baden Powell's view of the case. Does not magnetism, which is a force physical, though so refined as to be impalpable, throw a ray of light upon these difficulties? Ignorant as we are of the wondrous workings of this mighty force, one thing is certain, that the possession of it and the capability of using it has nothing whatever to do with goodness, either as cause or effect. This should be distinctly remembered. It is easy to understand this, if we bear in mind that it is a force of a physical character, although of a rare and refined quality. History, sacred and secular, sustains this fact. In all ages there have been prophets, healers, and seers; but they have not always been good men. We read of Balam, of false prophets, of men who sold their powers for reward, and of those who communicated with devils or evil spirits.

"The powers called miraculous have been from the beginning. Christ did not give these gifts for the first time. But He, as the restorer and the great healer of soul and body, taught men their highest aim and object—the restoration of men, spiritually and physically, the individual and the race, so as to establish the kingdom of God on earth.

"That these powers exist now, in some degree, as they have always done, is to my mind clear as daylight. That they would increase in quantity and quality, were there more "faith in the earth, I also earnestly believe. Faith, or imagination (if that name be preferred), the faculty which makes distant things present, and which realise the ideal, may be (how know we not?) the law that augments that magnetic atmosphere in which and through whose agency these things happen. Some deep thinker has said that "spirits make substance. If that be so, may not faith act upon and increase magnetism? But ours, alas, are not "days of faith." They are, for the most part, days of the sheerest and grossest materialism. Love of the outward, the transient, the unreal, stamp and characterise them. Nevertheless, the gift of healing, and the power of communicating with the unseen, lives yet in our midst, and is, or ought to be, a witness to the truth of the sacred records, and another proof that God is not dead, or asleep like Baal; neither is "His arm shortened that lie cannot save "now in the nineteenth century, as of old in Israel. I grant fully that, in an age such as this, great caution should be used in exercising such powers. We know so little about the conditions under which they may effect good, and so much harm may be done by failure, that to boast loudly of their possession is to exhibit a zeal untempered with discretion. Every opportunity for fair investigation should be given. Admitting the possibility and probability of these facts, there always remains the necessity for testimony and proof. Whether the cures attempted by Dr. Newton in your town will abide strict scrutiny, it is not in my power to decide. Except in the case of Mr. Young, their permanency, at least, has not been proved. Neither do you mention any other instance of such marked success. This may be the result of causes comprehensible to those who have studied the law of magnetism so far as it is known with its

attractions and repulsions, though it may not be easy to explain to the less versed in these subjects.

"It must have been a strange sight in these unbelieving days—in this matter-of-fact age, where hearts are often 'dry as swimmer's dust' and the gentle dew of faith and imagination has passed away—that eager, expectant throng of half curious, half hopeful sufferers, the blind, the halt, the lame—crowding to a man who had come from beyond the sea on a mission of healing. Crowding to him as of yore men crowded round St. Paul, at Ephesus, to touch him, or be touched by him, and even to imbibe his influence through garments which had received his contact.

"Knowing nothing personally of Dr. Newton, and having small sympathy with what I have read of his views and opinions, I do not write to support him individually. But being fully persuaded of God's power and presence yesterday, to-day, and for ever, and believing that what we call the miraculous is as simple and naturally in the order of His government, as the commonest circumstance of every day life, I would appeal to your readers not to turn contemptuously from these statements, but to receive them with the same wise and reverend patience which one of old time displayed, when he quieted the excitement of the assembly with the remarkable words, 'If this work be of men it will come to naught, but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found oven to fight against God.'—I remain, Sir, yours odediently,

A SPIRITUALIST, BUT AN ANGLICAN."

LONDON: J. BURNS, 15, SOUTHAMPTON ROW, W.C.

"Am I My Brother's Keeper?" A Sermon Preached in and of the Funds of the Hornbrook Ragged Schools Association, *In Chalmers' Church, Melbourne*, On Sunday, August 22, 1869,

By the Rev. Peter S. Menzies, M.A.,

One of the Ministers of the Scots' Church, Melbourne, [unclear: ferwerly] of St. George's -in-the-Fields, Glasgow.

Melbourne: Samuel Mullen, 55 Collins Street East. 1869.

Sermon. "Am I My Brother's Keeper?"

GENESIS IV. 9.—"*And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I Know not: Am I my brother's keeper?*"

It will be acknowledged to be a striking fact that this question first occurs on the lips of a murderer: for just as in the first hungry look of concupiscence there is the germ of all actual impurity, so he who disowns responsibility for his brother's good will be prepared, when occasion comes, to hate him; and hating him, may any day strike a sudden dagger into his breast, and go down to the grave accursed by the silent voice of a brother's blood.

Have you ever thought—you who as a man of business advocate the strictest principles of equity, and these alone—that when you resolve to insist on your rights, heedless of the utter destruction which this may bring upon a less successful rival; and quiet compunctions by some such speech as, "He is there to look after his own interests, I am here to attend to mine—have you ever thought, that there is incipient murder in the act? Yes: beyond doubt, he who was a murderer from the beginning put that speech into Cain's mouth: and any of us looking back upon it in the light of a saying of the greatest of Christians, "Every man shall bear his own burden" (Gal. vi. 5), may probably think it a curious triumph of diabolic skill which has been able thus to cast the very words of inspiration in the face of God. Wickedness becomes hopeless indeed when it calls in the sophistry of text-quoting to shelter the atrocities of blackest crime.

Ever and anon in the history of mankind, either by selfish customs, or by sordid philosophy, or by blind unthinking sloth, the question has been raised again, "Am I my brother's keeper?" and one of the most certain facts known to us is, that the character of the answer given it, has invariably presaged salvation or ruin, nothing less, to the nation whom it concerned. "Am I my brother's keeper?" asked degenerate Israel, after she had grown so proud of her unique position, her Temple, her mercy-seat, her sacrificial institutes, her new moons and appointed feasts, that she forgot the grand end for which those blessings were bestowed. "And in thee, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blest" (Gen. xxii. 18; xxvi. 4). And to the question as thus put, Christ tells us that the answer commonly given, in practice among the Jews, was, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy" (Matt. v. 43): deal leniently and live peaceably with every Jew: be indulgent to a Jewish debtor: take no interest from a Jewish borrower: dare not to sell any Jewish child into slavery. But with a Gentile it is different. When you see a robbed and wounded stranger lying on the roadside where the cowardly thieves had left him naked and covered with blood, though you should go near and look, and then pass by on the other side, it will be no so great a sin. Why should the children's bread be taken and cast to dogs? What part hath he that believeth with an infidel? Will God be so unfair as to grant to the Gentiles also repentance unto life? This was, it would seem, the practical answer of the vulgar Jewish morality. And because

this was Israel's answer; because she would be bitter in her exclusiveness and narrow in her love; because the only alternative she could offer to the vast mass of mankind was circumcision or everlasting contempt, because she made Jewish physiognomy the test of brotherhood, refused to be the keeper of any other brother; yes, and killed the Holy One and the Just whom God raised up to be the Keeper and Saviour of all mankind,—therefore, by one of the tremendous catastrophes of history, she fell into social and political extinction. "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day the things which belong unto thy peace; but now they are hid from thine eyes" (Luke xix. 42).

And give me leave to say, the issues are every whit as great, as solemn, which are bound up with the new and altered form in which the question is presented to many modern societies, notably to every society which has been formed under the influence of British traditions or derived from British blood. To be sure, there is no longer any theoretical distinction between the dignity of one blood and that of another: no longer any prescriptive religious rights claimed by one section of our race as against all other sections of it; or if so, the claim is derided by the intelligence of all civilised men. What Paul told the Athenians—"God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts xvii. 26); what a greater than Paul impressed upon his disciples, "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren" (Matt. xxiii. 9), has, after sore and curiously manifold struggles, been conceded. The equal admissibility of all nations, all classes, all colours—outlandish barbarian and polished European, sensual Australian savage and highbrowed English philosopher—to the privileges of the Gospel, to the mercy of God in Christ, to the benefits of the covenant ratified by a blood "which speaketh better things than the blood of Abel" (Heb. xii. 24), is no longer a proposition which any influential voice disputes; or, disputing, hopes to convince men of the contrary.

The murderous restrictions as to privilege are removed; but tell me, is the murderous indifference in feeling? Is the removal of our neighbour's disabilities to be considered a full discharge of Christian obligations to him? Is it enough, not to exclude him by specific oppressive enactments from his fair share of such wealth, wisdom, and happiness, as existence offers him? Or does there not remain after all this an infinite debt of unfulfilled obligation? a debt which can never or earth be utterly exhausted? a responsibility which commands us to shield and shelter him with our sympathy, with our prayers, with our affection, with our blessing? For is it not written, and is it not one of the grand and distinctive utterances of the Gospel, that the fulfilling of the law is love? (Rom. xiii. 10.)

If you consider for a moment with me some of the existing relations between one section of society and another (it matters not whether we think of England or the colonies), you will see that there is some reason for asking whether the fraternal obligations of Christianity are duly recognised. Think of the circle in which your rich friends live; think again of the circle in which any labouring men of your acquaintance live; and tell me whether there is not an absolute and complete separation of these two circles the one from the other: and whether if so the fact does not stare you in the face that in no sense which does not turn the words into a pitiful mockery, is the one section the Christian keeper of the other.

Have you any reason to doubt this fact—that the two extremes of society live in vital separation from each other? And can you suppose that where there is practical separation there may not readily enough arise bitter hostility? How many of the employers of labour in this large city know their employes personally; know where they live; how many rooms they dwell in; what children they have, and how they are bringing up these children for time and for eternity? Is it often witnessed that all the education, refinement, and good sense at the rich man's command enable him to govern or even influence the poor man's opinion, in opposition to that of any ignorant and eloquent demagogue who may chance to belong to the same class? Has not the rich man his haunts, and the poor man his? The rich man his set of amusements, the poor man his? The rich man his church or chapel, the poor man his? In point of fact might it not be affirmed with truth that there is just one point where the two waves of life meet (alas they do not always meet without a collision!) and that point is the relations of pure business? The one expends so much capital, and gets so much physical service in exchange for it; the other gives so much manual or skilled labour, and receives in return the stipulated pay. That is the whole: these transactions accomplished both return to their several homes utter strangers in feeling, thoughts, ambitions, everything!

We need not unthinkingly or unkindly lay the blame of these things on one class only. We might rather attribute it to the action of certain general laws, which have not been benignly modified by the consistent operation of the Christian spirit. Yet surely I am here entitled to ask; surely I am keeping within the lawful province of a Christian teacher when I ask, is not this a prodigious evil? Is not this an evil which involves both sections of society in a signal injustice, each to each? Few will deny that it does. It involves an injustice to the rich man, insensibly narrowing him and hardening him. It shuts him out from that knowledge of personal detail in the life of his brother, in which the most real sympathy and love are likely to arise. It compels him when he gives alms at all, to do so without the satisfaction of seeing the fruits of it tell, of witnessing the actual alleviation of the suffering, and so enjoying the personal gratitude of the sufferer who has been relieved. It

exposes him to continual misconception and misrepresentation at the hand of his poorer brother, who knowing him in no other relation than that of his master in business, is apt, often quite mistakenly, to suppose that the one idea of his soul is to grind out of his servant as much work for as little pay as possible. Thus it is terribly damaging to the rich man's reputation and subversive of his true social influence.

But alas! it is on the poor, that the more immediate and calamitous share of the mischief rests. There are, we all know, occasions of falling into poverty which no amount of prudence or of principle will always be able to avoid. There are many poor men whose characters are thoroughly virtuous, whose sufferings nothing but the tongue of calumny would ever impute to their personal sins. Just imagine the case of such a poor man. If his rich employer really knew him: and if he had any opportunity of really knowing his employer, and learning to believe in the sterling kindness that may and probably does exist in that gentleman's heart, the practical remedy would be found at once. The ease would be explained, the explanation accepted, and the true relief readily found. There are endless ways of helping a poor man's distress without at all wounding his sense of honour, nay, which give him the opportunity of conferring a positive happiness upon the rich, the luxury of doing a kind act to a worthy object. But, as society works at present, in the isolated state of the poor man's life, shut up in his own lonely circle, he has just these alternatives: either he must bear the worst without a remedy, or he must come under unpleasant obligations to friends of his own class who can little afford to help him, or he must submit to the inconceivable degradation of accepting pauper relief: I say pauper relief: for charities which are devised to meet extensive evils must, in whatever way managed, act by rules, and these rules, devised against imposture, carry on the very face of them a stigma on the poor man's honour.

It is only a natural result of such an unhappy isolation as I have described, that the burdens of charity fall greatly upon a few; and that with these illustrious individual exceptions the richer classes contribute scarcely more than a mere fraction of what they ought for the relief of the public misery. Large charities, managed officially by a few, cannot fail to glide into mechanical hardness. The imputation of imposture rankles like a thorn in the hearts of the deserving poor. The amount of squalid penury that lurks in large cities is increasing at a terrible ratio of speed; and no efficient effort is put forth to grapple with it. At the other extreme of life, many who live in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day, are falling, from pure ennuï, from the absence of proper life-occupation, into sins and crimes all the more odious and shameful than those of the poor, that they have larger opportunity to sin, and more extensive knowledge of the art of sinning.

Hear me on this point just a minute longer. I must not stop short at the actual evils which are already produced in our own day by this lamentable estrangement in life, if not in feeling, of poor from rich, and rich from poor. I will ask, what must be the outcome hereafter of such a state of things? To what, if unstayed and unchecked, must it infallibly lead? There is but one answer possible. As sure as God lives, to national decay. No community can possibly develop a healthy, not to say a splendid, future out of such sickly germs. As it is, even already, precursors of that degeneracy which we may expect are beginning to appear, in literature, art, philosophy and politics. Clever writers affect an unmanly cynicism in expression, and even in thought, and glory in the habit of playing with momentous subjects, as if it were beneath the literary dignity of the nineteenth century to be serious. There is an appetite for purely sensual enjoyment among those from whose intellectual refinement better things might have been expected, which cannot be described as anything else than appalling. The rapacity shown by so many, as well in political as in mercantile circles, need not here be commented on. I say these things are symptomatic. They indicate a diseased state of society. And no deeper cause of such disease could be named than this, that we have not always been careful to build the structure of our society on that strong foundation of Christian principle, love to God and love to man, without which there is no abiding prosperity possible.

Yet do not mistake the spirit in which these observations are offered. I do not myself cherish gloomy views of the destiny that lies before our Anglo-Saxon race. I do not wish to leave melancholy impressions upon you. I see no better race on the earth's surface arising at present to supplant us. I do not believe there are worthier representatives of human nature anywhere than among the rich and the poor of British origin. I do not believe the selfish spirit is stronger in the bosom of this generation than it has been in all other generations before us. But our attention cannot too earnestly be called to the fact, that great social energy, a high state of civilisation does develop separative tendencies between class and class, and never yet have we taken sufficiently active measures to modify or counteract these tendencies. That we must do now; in earnest, not under the influence of any sudden impulse created by an appeal to the feelings, but as the fruit of deep, strong, and rational conviction. We must do it as those who need God's grace always should do everything, with much self-distrust and profound reliance on the wisdom and blessing of Him who is the Maker alike of rich and poor. We must do it with the soberest, largest, most enlightened intelligence: for a zeal that is not according to knowledge will create many new evils for every old one it extinguishes. We must do it in that faith which is prepared to remove mountains of difficulty because its hand touches the Omnipotent arm that never wearies: but oh! above all things we must do it, and do it now; as we value our own immortal souls, and the souls of unborn generations

on whom we shall set our mark for good or for evil.

But here, you say, comes the critical difficulty. What can be done? Point it out. Assume that we wish to be our brother's keeper; assume the existence in us of a brotherly love, which a sense of redemption, as well as simple nature itself inspires; and show us how we can dry up even in any considerable measure these stagnant pools of vicious pauperism; save untarnished lives from being sucked into pollution; divert our surplus wealth and refinement into some of those dark channels and hope forsaken desolations where lust, when it has conceived, brings forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, brings forth death.

Language like this is held by many. All are ready to help you if you will but show the way. The pulpit wastes itself in stimulating high and hallowed feeling which is not practically expressed; seldom does it condescend to give any definite counsel as to how the gigantic evils in question are to be grappled with. It is not enough to create the spirit of duty. It must be shown what duty is. Now, I will partly accept this blame. I believe we may err in stimulating only the spiritual emotions, without directing them with sufficient care into a practical channel. Yet I accept the blame only in part. Surely by far the sublimest part of a preacher's function is performed when, by the use of God's appointed means, he has made men willing to do and to suffer for Christ's sake. The very essence of our calling is to bring you under the influence of the Holy Spirit, that, looking with faith to Christ and living in union with Him, you may advance yourselves nearer to spiritual perfection and save the souls of others also. But to expect that the wisdom of the pulpit alone should be able to grapple with anything more than the broad principles of active philanthropy, i.e., should present matured schemes for social revival, and lay the draft of definite plans before a public so intelligent and enlightened as we are accustomed to address—to expect this is surely too much; nor do I believe that those who cherish the expectation have fully grasped the gravity of that responsibility which they are throwing upon us. Nevertheless, even the inspiring and guiding principles of practical Christian beneficence are not so well understood or recognised as they ought to be. And I shall, therefore, occupy a few minutes longer in touching upon two of the more important of these.

I. It is our Christian wisdom, first of all, in all efforts to do good to our fellow-creatures, to meet them on the ground of human equality. We must recognise their brotherhood. We must feel, and show that we feel, a respect the same in kind for the honest hand which wields the hammer, grasps the chisel, guides the plough, that we do for whiter hands and paler countenances devoted to duties more refined, and which have never been required to come in contact with the rougher dust of creation. I put it to you. Why should any man be slow to acknowledge a fact? It is a fact that men are brethren. It is a fact that God owns us all as His creatures, as His children. Moreover, this brotherhood of mankind is a fact so boldly and openly presumed by the whole scheme of Christianity, as well as so deeply engraven on the natural conscience, that one wonders how argument should have been needful to establish it, how bloodshed should ever have occurred over it. "Call no man your father upon earth: for one is your Father even God." "Ye have one Master, and all ye are brethren." "Now in Christ Jesus, ye, i. e., Gentiles, who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ." "For He is our peace who hath made both one and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us." "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Could any announcement be more explicit? And this is only the open statement and Divine consecration of a truth written upon the fleshy tables of every human heart, not with ink, but by the Spirit of the living God. Why should any selfish prejudice be encouraged which tends to smother this so deep and blessed consciousness? Yet how far are we from treating men as our brothers and our equals! The man of means, of social position is not content without a pointed manifestation of deference. Well, quite right that deference should be paid to all that is manly in him. But it needs not me to assure you that the slightest tincture of patronage in the bestowal of a kindness, even the careless dash of condescension with which the coin is pressed into the poor man's hand, will upon the hearts of the great mass destroy the effect of your most charitable feeling. Ah, dear friends, God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble. Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted, but the rich in that he is made low. How beautiful is humility! How beautiful it is when the finest culture and the noblest piety walk with uncovered head among the sorrows of the poor, and while pitying the misfortunes of the sufferer, respect the indestructible majesty of the man! Until we are prepared to take the worst and weakest by the hand, as brothers, they will, with one voice, answer us: "Man, who made you a ruler or a judge over us?" We care not for the kindness which must be purchased by servility.

II. It must not be forgotten, secondly, that though no benevolent action can be efficient which is not well organised, yet the strongest of all influence for good is personal influence. Above all things, in charity, in acts of real philanthropy, the heart of the donor should act on the heart of the recipient as directly as possible. Wherever the wide growth of various forms of misery, especially physical distress, has excited the sympathetic attention of good men, there it has been uniformly found necessary to organise; to employ the services of many agents doing different things on one complete plan, in which there was the requisite co-ordination and subordination of parts. And not only so, but those who take an interest in the history of this subject will find that comparatively successful attempts have already been made in one or two large cities, for example,

Liverpool and New York, to form a federation of the more important charities. That is, leading representatives of the working committees of each meet together and settle the broader principles on which all are to be wrought; and these are in possession of detailed information from every part of the organism.

The writer desires to acknowledge obligations to a little work on "Social Duties, by a Man of Business": Macmillan and Co., London and Cambridge.

In that way one formidable evil incident to the bestowal of charity in this city is avoided, viz., it is impossible for a thorough impostor or an impudent mendicant of the more sordid type to be receiving largely from two or three different charities at the same time. And what is more. Whilst in London, it is a common occurrence any winter for men to die of pure starvation, and the thing is not wholly unknown among ourselves, it is, happily, a very rare event in either of the two cities I named, simply from their admirable principle of filiating and federating the distinct forms of charitable work. Whether it may be found practicable to centralise to the same splendid extent in this city; whether we have among us citizens sufficiently chivalrous, self-denying, and Christ-like, to form such a Board, and to bring all their best business habits to bear upon the management of it; whether we can hope for such a happy future or not, certain it is that indiscriminate charity is a great evil; that distress prevailing among any large mass of people must be met by an organised system; and that it is our clear duty, on conviction, for Christ's sake, in the high self-devoting Spirit of Him who saved others when Himself He did not save, to come forward with one heart and one mind, and attempt some combined action at once.

But while the economist, and justly, bids you organise, there is another counsel which the Christian lays even more imperatively upon you. And that is, if permanent good is to be done, if society is to be thrilled through with the sense of living God-like unity, the soul that believes and loves must be allowed to act directly upon the soul of his brother. Not otherwise can he be his brother's keeper as Christ would have His sheep watched and tended. Ask England, ask man's heart, the secret of the failure of every poor-law that ever has been or that ever will be tried. It is this, that the best feelings and the best life of men are called forth not by invisible corporations, not by official agencies, but by the life that glows in the souls of brother men. It is impossible to feel gratitude to the exchequer of a state. It is impossible to be warmly impressed with affection for officials, who neither have nor pretend to have any particular interest in the individual recipient. The whole thing is mechanical and degrading in the last degree; as far as possible from harmonising with the infinite tenderness and delicacy of the Spirit of Christ. I trust that the curse of such a state provision for the poor will long be averted from this country. Let our benevolent friends bestir themselves. Let our rich men and rich women treat their heart to the delight of personally ministering to those who need: let them act so far in concert that the work may be done regularly and done well: but above all let them not shrink from personal action, let them shed the light of their intelligence, their refinement, their pure Christianity, their unworldly longings for God and God's gracious presence, over the threshold of the homes of want and misery: and I am confident the joy of acting thus upon the souls of friendless creatures of God will stimulate them to tenfold exertion, will supersede for ever the cold charities of officialism, and make our rich and poor one great loving family dwelling together in unity, and affectionate peace. Then and not till then shall the black waters of sorrow retire before the wind that God shall cause to blow over them. Then the nation shall cease to breathe heavily and weep secretly for the slain of the daughter of our people. Then, best of all, men shall begin better than ever before to feel that they are brothers, the gulf between rich and poor shall vanish, and a springtime of better hopes for all who dwell under these skies succeed the dreary winter of human wretchedness and human wrong.

Is this too much to hope from those who are bound together by such a sacrament as Christians are? Is it too much to expect of those who believe that the rich Lord of the universe for their sakes became poor that they through His poverty might be rich? Do you not know how wretched are many in this city? Do you not know that drunkenness like a horror of great darkness sits brooding everywhere, leaving men without hope and without God? Do you not know that the pestilence of an unbridled sensuality cloaked under whatever fair name it be, is eating the very heart out of a large section of our society? Are we to know these things and keep silence? Are we to talk for ever and not act? Are we to wait till the conflict of confusions shall bring forth order? Tell me, if these things are done in the green tree what shall be done in the dry? If the cancer of a neglected and criminal population assumes already such fearful dimensions in a city not half a century old, what shall be the state of society when our great grand children drive highways and railways over our graves? Ye can discern the face of the sky: but can ye not discern the signs of the times?

God calls you to be the keepers of these poor uncared for brothers! He calls you, adding the promise even of a blessing in this life. Did not at least one leper out of the ten turn back to glorify Christ for his cleansing? The heart of the most desponding, most degraded, is not for ever proof against the influence of love. But He calls you by a stronger and mightier summons than any hope of selfish reward. He calls you by the remembrance of the sacrifice that has been made for you, and the precious blood of Christ wherewith you have been bought. He calls you by the respect you have for the human nature which Christ wore, which Christ perfected, for which Christ died, and round which He now has cast in Heaven the rays of an imperishable glory.

He calls you to have mercy upon the forsaken, the friendless, the poor, as you hope to have mercy from Him in that great day when the throne shall be set and the Books be opened, and the dead, small and great, shall rise to judgment. He calls you because they are limbs of his own blessed body, and He wills not that they should sicken and die. Their blood will He require at your hands. We cannot let them bleed or starve under the starry heavens on this cold earth without storing up a heavy reckoning. Rise then to the height of your calling, and be kind to Christ's poor ones for the sake of the Lord that bought them. Has He not promised to acknowledge you and them, in his own bright heavens, saying, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto Me."

Worthy of deep veneration is the memory of that sainted lady who, after thinking what she could do for Jesus and His cause remembered that sweet commandment, "Feed my lambs." If they who have ceased from their labours can behold from heaven what is done on earth, she who gave her name to this association must rejoice with a truly heavenly unselfishness over the conquests which this institution called by her into existence is making from the kingdom of Satan. Many hundreds of children receive from these Hornbrook Schools all the studied instruction they shall ever get under the sun. They are taught to read, write, and cipher, and look at the face of this world with the intelligence of reasonable beings. They are kept clean and orderly, are taught the laws of modesty, punctuality, and industry; above all they are taught to remember that God has given them a spark from His own everburning light that cannot be quenched. They are taught that they are sinners in a sinful world, but that the blood of Jesus cleanses from all sin. They are taught that one Eye sees them which can form no false judgments, and that they shall one day tremble before that terrible purity to give an account of all they have been and done. But they are taught that the mercy of God has provided for their recovery, that a Lamb has been slain from the foundation of the world: that the merciful High Priest waits for them, weeps for them with an unutterable affection. And so through Him they are taught to despise all clanger and to hope for the mercy of the God who wills not that any should perish. I commend to your earnest friendly prayerful support this excellent cause. Let us be dealt with liberally. Oh, call upon God in an acceptable time and make your offerings. Most precious are the promises which He has made to those who give even a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple.

Melbourne: Walker, May and Co., Printers, 99 Bourke Street West
The Law and the Limit of Labour. A Sermon (Preached on Behalf of the Early Closing Movement,)
By J. Langdon Parsons,
Pastor of the Hanover Street Baptist Church, Dunedin.
"Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening"— *PSALM civ., 23.*
Dunedin: Printed by Fergusson & Mitchell, Princes Street. 1867.

Note.

This Sermon was preached on last Lord's Day evening, April 14th, in the Hanover-street Baptist Chapel, with special reference to the efforts now being made in Dunedin to shorten the hours of shop labour; it is now published, just as it was preached, in deference to the request of the Committee of the "GROCERS' EARLY CLOSING ASSOCIATION," who are kind enough to think it should speak to a wider audience than that which heard the preacher's voice. It was written, of course, without the slightest thought of publication, and the writer must bespeak a lenient judgment of its many faults, and marks of evident haste. If it, in any degree, helps forward a movement that has his warmest sympathies, he will be more than satisfied.

Dunedin,

April 13th, 1867.

The Law and the Limit of Labour.

"Man Goeth Forth unto his Work and to his Labour Until the Evening."—
Psalm civ., 23.

YOU will not meet with a sublimer ode than this 104th Psalm in all the wide range of poesy, sacred or profane. It is a grand, sustained strain of praise to the All-mighty and All-wise Creator and Preserver. The language is of the richest poetical beauty, and the images employed, whether we isolate them or regard them in

their groupings, are surpassingly lovely; while the description is as faithful as it is eloquent. Though the Psalm has no title and no author's name prefixed, it has been ascribed by many expositors to Israel's sweet singer, David. Its close connection with the 103rd Psalm greatly strengthens this opinion; though it must be acknowledged that many—Hengstenberg amongst the number—are against the Davidic authorship. Undoubtedly the Psalmist's object is to set forth the majesty and might of Jehovah in the work of Creation, and His beneficence and bountifulness in Providence. He seems to behold the Almighty clothed in a glistening garment of light: he seems to hear His authoritative commands—done as soon as spoken: he seems to see His plastic hand moulding matter to the fair designs of His will: and he marks the lavish profuseness with which all things needed for the sustenance and comfort of His creatures have been provided. With such a theme it is not to be wondered, at that he whose harp had many notes, and whose soul was capable of passionate adoration, should almost surpass himself.

Careful critics have detected a plan in the composition well worth a passing remark. The author's model is the first chapter of Genesis. He recounts the six periods of God's work, viewing them as perpetually prolonged in the preservation of all; and at the close he appropriately hints at the seventh period of rest, wherein the Lord rejoices in His works. If you will turn for a moment to the Psalm, you will see the justness of this principle of interpretation. Verses 3—8 refer to the first and second "days"—as we call them—when the Light was created, and the firmament was built up and called Heaven. Verses 9—13 refer to the third "day" when the earth and sea received their appointed bounds, and the grasses, the herbs, and the trees clothed the barren land with a raiment of many-hued loveliness. Verses 14—19 refer to the fourth "day," when the two great lights were hung on high—the sun to rule the day, the moon to rule the night—and when the stars were sprinkled through the wastes of space. Verses 20—30 refer to the fifth and sixth "days," when the fowls of the air, the fish of the sea, the living creatures of the field and forest,—and man, their monarch—were placed in their prepared, homes. And in verse 31 there is an allusion to that Sabbatic rest, which some identify with this lengthened dispensation of grace, wherein God waits for the return of prodigal wanderers to His love and His bosom.

Now, set in the very heart of this Psalm, which is almost wholly about God and His work, we have something about man and *his* work. God is spoken of as working and working always, because His work is without weariness, because the pouring forth of His energy is without exhaustion. But man, because of his frailty, because he is liable to fatigue, though under the law of labour, yet has a limit assigned to his labour. He is not to be, like the Eternal Jehovah, ceaselessly working; nor is he to toil by day while the stork is making her house in the fir trees, while the wild goats are gleaning their food on the tops of the high hills, and by night, too, when all "the beasts of the forest do creep forth." Man has a time for labour, and that time is the day. Man has a limit to his labour, and that limit is the evening. "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening." We have here, then—

I.—THE LAW OF LABOUR.

"Man goeth forth to his work and to his labour." He goeth forth, mark you, not by his own choice—for man has little love for work, He goes forth in obedience to a law. The existence of this law can be proved from Scripture, from reason, and from necessity. I do not prove it here, because I have neither time nor need to do so. The character and obligation of this law may be seen from the following considerations:—

1. It is *Divine*. And we get some grand and cheering thoughts from the remembrance of this fact. Let all workers note it. By working you follow a divine example, and obey a divine law. Light up your places of toil and irradiate your common tasks with that reflection. See a higher model than the most skilful craftsman—see God working for evermore, doing all things well, making all things perfect. Obey a higher law than the law which comes from the lips of an earthly master—the law of Him whose name is Love. and whose nature is what His name declares. No man will see what dignity, what nobleness, what consolation there is in work, until he grasps that, until he feels: "I am doing, faultily, what He does perfectly, it is true—but still I am doing what He does. He has laid upon me no severer law than He obeys himself."

It is necessary, also, to free labour from that false association with the curse into which it has been wrongly dragged. Labour is not *the* result nor *a* result of the curse. Men do not work because Adam fell. Men would not have been free from labour if our first parents had kept their first estate. Adam was not an idler during those days at whose cool eventide he heard the voice of the Almighty among the leafy lovelinesses of Eden. It is wholly a mistake to say we work because of sin. For in the 15th verse of the 2nd chapter of Genesis—before our common mother, who was the first in the transgression, was formed—it is written: "And the LORD GOD took the man and put him in the garden to dress it, and to keep it." Now the word there rendered "to dress" (*ghabadh*), is the root of the very word which in my text is translated "work." And by that word the meaning of the Hebrew would be more clearly expressed:—"The Lord God took the man and put him in the garden to *work* it and to keep it."

It is not labour then that divides us from God, and it is not labour that marks the difference between man's state in innocency and man's state under condemnation. It is *sin* which has cut us off from God; and it is *sin*

which has made labour a curse, so that that which before was man's pastime and privilege is now regarded as the sign and seal of his lapse, the irksome necessity of his lot. It was *these* words which flung a dark shadow upon toil and made it bitter: "Cursed be the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; . . . in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground." *There* you have the cause of all man's weariness and dislike for work. Still, with the sweat beading upon the brow as a result, the law of labour is Divine. God has ordained it for us. It is His decree. And the organs, the faculties, the limbs with which we are endowed—the planning brain, the far-reaching mind, the cunning right hand—all confirm the written command, and teach that man was made "to go forth unto his work and to his labour."

If you need further proof, we have the law repeated in the New Testament: "If any man will not work neither shall he eat." If you need further attestation you have it in the fact that the "Father worketh hitherto," the Son toiled at his craft in despised Nazareth, the Holy Ghost intercedeth incessantly, and the angels, "are they not all ministering Spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?"

2. This law is *Universal*. All men work. Work is manifold—of many kinds. We have contracted the meaning of the word work, until the hand-labourer is supposed to be the only working man. But all men are workers. Even those we call idlers work. Their pleasure—the filling up of their aimless days and vacant hours—is a work indefinitely more wearying than that of the ploughman who walks in the furrow from day dawn to shut of eve; than that of the backwoodsman who wields his axe from morn till night against forest trees; than that of the brawny smith who swings the heavy hammer on the anvil, before a flaming forge. Idleness, indeed, is the hardest of all work.

But there are many toiling labourers besides those who work with their hands: and there is other sweat than that of the brow. There are the men who work the mine of thought, who gather the wisdom of the ages, who solve life's problems, who unravel earth's mysteries, who plan our gigantic works, who lessen by artificial means the severity of toil, who manage our commerce, who write our books, who expose the false and teach the true. These are true workers though their palms are unhardened, and their brows are dry. They work with mental implements, and their sweat is the sweat of the brain. There are pitying ones, upon whom human sorrow rests as a burden, whose hearts yearn over the outcast and the destitute; on whom there rests a woe if they do not go forth redressing wrongs, striking off fetters, opening prison doors; if they are not devising how to teach the ignorant, lift up the fallen, and reclaim the criminal. Their hands are soft, and, thank God, their hearts are softer still. You will not refuse them an entrance into your ranks; you will not be ashamed to stand side by side with these gallant leaders of forlorn hopes, in your "lordly chivalry of labour"—for the sweat they sweat is the sweat of the heart, and the work they do is likest His who went about doing good. We are all working men—some with hand, some with brain, some with heart, some with all three combined. Let neither class despise the other, but like a triple-stranded cord, be all the stronger by being woven indissolubly together.

3. This law is *Necessary*. Some measure of physical work—to narrow the meaning—is needful for our general well-being. It is needful for the body else the sinews relax, the muscles become flaccid, the nerves grow over sensitive. It is needful for the mind else the over-wrought brain flags, and the tension of thought destroys the balance of the intellect. Every wise man, therefore, who wishes to keep a sound mind in a sound body works with his hands or his feet—for no better tonic can be found for the mind than physical fatigue. But labour is necessary for other reasons than these. If we are to get the good there is in nature, if we are to be surrounded with comforts, we must work for them personally or in order to pay those who have worked. Nature supplies man with material, but it is in the rough. She furnishes the elements, but they are uncombined. To combine and polish them is man's necessity. If man is to be fed, the soil must be broken up, the seed must be sown, the harvests must be reaped and garnered; the fruit-bearing bushes and trees must be planted and pruned; the flocks must be tended, the herds pastured. If man is to be clothed, the wool must be shorn from the sheep, the flax fibre and the down of the cotton plant must be collected, the cocoons of the silkworm must be preserved; the spinner must spin them, the weaver must weave them, the dyer must dye them, the sewer must sew them. If man is to be housed, the quarryman must quarry the stone, the woodman must fell the trees, the architect must plan, the builder must build. If man is to have in his house luxuries that delight the eye and charm the ear, the painter must paint, the sculptor must ply his chisel, the musician must construct the instruments of music, and the cunning workman must use his deft and nimble fingers to produce what the ingenious brain of the inventor has designed. It is most plain the law of labour is a necessary one. We cannot have what we need, what God has provided for us, without work.

4. This law is *Beneficent*. Labour is not only of divine institution, universal and necessary: but it is also the best law there could be for us, fashioned as we are and hemmed in as we are by other laws. Idleness is an evil, and the prolific cause of numberless evils besides itself. Wherever a man or nation of men has given up honest, earnest toil—wherever pleasure has been made the only work—it has invariably ended in ruin. Idle periods in nations histories have always been improvident and vicious periods. An idle man with no occupation save the gratification of his restless spirit and hungry heart, is ever as unhappy as he is injurious. There is something

both preservative of good and preventive of evil in the discipline of severe, faithful work, whether it be of the hand or the brain. It gives stability and width to the character, it checks the rank growth of evil that quickly overspreads the unoccupied mind, it gives a level beat to the heart, it gives an accurate skill to the motions of the hand, it gives a zest to needful food better than the best of tonics and more provocative of appetite than the choicest condiments, it gives a sweetness and a soundness to sleep which nought beside can furnish, so that the labouring man closes his eyes, and "tired nature's sweet restorer" folds him in her arms, and hushes him to a deep and dreamless slumber, upon a hard and an unpillowed couch, while pampered idleness tosses wearily upon eider down and within silken curtains. Let the idlers and workers both declare if the law of labour is not beneficent as well as divine, universal and necessary.

But—

II.—THERE IS A LIMIT TO THE LAW OF LABOUR.

"Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour UNTIL the evening." He is not to prolong his toil, nor is he to have it prolonged indefinitely. He is not to work by day and by night too. He is not to labour both during the light and the darkness—or the time when it would be darkness but for artificial light: light, which in every jet and flame of it reads like a complaint of man's greedy heart, that God has not given time enough to buy, and sell, and get gain. I make no appeal to your feelings, however; at any rate just now. One sentence of argument, one authoritative proof, is worth more than pages of appeal and declamation. I said Labour has a limit: I say further *that* Limit is the Evening. For proof I appeal:

1. To *Scripture*. But at the outset, because it is necessary to the understanding of the passages I shall quote, I must ask you to note the Scripture definition of Day. In Genesis i., 5, we find "God called the LIGHT Day." We start then with that understood—the Day is the duration of Light. And now what saith the Scriptures? If you turn to Genesis iii., 17—19, you will find the sentence upon man runs thus: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread . . . all the *days* of thy life." In Deuteronomy xxiv., 15, we have the Mosaic Law: "At his DAY thou (the master) shalt give him (the hireling) his hire, *neither shall the sun go down upon it* " In Judges xix., 16, we have a casual reference which shows the custom during the time of the Judges; "And, behold, there came an old man from his work, out of the field, *at even*." In Job xiv., 6, we have life compared to the term of labour: "He shall accomplish as a hireling his *day*." In Psalm civ., 23,—the text—we have the length of the working period fixed for the great human family: "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour *until the evening*." In Isaiah xxviii., 24, we have the question: "Doth the plowman plow all *day* to sow?" In Matthew xx., 2—8, we learn by a parable our Lord's will concerning labour: "The householder agreed with the labourers for a penny a *day*; and when the *even* was come, the steward gave them their hire." Then, in John ix., 4, we have the duration of toil definitely settled—Christ says: "I must work the works of Him that sent me while it is Day; *the night cometh when no man can work*."

No doubt these references point to a primitive period, and to primitive occupations; but the last one quoted and the text are to be understood in the widest sense. If we accept the teaching of Scripture at all, we are not to set up our modern customs against it as either invalidating or rendering its sanctions obsolete. If, then, the Bible be of any authority, its utterances are plain, emphatic and consistent throughout that the limit of labour is the evening.

2. *Nature* is another witness. Her testimony is unmistakeably on the side of early hours. She enforces her law in her own domain. "The sun knoweth his going down;" and "the day spring knows his place." The sun has his appointed time, and with undeviating regularity, according to the season, he slopes down to the west, "upgathers his spent shafts, and puts them back into his golden quiver," and sets. And, though an unwearied and unresting worker, he goes to shine on other lands, and light other men to their toil, he seems to pause and say, as he rays out his last farewell beam: "Rest! Rest! Res! oh earth-children; I have given you light for your work, even as He ordained who appointed me for seasons. Let the busy rest, for there cometh another day to-morrow. Let the idle rest, and be admonished to rise betimes and have no more reason to say, 'I have lost a day.' Let the successful rest content, and care not to lay up treasure on earth, nor grow greedy of golden gains. Let the disappointed rest, and sleep a tranquil sleep, knowing there is a blessing in failure, and that all things work together for good to them that love God." And, I think, when the silver moon rides, in her white beauty, up the skies, and the tender, throbbing stars come forth like sentinels to keep their watch, they take up the strain, and whisper with a wondrous melody "in reason's ear:" "Pause till the morrow ye who are weary with toil, we keep a faithful guard. Put away your finished and unfinished tasks. Like him who waited for his bride, go forth and meditate at eventide.

*Toll comes with the morning,
And rest with the night."*

It may possibly be objected that this is poetical and consequently most unpractical. It may be said the difference between the length of summer and winter days renders the following of nature's rule most inconvenient, for at one time it is too long, and at another too short." My reply is: "Take then, the long and the

short, add them together, draw the line at the average, and you will find seven o'clock outside the due and proper limit.

3. *Reason's* utterance is in strictest agreement with that of Scripture and Nature. Man is a compound creature. He is not all body. He is body, intellect, and spirit. The body in fact, because of its mortality, and the brevity of its existence, is confessedly of incalculably the least value. Reason, therefore, protests against the monopolizing of nearly all man's time for the benefit of the body alone. Reason claims that the intellect and the spirit shall both have their fair share, their due proportion of the three score years and ten. How can they have this if twelve and fourteen hours are greedily grasped for providing the body with the bread that perisheth, and if eight hours more—and few men who work twelve or fourteen hours can do with less—if eight hours more are to be given to rest and sleep, to enable the body to endure its protracted labour? If you take the lesser number, if a man works twelve hours and sleeps eight, you have FIVE-SIXTHS—if you take the larger number, if a man works fourteen hours and sleeps eight, you have ELEVEN-TWELFTHS of the six working days wholly devoted to the body. What can the jaded mind, what can the deadened spirit do with the miserable fragment that is left? They can do nothing, but seek a short excitement that will spur them into an unnatural and harmful activity. Is that right? Is it wise? Is that as it ought to be? Is it answering the end of man's creation? No; for it is written "Man shall not live by bread alone," and Reason adds that an estimate of the comparative values of the intellect and the body, and the soul and body, gives vehemence to the demand that a wider margin of hours should be left for the culture and informing of the mind, and for preparing the soul to loose its moorings from the anchorage of earth, and float out to that great ocean of eternity, the boom of whose waves are heard in the farthest inland spaces of our being.

There is a Law of Labor. Let no man neglect it, or ask for pity because he has to work, and work hard. But it is a Law with a Limit. Let no man habitually pass it, or compel others to pass it. "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor;" yes, but he goes forth "UNTIL the evening," and then he should return to his home, or devote his hours to his mind and his soul.

I have no time to do more than hint at what might have been a very long division, viz.:—

III.—THE EVILS THAT RESULT FROM EXCESSIVE LABOUR.

I could say much upon the *physical* evils that ensue The stunted stature; the undeveloped and impaired constitution; the exhausted, because overtaxed, frame; the premature feebleness that comes before age—for Nature is rigorous in her exactions, and demands the uttermost farthing. Youth may draw bills on the strength of the future, but age, and oft times middle age, must pay them. Nature suffers no dishonour.

I might have dwelt upon the *mental* harms that follow. The forgetfulness of what once was learnt: the fading out of facts and principles from the memory; the blunting of the keenness, the crippling of the nimbleness of the intellect; the gradual lessening and narrowing alike of the capacities and aspirations of the mind, until little is known beyond prices current, and ignorance covers it like green weeds cover a stagnant pool, shutting out even the reflection of light and beauty,

I might have enlarged upon the irremediable and eternal ruin that results to the *soul*. It is chained to earth like a captive eagle, and though it would fain soar up into the sunlight, it ceases at last to chafe itself with a vain endeavour. Its energies are bent to the producing and laying up of treasures on earth. Every freshening thought of a Father's and Redeemer's love is expelled—until plodding a weary round of unprofitable and unennobling work, the soul's highest creed comes to be: "Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die—"

*'For men must work and women must weep,
And the sooner it's over the sooner to sleep;
And good-bye to the bar and its moaning.'* "

And the end of such a godless life is a godless eternity of unending and unintermitted misery.

I have but touched on these things in passing. I trust that I have said enough to make all who hear me feel that the subject has a solemn as well as a practical side to it.

Now I must hasten on, for I have kept you long, to point out

IV.—OUR INDIVIDUAL DUTY IN RELATION TO THIS SUBJECT.

1. I begin with *Employers of Labour*. Their duty is to rest, and give rest; to live and let live. "Masters are to give to their servants that which is just and equal, knowing they also have a Master in heaven." They are to apply the golden rule. They are to do as they would be done by. They are to do by those in their employ as they wished to be done by when they were employed. For I have known very energetic advocates for early closing when they were assistants grow very short memored about their principles when they became masters, and very loth to yield a single hour of grace. They should remember all the fine and bitter—and true things too—they once said. They should remember how hard the bondage was to them, and mete out the measure they

wished to be meted out to them. Employers too are not to shut up their shops, and keep their employees—a practice very common in the case of milliners, dressmakers and sempstresses—working on far into the night, so that even in Dunedin there are some who can sing with a dolorous voice—

*"Work—work—work
Till the brain begins to swim,
Work—work—work
Till the eyes are heavy and dim!*

* * *

*Work—work—work
From weary chime to chime,
Work—work—work
As prisoners work for crime.*

* * *

*It's oh to be a slave
Along with the barbarous Turk,
Where woman has never a soul to save,
If this be a Christian's work."*

Employers should, further, as far as practicable, pay their wages on Friday instead of on Saturday night. Then there will be some hope of putting an end to that most pernicious of all practices—late shopping on Saturday nights. The very night when because "the Sabbath draws on," toil should be over earliest, is the very one when it is the most prolonged. The result is, that some are so worn out as to be unable to attend the house of God, and others are so jaded as to be unfit to profit by its hallowed exercises. This accounts for empty pews, and nodding hearers. Then, further still, employers should generously give those in their employ time during the day to make their purchases, that they who enjoy the blessings of short hours should not be compelled to inflict long ones upon others.

2. I now pass to the *Employed*. Their duty is to be patient. They are to be subject not only to those who are good and gentle, but also to the froward. It is better to make no mention of force. Anything like a strike invariably places the employed in a false and worse position than the employers. I am well aware the Association on whose behalf I am preaching needs no counsel to orderliness. The members of it have shown they not only know how to plead their cause, but that they know what to do with their time. While, therefore, I urge the general principle of judicious measures, I am far enough from bidding the employed to be content with what has been aptly called "WHITE SLAVERY." On the contrary, I would say to them, "Work, and work hard, till you get your right. Agitate! Agitate! Agitate! Endeavour by every proper means to obtain remedy and redress. The prayers and hearty sympathies of every philanthropist are with you."

3. And now I come to what I may term the *General Public*, to which many of us belong. You and I then are to act as if the downfall of the long hour system wholly depended upon us individually. There must be no shirking of personal responsibility. There is no putting an end to any social abuse unless every member of society rises to the dignity of his position, and individually wages war against it. We are not to mind what others do; we are to do right, and use every effort to induce them to do right also. We are not to find refuge in the flimsy excuse that it is a small matter, or that we are very unimportant units of the great whole. It is quite enough that we *are* units—and what the units do that the whole does. If each individual does his duty, society will do its duty.

In this particular case, I have no hesitation in saying that it is the clear duty of every faithful friend of his kind, *to withdraw his support from every man who refuses to comply with the reasonable request to close at a reasonable hour*; and to give that support to those who think that to do what is right, and fair, and equal, is better than to get pelf. Specially they who themselves know the benefit of early hours—specially they—should be foremost to emancipate those who are still doomed to late hours. I hope no working man who leaves off with the bell, goes himself or permits his wife to go buying at eight and nine o'clock. Then ladies who must have their new bonnets and dresses to wear on Sunday, should give their orders early instead of late in the week; and

so offer no premium to wrong, no bribe to conscience. We must not expect too much from employers, we must not ask them to be too heroic, we must bear our own part in the work.

I venture to recommend that all purchases of every kind should be made BEFORE SIX O'CLOCK. I ask that those who have domestic servants will grant them time to do their shopping *before* that hour. If we, the public, enter into a compact to do no buying *after* that hour, it will be worth no one's while to try and sell. For I desire that not one trade but all trades should share in the benefits of the movement—that even those employed in hotel-bars and chemists' shops should be set free from their interminable work, and in one city in the world at least be permitted to go out in the daylight.

And now I must finish. I have been plain, practical, and pointed, for without particularising I should do no good. I have said but little in the way of appeal to your feeling's. Yet I could find materials for a pathetic appeal. There are the sighs of the weary to echo. There are the wrongs of the dumb to give voice to. There are the rights of the timid to plead for. I could appeal to you on behalf of men, women, children—fathers and mothers, sons and daughters. I could plead for their bodies, their minds, their souls. I fervently pray, though I have not pleaded, you may be persuaded, and nobly, unitedly act.

In conclusion, remember that life itself is but one long day. We are accomplishing it. Evening comes on apace. The night when no man can work draws nigh. Take care—Oh! take care—that none neglect the one thing needful. Life has but one all important work. If that be left undone, all besides is vain and worthless. And this is the work, to believe on Jesus Christ whom God hath sent to save us from our sins, and bring us to that rest which remaineth for the people of God. May it be so when our life's evening comes, when the evening deepens into twilight, and the twilight darkens into night, we may each close our eyes in peace, and then open them where there is no night, and where an eternity of service will bring no weariness.—AMEN.

Science and the Bible: a Lecture

By the

RIGHT REV. CHAS. PERRY, D.D.,

Lord Bishop of Melbourne.

Delivered by Request.

On Monday, September 20. 1869

Melbourne: Samuel Mullen, Publisher, Collins Street.

Mason, First and Co., Steam Printing, Flinders Lane West. Melbourne.

Science and the Bible.

IN accordance with a request made to me by some of my clerical brethren, I am going to address you this evening upon Science and the Bible. Their request has imposed a somewhat arduous task, not only upon me who have had to write, but also upon you, my friends, who will now have to listen to my lecture. For you must not expect to be entertained with anecdotes, or amused with pleasantries, or charmed with eloquence, as some of you have been on former similar occasions in this building. I am not a good story-teller, nor am I a wit or an orator. Indeed, even if I could hope to do so with success, my present business is of too grave a nature to permit me to assume either of these characters. All that I shall aim at will be to communicate to you in clear and homely language, and at the same time as briefly as possible, some results of my reading and reflection, not within the last few weeks only, but during many past years; and that which I ask of you—and your presence here encourages me to ask it with confidence—is, that you will give me your patient attention for the space of at least an hour and a half. Less than this will not suffice for what I have to say.

Before entering upon my subject I would beg you to observe that I have not come forward as the champion of the Bible against Science. In my opinion the Bible has nothing to fear from Science. There is no quarrel between them. Some unwise friends of one and the other have tried to set them at variance, but I believe they are, and always have been and will be, inseparable friends. A man is not to be regarded as a disbeliever in the Bible because he is a votary of Science; nor, on the other hand, is one who upholds the authority of the Bible to be supposed to look on Science with suspicion. While I receive with the most perfect confidence all that God has told me through the Bible, I receive with the same confidence whatever He has enabled me to learn from Science. I have no more doubt of the diurnal and annual motions of the earth, or of the monthly revolution of the moon, or of the leading facts of geology, than I have of the birth, life, and death, the resurrection and ascension, of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I cannot for a moment entertain the idea of Science contradicting the Bible. For what is the Bible? It is a volume of writings inspired of God for "our learning." or instruction. And what is Science!—I use the word throughout this lecture in its widest and most comprehensive meaning. It is the accumulation of all that man has been able to discover by the use of his unassisted reason concerning this visible world, and concerning the events which have occurred and are occurring in it. The

knowledge acquired from one of these sources cannot, therefore, but harmonise with that which is derived from the other. Any disagreement between them is impossible. This harmony however, although it must always subsist, may not be in all cases discernible. Science may appear to contradict the Bible; and during the present century, in which such great progress has been made in all its various branches, it has made us acquainted with a number of facts relating to this earth and its inhabitants, which from their apparent irreconcilability with the Bible, have not only given occasion of triumph to unbelievers, but have shaken the faith of many weak, and greatly perplexed the minds of some established, Christians. Theories, also, directly opposed to the statements which are contained in the Bible narrative, have been propounded by men whose names stand high in the scientific world. My object, then, in this lecture will be to show that these facts and theories afford no real ground for exultation to the adversaries, or alarm to the lovers of the Bible.

In consequence of the wide extent of the field over which I must travel, I have found much difficulty in determining how to arrange what I have to say upon the several branches of my subject in an orderly manner. The method I have chosen as most suitable for my purpose is to state to you four distinct propositions, the truth of which I shall endeavour to establish. These will serve as so many heads, under which I may collect the various facts and arguments that I wish to bring under your consideration. I will now, therefore, proceed to state my first proposition, vis:—

That much of what is called Science is nothing else than arbitrary and unphilosophical hypothesis. The ablest inductive philosophers may put forth theories which are subsequently found to be erroneous. Newton's theory of light—the corpuscular—which was for some time generally accepted, has now been quite superseded by another—the undulatory. In like manner, geologists have been repeatedly compelled, in the progress of their researches, to put aside, or greatly modify, their earlier conclusions. It is, therefore, no discredit to a scientific man to have suggested, upon grounds of reasonable probability, an hypothesis which has ultimately been disproved; but those to which I now refer are not of this kind. They are such as rest upon no reasonable probability whatever. The instances that I shall adduce are the several theories which have been successively proposed, in place of the account given us in the Bible, concerning the origin of all the infinite variety of vegetables and animals that abound on the earth.

Of these, the first in order of time is the atheistic atomic theory, of which the remarkable work of the Epicurean philosopher and poet, Lucretius—a name lately made familiar to the English reading public by our own poet laureate—contains the fullest exposition. His notion was, that all this beautiful and well ordered universe was, to use Matthew Henry's expression, "a chance hit" coming into existence by the accidental agglomeration of an infinite multitude of material particles. This theory—although no one, I suppose, would now accept it—appears to me to be not one whit more absurd than those modern ones contained in the anonymous work entitled, *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*, and in Darwin's book *On the Origin of Species*. I am aware that in speaking thus of these latter works I may be charged with very great presumption, and may be reminded that I am assuming to judge of and condemn the reasoning and conclusions of men of far higher scientific attainments than myself. My reply is, that I readily acknowledge their superiority in their own departments of science; but that superiority does not entitle them to a deferential submission in matters which lie outside of those departments. A man may attain the very first rank as a naturalist, an astronomer, or a geologist, and yet may be entirely destitute of those higher faculties, which are required in an inductive philosopher. Besides, in the investigation of truth we must always use our own independent judgment. Herein the only deference that a great name can claim from us is, that, as to matters with which he is conversant and we are not, we should take his word for what he says; and that as to other matters, on which perhaps we are equally able with him to form a correct opinion, we should not come to a decision different from that at which he has arrived, without bestowing on them careful attention and exercising due deliberation. For myself, I do not possess extensive scientific knowledge; and therefore, in reading the work of such a man as Darwin, I implicitly believe, on his authority, whatever he describes as observed facts of natural history. But I can follow a train of reasoning, and therefore judge for myself of the correctness of any inferences which he may draw from those facts. And that which I can do, every man of ordinary intelligence—every one of you, my friends—can, if he will, do also. Now, what we can judge of for ourselves, we ought not to accept upon the authority of others. I do not therefore feel it necessary to offer any apology for the expression of my opinion concerning these two works. Of the correctness of that opinion you are now to be the judges. If I succeed, as I trust I shall, in convincing you that these two theories deserve to be designated as arbitrary and unphilosophical hypotheses, you will acquit me of presumption; if I fail, I must bear the reproach.

You will observe that my reason for examining the arguments of these two works is, that the theories proposed in them directly contradict the statements of the Bible, both as to the independent creation of all the various kinds of plants and animals which now exist, or have formerly existed on the earth, and also as to the limitation of the generative power of each plant and animal to produce only those which are of the same kind with itself. But in conducting my examination I shall take no notice of any such contradiction. I shall put away

altogether the consideration of the bearing of these theories upon the truth of the Bible, and test them simply by the natural reason. For when our object is, as at present, to ascertain what Science says upon a particular point, we must listen only to its voice. To allege the authority of the Bible, or to take any account of its statements, would be very right on another occasion, but not on this. We have now to do with nothing but the facts which are adduced as premises of the argument, and the conclusions which are deduced from those facts.

To begin then with the earlier of the two works, *The Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*. The author describes himself as "a private person with limited opportunities for study;" but his book shows him to have acquired large scientific knowledge, and to possess great acuteness and literary ability. It is written in an agreeable style; and, except that it altogether ignores the Bible account of the creation, there is nothing in it, so far as I have observed, calculated to offend the religious feelings of a reader. No one can recognise more distinctly than he does the evidence, which the phenomena of the physical world afford to the existence of "a Being (I quote his own words), beyond nature—its author, its God—infinite, inconceivable it may be, and yet one whom these very laws (the laws of the physical world), present to us with attributes shewing that our nature is, in some way, a faint and far-cast shadow of His, while all the gentlest and beautifullest of our emotions lead us to believe that we are as children in His care, as vessels in His hand." The hypothesis which this writer proposes to us for explaining the existence of the present animal and vegetable world is progressive *development by means of natural generation*. He conjectures that God has imparted to plants and animals the power, not only of propagating their own respective species, as we see to be ordinarily the case, but also of producing occasionally, at long intervals, under special circumstances, plants and animals of a higher species than their own. In this manner, according to his idea, during the ages which have passed since the creation of the earth, all the varieties of organic beings which now people it have been produced—one higher species, genus, family, order, and sub-kingdom following after another, until the highest of them all—man—was reached. Here, for the present, the series ends.

Now, what are the facts on which this hypothesis is grounded? I shall take pains to state them fairly.

First of all, there is the universal existence of law in inorganic nature from the beginning of creation. The same law of gravitation which now exists on the earth's surface keeps, and, as he says, produced (but this is only an hypothesis, not an observed fact) the earth itself, and the planets in their forms and in their orbits. This law also governs the most distant stars: and not only so, but it, and every other whereof we have any knowledge, have ruled in the world from the beginning.

Secondly, in the animal life of the globe there has been a regular progression, not only of grades, or sub-kingdoms—as from invertebrate to the lowest vertebrate, fish; then from fish to reptiles, and afterwards to birds and mammalian, and finally to man—but also of orders and genera: the inferior forms, which appear in the lower, being succeeded by superior forms in the higher strata.

Thirdly, in "this revelation of organic history" are to be noted the following particulars:—1. That "the initial genera of all the various orders are always perfect animals, well fitted by creative wisdom (I quote his own words) for the part they had to play in the field of life." 2. That throughout large groups there is observable a fundamental unity of organism, as if all were constructed upon one plan, though in a series of improvements and varieties, each having a strong affinity to others which have preceded or succeeded it in the series—*e.g.*, the form of man represents in many particulars, some very minute and curious, the forms of other mammalian quadrupeds. One instance which he mentions of this unity is that the number of cervical vertebræ is the same in all mammals; the long neck of the giraffe having no more bones in it than the necks, or no-necks, of the elephant and pig. 3. That while this unity of organism is preserved, particular organs, which correspond to each other in different animals, are sometimes put to different uses—in the elephant the snout is extended into an "instrument serving all the usual purposes of an arm and hand." 4. That, further, there are sometimes to be found in what the author calls "the original plan of the animal structure" a double set of organs, one or other of which is selected for development according to the needs of the particular animal. The most remarkable and best known instance of this is found in the twofold arrangement for breathing in air and in water—lungs and gills; but the remarkable circumstance is that at an early stage of the foetal process mammalia have no lungs, but a bronchial apparatus, and that afterwards, as the author says, this goes back, and the lungs are developed from a different portion of the organism. 5. That, lastly—and this is perhaps "the most remarkable circumstance" of all—there exist in many animals what are called rudimentary organs—*i.e.*, organs which are developed to a certain extent, but are wholly useless; *e.g.*, the mamme of a man, and the process of bone which in female marsupial animals supports the pouch, but which in the male is of no use whatever.

Besides these there is another class of facts of a different and very curious nature, concerning the progress of embryonic development; which, as the author lays great stress upon them, I must not pass over. According to his statement, the correctness of which I do not at all doubt, all animal organisms commence with a simple cell, of which it is impossible (*i.e.*, impossible for man in the present, and probably in any future, state of science) to tell to what form it is destined to advance. In this cell a series of changes takes place, whereby the scientific

observer is enabled successively to determine, first, to what sub-kingdom the embryo belongs; then, if it be of the vertebrate, whether it belong to the fish, reptile, bird, or mammal class; next, if it be of the mammal class, what is its particular order, and afterwards what is its family, genus, species, and sex. "Thus," the author remarks, "the embryo of each grade of being (i.e., each animal sub-kingdom) passes through the general conditions of the embryo of the grades beneath it." In this statement, however, he appears to me to affirm more than the facts which he has mentioned strictly warrant. All that they show is, that embryos are at first undistinguishable from one another, and that afterwards, at different stages of their growth, the character of their particular orders, families, and so forth, become successively discernible. I do not, however, object to his speaking of these facts as "tending to establish a parity or identity of plan between the succession of animals on the earth and the stages of embryonic development in those which have last come upon the scene." It is obvious to every thoughtful observer of nature that, amidst their manifold diversity, there is a marvellous mutual resemblance and closeness of connection one with another pervading all the works of God. Such a "parity or identity of plan" is therefore very probable.

But the question before us is, Will these facts support the hypothesis which the author has founded upon them? They are really all that he alleges; and I trust that I have stated them, although necessarily with great brevity, yet with sufficient clearness to enable you to judge whether it is a reasonable suggestion which he grounds upon them, that "*embryonic development shadows forth the principle which was employed, or followed, by the Uncreated in filling the earth with the organic creatures by which it is inhabited!*" When this idea is proposed to us, does it "appear" to quote his own words, "as if the clouds were beginning to give way, and the light of simple unpretending truth about to break in upon the great mystery?" Can you, my friends, with the author "embrace, not as a proved fact, but as a rational interpretation of things as far as Science has revealed them, the idea of *progressive development?*" Can you, with him, "contemplate the simplest and most primitive types of being as under a law, to which that of like production (i.e., the production of animals of a like kind with their parents) is subordinate, giving birth to a type superior to it, this again producing the next higher, and so on to the highest?" Can you, for example, imagine a kangaroo, in a quite natural manner, without an "circumstances of some startling or miraculous kind," bringing forth—it might be a deer, or a horse or some mammal of a species altogether unknown? This is the author's theory of creation. He frankly admits, that "in nature's government there is no observable appearance of such promotion;" but he thinks "that it does not seem, after all, a very immoderate hypothesis." To me it does seem a very immoderate and, as I have said, an altogether arbitrary and unphilosophical hypothesis. Do you agree with him or with, me? or, I would rather ask, do you agree with him or with the Bible, which says that God created "every living creature after his kind?"

Darwin's book *On the Origin of Species* was published some years subsequently to the *Vestiges*. I will now endeavour to state, as clearly as is consistent with extreme brevity, the hypothesis which he propounds, the grounds on which it is based, and some of the most conclusive objections to its acceptance.

The author rejects the idea proposed in the *Vestiges* as an assumption, which does not explain the phenomena; and he proposes in its stead another, which he calls "*natural selection.*" This phrase he uses to designate "the preservation of favourable, and the rejection of injurious variations," which he supposes to have been going on continually throughout all past ages in the visible world. Its operation, according to his conception of it, is described by him as follows:—"It may metaphorically be said that natural selection is daily and hourly scrutinising throughout the world every variation, even the slightest, rejecting that which is bad, preserving and adding up all that is good, silently and insensibly working whenever and wherever opportunity offers at the improvement of each organic being in relation to its organic and inorganic conditions of life." In this manner he imagines "species have been modified during a long course of descent by the preservation, or the natural selection, of many successive slight favourable variations." And not only species in the scientific meaning of the term, but also genera and families and orders; so that all "animals have descended from at most only four or five progenitors, and plants from an equal or lesser number. I shall here omit all notice of plants, for the truth of the hypothesis can be tested as surely and more simply by confining our attention to animals only.

The grounds on which this hypothesis is based are substantially the three following—the order in which I place them is different from that in which they occur in the book, but appears to me the more logical. The first is the struggle for existence, caused by the high rate at which all organic beings tend to increase, in connection with the fact that the greatest amount of life can be supported by the greatest diversification of structure. The second is the variability observable in what are called the varieties of particular species in the animal world; and the power of man, by care in breeding and other means, to produce in domestic animals, such as sheep and cattle, and especially pigeons, changes so great as to form, in appearance at least, new species. The third is the care which nature takes of all organic beings. This last is not expressly mentioned by the author, but is evidently implied throughout his work.

Now, assuming all this—that such a struggle for existence is continually going on upon the earth, that man

has been able to produce such wonderful results, and that nature does take care of all that are under her keeping—it does not prove, it does not even furnish any argument for, such a gradual development of all the various kinds of organic being as is supposed by the hypothesis of natural selection. It may have suggested the idea, but it can do no more. Unless the author can adduce some facts in evidence of its truth, his proposed solution of the problem of creation must be regarded as at least merely conjectural. Has he then adduced any such facts? I have looked carefully through his book, and can find none—none whatever. He certainly relates a large number of very curious and interesting facts concerning the structure, habits, and instincts of different animals; some as illustrating, in his opinion, the action of natural selection, some as showing the advantages of intercrossing, some as exhibiting the manner in which he supposes varieties may have been introduced, and others for various purposes. Also, in relating these he frequently points out how, as he thinks, they elucidate or accord with, or may be explained by, his hypothesis. But after very careful examination I do not hesitate to affirm, that no one of them alone, nor therefore the whole of them together, in any the slightest degree corroborates it. The most plausible is the following, and what weight ought to be attached to it, you will judge for yourselves. There exists, the writer tells us, in individual animals, a tendency to revert to some of the characteristics of their ancient progenitors. Thus several breeds of pigeons (which you will remember are all only varieties, not distinct species) are descended from an ancestral pigeon of a bluish colour, having certain bars and other marks upon it: and when any breed assumes by simple variation a bluish tint, these bars and other marks invariably re-appear, but without any other change of form or character. Now, the horse, the ass, the hermionus, quagga, and zebra are species, not varieties, of the same genus; and, among other characteristics by which they are distinguished from one another, are certain bars and stripes in different parts of the body, which are peculiar to some, and wanting in the other species. But Darwin states, on the authority of certain persons whom he names, that mules and other hybrids have in a number of instances been known to be marked with bars and stripes, not to be found in the species to which their parents belonged. He also mentions that in the north-western part of India there is a breed of horses, the Kattywar, so generally striped, that a horse without stripes is not considered as purely bred. From these facts he draws a conclusion, which he states as follows:—"For myself. I venture confidently to look back thousands and thousands of generations, and I see an animal striped like a zebra, but perhaps otherwise very differently constructed, the common parent of our domestic horse and ass, the hermionus, quagga, and zebra." Am I not justified in saying that a theory, which rests upon no stronger argument than this, is no more than an arbitrary and unphilosophical hypothesis?

But this theory of Darwin is deserving of yet stronger condemnation; for it is not only unsupported by any facts, but it is liable to several obvious and insuperable objections. Some of these the author himself mentions; and he frankly acknowledges, that, although he does not think them fatal to it, he can never to this day reflect, upon them without being staggered. Some of them are indeed sufficient, one would think, to stagger his most unreflecting partisans. I will briefly enumerate the principal.

First, by *natural selection*, the author must mean some faculty naturally inherent in animals, and exercised independently of any external influence, whether of man or any superior being. It is also clearly a faculty, which implies forethought; for it looks forward to the future well-being of the animal, or community of animals, on whose behalf it is supposed to be exercised. But, with the exception of man, no animal appears to be endowed with any forethought beyond that which is required for providing food and other necessaries for itself and family. We have no example in any of such looking forward to futurity. This appears to me a fatal objection *in [unclear: timine]* to the hypothesis of natural selection.

But passing by this, and not stopping to inquire how far the aggregate amount of animal life has been increased by the production of carnivorous or insectivorous animals—the swallow, for example, which devours I know not how many thousand insects in a day—or to ask whether it was for the benefit of the antelope, that its flesh was made such tender and tasty food for the lion or tiger—not stopping to waste your time with such trifling questions as these, I proceed to the consideration of those difficulties and objections to which he has himself alluded. Among them are the following:—the difficulty of conceiving how the peculiar structure and habits of each particular animal (*e.g.*, the bat), and how the most perfect and wonderful organs (as, for instance, the eye) could be formed by any such gradual modification; the difficulty of accounting for the acquisition and modification of the peculiar instincts of different animals, as the hivebee; and the difficulty of explaining how the various races of animals became distributed over the earth. These are certainly such as *prima facie* render the hypothesis of gradual development of species by natural selection extremely improbable; but still they are not such as might not be overcome by a sufficient number of well-authenticated facts. Does, then, the author attempt so to overcome them? No; all that he tries to prove is that, while they render this hypothesis extremely improbable, they do not prove it to be impossible. Thus he argues, that remembering the great variety of animals existing upon the earth, and the dissimilarity of habits among those of closely allied species (*e.g.*, the upland and the common goose), we should be cautious in concluding that the most different; structures and habits of life could not graduate into each other. Again, he alleges that if we know of a long series of gradations

in complexity, each good for its possessor, then under changing conditions of life there is no logical impossibility in the acquirement of any conceivable degree of perfection (of any organ) through natural selection. He does not, however mention any instance of such a series of gradations existing in the animal world. His manner of dealing with the difficulty of accounting for the present geographical distribution of the various kinds of animals over the earth on the hypothesis of all having descended, through modification by natural selection, is very characteristic. As is his custom, he frankly acknowledges the difficulty to be "grave enough." "Nevertheless," he says, "the simplicity of the view that each species was first produced within a single region captivates the mind;" and then he adds, "He who rejects it, rejects the *vera causa* of ordinary generation with subsequent migration, and calls in the agency of a miracle."

But, besides these difficulties, there are two other acknowledged facts, each of which would alone disprove his hypothesis. The one is the absence of all transitional forms, either among living or fossil animals; the other is the very general if not universal sterility of hybrids produced by crossing between species of the same genus, and the absolute impossibility of crossing between different genera. These facts constitute objections, which no evidence, if any existed, for the probability of the hypothesis, however strong, could overcome. They are absolutely insuperable. For, if this natural selection had been going on in the world during the long succession of past ages, the earth would now necessarily be filled with a multitude of transitional forms. If the hive-bee the comb of which is such an exquisite structure, had been developed by natural selection from the humble bee, which uses its old cocoons for holding its honey, there must have been between these two kinds, besides the Mexican [*unclear: mettijpona*], which alone Darwin mentions, an innumerable series of intermediate bees, But none such are known to exist. Again, if all the various kinds of animals have been gradually developed by natural selection, what reason can be assigned for that sterility of hybrids, by which nature now seems peremptorily to forbid the formation of any new species, and for that impossibility of crossing between animals of different orders, which yet more strongly shows their distinctive peculiarities of structure to have been originally inherent and indelible? The answers which the author attempts to give to these objections are really undeserving of notice.

Your patience has, I fear, been severely tried by this long discussion, but I could not abridge it. The hypothesis against which I have been contending holds so important a place in the pseudo-science of the modern sceptical school, that I have felt obliged to scrutinise it, and the book in which it is propounded, very carefully, for the purpose of showing you that it is altogether unworthy of the favour which has been accorded to it. To what that favour with the public generally, and with some men of high scientific character in particular, is to be attributed, cannot easily be explained. I can only ascribe it to one or other of two causes, or to a combination of them both. The one is, that the multitude of curious and interesting facts of natural history, with which the book abounds, draws off the reader's attention from its argument, and at the same time disposes him to take for granted whatever a writer, who appears to have such a perfect acquaintance with his subject, chooses to assert. The other is, that there exists a *credulity of scepticism* which makes men who are disposed to reject the authority of the Bible blind to the fallacies of any argument, and ready to accept any theory which may help to confirm them in their unbelief. They have not received *the love of the truth*; and, therefore, according to the prophetic saying of St. Paul, *God sends them strong delusion that they should believe a lie*. I would ask those who possess Darwin's book to compare the description of his idea of creation, in its last two paragraphs, with the 104th psalm, and the 38th, 39th, 40th, and 41st chapters of the book of Job, and then say whether his theory or that of the Bible most commends itself to the natural reason.

Protoplasm.—Another work, entitled *Protoplasm, the Physical Basis of Life*, by Professor Huxley—as it has lately excited much attention, and, in fact, suggested the request that I would deliver this lecture—must not be passed unnoticed by me; but I shall not occupy much time by my remarks upon it, for the aim of its author is not so much to controvert the Bible, as to root out those instinctive convictions of human nature, which are the foundation of all religious belief. I will state to you the result of a careful analysis of his pamphlet. He professes "to demonstrate that a threefold unity, namely, a unity of power or faculty, a unity of form, and a unity of substantial composition," pervades "the whole living world." This unity is produced by "protoplasm," "a single physical basis of life, underlying all the diversities of vital existence." what this protoplasm is he illustrates by two particular instances, the hair of a nettle and a drop of human blood, which he takes occasion to introduce. I will quote his words:—"The whole hair (of a nettle) consists of a very delicate outer case of wood, closely applied to the inner surface of which is a layer of semi-fluid matter, full of innumerable granules of extreme minuteness. This semi-fluid lining is protoplasm," and "when viewed with a sufficiently high magnifying power, is seen to be in a condition of unceasing activity." Again, in a drop of blood, similarly viewed, are seen a "number of colourless corpuscles," which likewise "exhibit a marvellous activity. These, also, are a mass of protoplasm." In another passage he states, that "all the forms of protoplasm which have yet been examined contain the four elements, carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, in very complex union."

Now, these may be observed facts; and as they are perfectly consistent with the statements of the Bible, that

"God made man (and doubtless all plants and other animals) out of the dust of the ground," and that "the blood is the life," I am not concerned about them. But how does he demonstrate the threefold unity that he speaks of? Leaving out all extraneous matter, his argument is simply this:—As to the unity of power and faculty; "all the multifarious and complicated activities of men are comprehensible," he tells us, "under three categories. Either they are immediately directed towards the maintenance and development of the body, or they effect transitory changes in the relative position of parts of the body, or they tend to the continuance of the species." "But the scheme, which is large enough to embrace the activities of the highest form of life, covers all those of the lower creatures. The lowest plant or animalcule feeds, grows, and reproduces its kind." Therefore (here follows the Q. E. D. of the geometrician), "the acts of all living things are fundamentally one;" and, to use his own illustration, there is "a community of faculty" between "the bright-coloured lichen" on the rock "and the painter to whom it is instinct with beauty, or the botanist whom it feeds with knowledge." Again, as to form; "beast and fowl, reptile and fish, moluse, worm, and polypa," together with plants of every kind, "are all," as he informs us, "composed of structural units of the same character, vis., masses of protoplasm," either with or without "a nucleus." Hence he concludes that there is between all living things, "between the animalcule and the whale," and "between the fungus and the great pine of California," "a community of form or structure." Lastly, as to substantial composition; his proof of this consists simply in the statement already quoted, that all forms of protoplasm contain the same four elements, and further that "they behave similarly to several re-agents," Hence, according to his conception, there is, as to their substance or material composition, no difference between "the flower which a girl wears in her hair, and the blood which courses through her youthful veins." Such is his mode of demonstrating this threefold unity. Does it not remind you of the reasons by which a horse-chestnut can be most conclusively proved to be a chestnut horse?

But it may be asked—what has all this to do with the Bible, or with our religious belief? Nothing whatever. But the author, whose object evidently is not to teach science, but to propagate infidelity, grounds upon it the inference, that all vegetable and animal life, including therein what we usually call spiritual life, is "the product of a certain disposition of material molecules," and that "matter and law have swallowed up spirit and spontaneity." At the same time he assures us that he is "no materialist;" for that, in fact, he does not believe in the real existence of either matter or spirit. Nevertheless—so inconsistent are writers of this kind with themselves—he does not hesitate to use such phrases as "I do not think he has any right to call me a sceptic," "I conceive that I am simply honest and truthful." What does it signify that a man calls him a sceptic, or what is to be honest and truthful, if "spirit, gesture, and every form of human action, are," as he tells us, "resolvable into muscular contraction, and muscular contraction is but a transitory change in the relative positions of the parts of a muscle?" Again, he says that "our volition counts for something as a condition of the course of events." But what is volition if law have devoured spontaneity? I will only remark further that, although I could not undertake to prove the existence of matter and spirit, there is certainly nothing in his pamphlet to shake my belief in the Bible statement, that not only did God form "man of the dust of the ground," but He also "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and" so "man became a living soul."

I now gladly turn from this painful branch of my subject. If I have spoken of these three works with severity, it has been because the object of the writers obviously is to produce in their readers a disbelief of the Bible; and, therefore, it appears to be a plain duty for the lovers of the Bible to point out that herein—observe, I only speak of them in reference to this particular matter—herein they have shown themselves, to use the language of the apostle Paul, "fools."

The next proposition which I have to submit to you is this:—

Science although it sometimes has, for a while, appeared to contradict the statements, and, in many instances, has necessitated modifications of the received text and interpretations, yet has always borne not only negative, but, upon every question which has been thoroughly investigated, positive testimony to the truth of the Bible. You will bear in mind that, although the Bible is a volume of writings inspired of God, yet the copyists by whom these writings have been transmitted to us, and the translators who rendered them into our language, were liable to err equally with the copyists and translators of other ancient books. We have, therefore, no reason to be surprised or troubled if Science have shown, as undoubtedly it has, both that the Hebrew and Greek text from which our English version was made is, in many places, corrupt, and also that in that version many words and sentences have been incorrectly rendered. On the contrary, it is a strong confirmation of our faith that not only do not the errors, although numerous, seriously affect any point of faith or duty, but the correction of them has frequently furnished an answer to some previous objection. You will also remember that, although the diligent and humble student of the Bible may confidently expect, in answer to prayer, that the Holy Spirit will teach him and guide him into all truth, yet he cannot so depend upon divine inspiration as to be able to say that his interpretation of every particular passage is certainly correct; and this liability to error, which attaches to every Christian individually, attaches also to the whole Church collectively.

We cannot wonder, therefore, that Science, as it has detected spurious readings and false renderings, so

likewise should have shown some generally received interpretations to be incorrect. At the same time we can readily understand how, when these various errors were first exposed, an outcry arose that the truth of the Bible was at stake; and that if Science were permitted to teach such things, man's belief in the sacred volume would be gradually undermined and destroyed. But it has not been so. We now have no difficulty in believing that the earth is a globe suspended in space, and that it rotates daily about its axis, and revolves annually round the sun. The language of the Bible, which seems to represent it as a vast-stationary plain, and to ascribe day and night to the motion of the sun, we now readily interpret with reference to things as they appear to us, not as they are in reality. Such language is not inaccurate, any more than it would have been for one of us, when leaving England for Australia, to speak of the shores of our native land rapidly receding from our view. In the same manner we are now quite content, I suppose, to give up 1 John v. 7, although some of our fathers of the last generation contended most earnestly for retaining so distinct an affirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity. I, therefore, have no difficulty in admitting, not only that Science sometimes has for a while appeared to contradict the statements, but that in many instances it has also necessitated modifications both of the received text and interpretation of the Bible.

I now proceed to consider the testimony of Science to the truth of the Bible. This testimony is both *negative* and *positive*. The *negative* has been usually overlooked; but it is very remarkable, and to my mind in itself quite conclusive. Reflect for a moment of what a variety of writings the Bible consists. In the Old Testament we have a collection of distinct books of the most diversified kind—historical, didactic, devotional, prophetic, in prose and in poetry—written at intervals extending over a period of about 1100 years, by men of the most various characters and in the most different circumstances. In the New Testament, also we have another collection of a very various, although not so various, description. Yet, if we except the first eleven chapters of Genesis, there is no one portion of the whole volume, in which it can even plausibly be alleged that Science has found a flaw. There are many things difficult to be explained in the Bible. There are discrepancies, real or apparent, between the books of Kings and Chronicles, between the narratives of the several Evangelists, between the historical references of the martyr Stephen and the apostle Paul. But all these difficulties and discrepancies lie upon the surface. They have not been brought to light by scientific research. Any reader of ordinary intelligence may perceive them. Science, so far from adding to, has, by the explanations which it has suggested, greatly diminished both their number and their force. In not a few instances where Science seemed to have detected an error, Science has itself confirmed the accuracy of the Bible. Some of these I shall mention presently. What I now want to impress on your minds is, that neither the science of history nor that of language, neither the investigation of the archaeologist nor that of the geographical explorer, neither natural history nor natural philosophy, has convicted one of the sacred writers of any actual mistake. In the Bible there is found no such fabulous animal as the phoenix, referred to in the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, no such absurd reasoning as that of Plato for the immortality of the soul, no such contrariety with any trustworthy historian as Xenophon's *Cyropedia* exhibits to the narrative of Herodotus. It is quite that the Bible was not written to teach us general history, or geology, or natural history, or natural philosophy; but statements relating to these several branches of science incidentally occur in it, and what I now assert is, that Science has not shown any of them to be false. Taking into consideration the character of the Bible, this negative fact is alone conclusive testimony to its truth; and I might add, not only to its truth but its inspiration also.

But, further, Science has, upon every question which has been thoroughly investigated, borne *positive* testimony to the truth of the Bible. The time at my disposal does not permit me to adduce proofs of this assertion from the discoveries of Layard in the ruins of Nineveh, the large additional knowledge we have recently acquired of Egyptian history, and the inscriptions upon the rocks of the Sinaitic desert; but I will notice one or two particulars which can be briefly told, as showing in a remarkable manner how Science has removed difficulties which itself had suggested. You remember that a king of Babylon is related to have sent messengers to Jerusalem to congratulate King Hezekiah upon his recovery from his sickness, and his success against, the Assyrians. But, during a long period of before and after the reign of Hezekiah, Babylon was under the government of the kings of Assyria. Here, then, seemed to be an historical mistake. But the more exact knowledge recently acquired has shown, that, precisely at the time when the Bible mentions this king, Babylon had revolted from Assyria, and Baladan had established in it an independent monarchy, which, however, was overthrown a few years afterwards by the Assyrians. I will take another instance from the New Testament history. Sergius Paulus, the ruler of Paphos when Paul and Barnabas visited the island, is described as the deputy, i.e., the proconsul, of the country. This was the title of the governors of those Roman provinces which were under the Senate, and was never given to the rulers of provinces which were under the direct government of the Emperor. The rulers of these latter were called proprætors, or legati. Now, Paphos was originally an imperial province, and so it was thought that the title of proconsul was incorrect. But it has since been pointed out that a Roman historian relates the Emperor Augustus to have exchanged this with the Senate for another province; and hence the title is proved to be correct.

The following instances are of another kind:—The ancient idea that the earth was enclosed by a solid concave canopy, in which the stars were fixed, has been shown by science to be erroneous, and, therefore, the word "firmament" used in Gen. i., which expresses that idea, is clearly wrong. But while the science of natural philosophy condemns our English Bible, the science of language clears the original Hebrew of all responsibility for the error; the word used in it meaning, not a "firmament," but an "expanse." Again, natural history has taught us that whales do not belong to the class of animals related in Gen. i. to have been created on the fifth day, but to the order of mammals which were created on the sixth day. Here appears an incongruity; but again the science of language helps us, by pointing out that the word rendered "whales" properly signifies "monsters," and aptly describes those saurians which occupy so prominent a place in that geological epoch.

Two other proofs of the confirmation of the truth of the Bible by Science I will mention. One, which I have never seen noticed, and which, therefore, may perhaps not strike others as it, strikes me, is afforded by the discovery of Galileo, to which I have already alluded—the rotatory motion of the earth, by which the alternations of day and night, and the rising and setting of the sun and moon, are produced. Through this rotation of the earth the apparent motions of the sun and moon are so connected with each other, that, if the one was stayed in its course, the other would be stopped likewise; whereas, if the earth were stationary and each of them revolved round it, their motions would be independent of each other, and there would be no reason why, if one were stopped, the other should not go on its course as before. Now, we have an account in the Bible of the sun being miraculously stopped, and we are expressly told that the moon, in accordance with the true theory of the earth's motion, was stopped also: "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, moon, in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies."

The other, and the last that I shall refer to, is the most remarkable of all; inasmuch as it distinctly demonstrates not only the truth, but the inspiration of Genesis i. It is the correspondence of the geological with the Bible record of the creation. Bear in mind that Moses, or whoever wrote that chapter, must have been wholly ignorant of geology, for there is not a trace of the existence of this science among mankind in the early ages of the world. Bear in mind also, that he could have obtained no information concerning the creation of the world from any human source. Upon this subject neither he nor any other man could have known anything, except by revelation from God. His account, therefore, must have been either inspired of God, or else a pure fiction of the imagination. Now, that it was not the latter is irrefragably proved from the confirmation of its statements by geology. Suppose any one thoroughly acquainted with geology to be required to give a summary history of this earth, the succession of plants and animals upon it, and the laws which have regulated their production. Could he do it in the same space—with the same accuracy? I will venture to affirm that he could not. Let us just call to mind the several steps in the work of creation as they are related in Genesis, and observe how graphically they describe a series of events, each of which is verified by the discoveries of geology.

The Bible history commences by telling us that "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth;" and it proceeds to represent the earth as entirely destitute of all vegetable and animal life, and Immersed in darkness. This description exactly agrees with the conclusions of geology; the darkness, doubtless, being occasioned by the thick vapours, through which the sun's rays could not penetrate. The creation of light upon the earth, which we can conceive to have been produced by the thinning of those vapours, is afterwards related; but, in the mention made of the Spirit of God brooding upon the face of the waters, there is an intimation of animal life having been previously produced in them; and this is quite consistent with the geological record. Next comes the creation of the expanse, the space occupied by the air, when the larger portion of the surrounding vapour was gathered into clouds, forming the waters above the expanse, which were thus divided from the waters under the expanse. The latter still continued to cover the earth. But the Bible story tells us that the next step in the progress of creation was the gathering together of those waters, and the consequent appearance of the dry land. This would be the natural result of the upheaval of all the great chains of mountains, which geology tells us occurred at that particular epoch. Here, again, the two records agree. Upon the earth being thus prepared, we read that the dry land was immediately covered with vegetation: and this fact, too, is attested by geology. And now we come to a very remarkable part of the Bible story: the making of the two great lights, or rather luminaries, for the earth—the sun and the moon. At first we are perplexed at this statement; for we cannot doubt that the sun and moon were created with the earth at the beginning, but this perplexity is removed by the explanation, that then these luminaries first became visible—shone clearly forth upon the earth. And it is very remarkable that the effect of sunshine is, at that epoch, first distinctly indicated by geology. The manner in which it is indicated is exceedingly curious. During a long series of ages the plants (I use the word as including all manner of trees), with which the earth was thickly covered, were all of a character that required for their growth heat, moisture, and shade; and hence we may infer that the earth was then still overhung with thick fogs, which the rays of the sun were unable to penetrate. But at the end of that period, as their fossil remains show, there began to appear forests of trees, the hardness of whose wood, and their season rings,

proved that the earth was then in sunshine. On the fifth day, as it is called, our Bible record relates the creation of all manner of aquatic reptiles and birds, and this likewise agrees with the geological history. For it was at this epoch that, as it tells us, all the great saurians abounded upon the earth, and that birds first began to fly in the heaven. Hitherto, according to both records, no mammals, *i.e.*, no animals of the highest class of being, existed upon the earth; but now in this sixth and last era the Bible describes their introduction, and geology also bears its testimony to the fact. Nor is our comparative review yet complete. There is still one point more to be noticed. Whatever disputes exist among them about the antiquity of man, all geologists are agreed that he was the last created animal upon the earth. Thus they confirm the Bible narrative in this also, that, when all else was finished, and God saw that it was good, He said, "Let us make man."

Thus the brief record in Genesis is confirmed in every point by the results of geological science. That record may suggest many questions as to details which we are unable to answer; but this inability does not in the least impair the force of my present argument. What I affirm is, that such a perfect correspondence between Science and Genesis *i.*, in so many particulars, upon a subject on which nothing could have been known except by divine revelation, can be explained only by the truth, and therefore the divine inspiration, of this portion of the Bible. I can only just remind you of the controversy upon this subject, and the doubt and perplexity occasioned by it, even up to a few years ago. Even now many hesitate to accept the interpretation which geology seems to me to render necessary, and to which I see no reasonable objection, that the days in the Bible record do not mean periods of 24 hours, but long eras of time. I must also content myself with simply mentioning that geology affords no countenance whatever for the hypotheses of Darwin and the *Vestiges of Creation*, but, on the contrary, confirms the statement of the Bible that God created every plant and every animal after its kind. The following out of this argument has compelled me to draw very largely upon your patience; but I trust, my friends, that I have succeeded in proving to your satisfaction the truth of my proposition—that Science, although it sometimes has for a time appeared to contradict the statements, and in many instances has necessitated modifications of the received text and interpretation, yet has always borne not only negative, but, upon every question which has been thoroughly investigated, positive testimony to the truth of the Bible.

The third proposition, which I shall now endeavour to establish, is this:—

There is no reasonable cause for us to doubt that all recent scientific discoveries, and the speculations to which they have led, will likewise issue in the confirmation of truth and inspiration of the Bible. The discoveries and speculations to which I particularly allude, are those relating to the antiquity and original condition of man, which have lately excited so much attention. A few weeks ago my friend Dr. Bromby delivered a very interesting lecture upon them in this building. The hypothesis, by which he would reconcile the facts of science with the Bible story, is not in my opinion admissible; and there were some expressions used by him in his lecture which I greatly regret, as seeming to indicate a doubt respecting the title of the Bible to our unqualified belief in matters of history, and as likely to be misapprehended by many of his brethren. But while I feel bound to say thus much, I am not going to run a tilt against my friend. I am quite sure that, although he may differ from me in some particulars, he has an equal reverence with me for the Bible as the divinely-furnished treasury of all religious truth, and, with respect to all matters of Christian faith and duty, would be equally earnest with myself in contending for its inspiration of God.

From the great variety of particulars comprehended in it, this branch of my subject is exceedingly difficult to compress within the short space that I am able to allot to it, and I must therefore strictly confine myself to those matters which are essential to my argument. The course which I shall adopt will be, first, to bring together the several classes of facts which Science presents to our consideration for determining the two points that I have mentioned—the antiquity and original condition of man, and to notice some of the inferences which have been drawn from them; and afterwards to examine what the Bible tells us upon the subject. We shall then be able to compare together the respective testimony of these two witnesses, and observe whether the conclusions of Science disagree, and if so, in what particulars and to what extent, with the statements of the Bible.

Several quite distinct classes of facts relating to the early ages of man's existence upon the earth have recently caused scientific men to attribute a very great antiquity to the human race. Of these, the first to be considered is the evidence which history and tradition furnish of the existence at an extremely distant period of highly-civilised nations, and the establishment of powerful empires, such as those of Egypt and China. Little doubt appears to be entertained by persons capable of forming a correct opinion, that the Egyptian kingdom dates from at least 2700 B.C., and that the authentic records of the Chinese empire extend back upwards of 2000, and probably 2300 or 2400 years, before the Christian era.

Next, there is another class of facts, described at some length, and with much graphic power, by Dr. Bromby, in his recent lecture, which are thought to indicate that man was an inhabitant of the earth very long before that time. For my present purpose it is necessary that I should briefly re-state them. In England and France, in certain strata, and among the bones of certain extinct animals, of a kind that geologists had

previously regarded as long anterior to the existence of the human race, have recently been discovered flint and other stone implements, known now by the name of celts, together with tools of bone, and broken pieces of a very rude species of crockery, which clearly show that a race of men in a very low state of civilisation was coeval in that part of the world with those extinct races of animals. Also in the extensive peat-bogs, which are found in various parts of Denmark, have been discovered implements of stone, bronze, and iron, lying in the successive strata of the bogs—the stone being in the lowest, the bronze in the next, and the iron in the most recent strata; and what is especially noticeable, in the lowest strata with the stone implements are found the prostrate trunks of Scotch firs; in the next higher, with the implements of bronze, the trunks of oaks; and in the most recent, with the implements of iron, the trunks of beeches. Hence it is inferred that there was in the country a succession of forests of fir, oak, and beech, with which the successive races of men who used these various materials were respectively contemporary. But neither the fir nor the oak has been for the last 2000 years known to grow, or can now be made to grow, in Denmark; and therefore it is argued that many ages must have elapsed since the existence of these ancient forests, and consequently since those ancient races of men dwelt in or near them. Denmark likewise furnishes other remarkable relics of its primeval inhabitants. The shores of its islands "are dotted" with numerous mounds composed of gnawed bones and shells of fish, such as are not now to be found in that neighbourhood, interspersed with stone implements. From the circumstance that in these old "kitchen heaps," as they have been appropriately called, no remains of any extinct animals, with the exception of the urus, or wild bull, which was alive in the days of Julius Cæsar, are found, and also that the flint knives and hatchets are of a more finished description, it has been inferred that these mounds belong to a later period than the relics in England and France, of which I spoke just now. This is therefore called the second stone period. In Switzerland, again, there exist very curious remains, which are of quite a different character, but which tell a similar story of its ancient inhabitants. A large number of the lakes in that country contain the ruins, if they may be so termed, of villages, which were built on platforms raised upon piles, in water from 5ft. to 15ft. depth. The sites of these villages—*i.e.*, the mud under the platforms on which they were built—afford abundant evidence of the condition and habits of the people who dwelt in them. In some—principally those of the Eastern lakes—no implements, except of stone, horn, and bone, have been found; but yet, in these are indications of an advance in civilisation beyond the people of the stone age in Denmark. In others, which are confined to the Western and Central lakes, bronze weapons and utensils have been dredged up, some of them bearing a close resemblance to those which have been found in Denmark. The inhabitants of all these villages appear to have domesticated the ox, the sheep, the goat, and the dog, and to have cultivated wheat and barley. But in those of the stone age, hunted beasts seem to have been eaten more commonly than the domestic animals, and the reverse in those of the bronze age.

There is yet another class of facts which are adduced in this argument, *viz.*, those which ethnology and the science of language have made us acquainted with. It appears to be now generally acknowledged that, while all the manifold races of mankind blend into one another, they may be classified under three types: the Caucasian, which includes the principal European and many Asiatic nations; the Mongolian, of which the Chinese may be taken as representatives; and the negro. There seems also to be no reason to doubt that these three great divisions of the human family were characterised 3000 or 4000 years ago by the same broad distinctions as at present. This as respects the negro, is actually proved by ancient Egyptian pictures, in which he is clearly portrayed, and it may, I think, be not unreasonably assumed of the Mongolians also. In correspondence with this threefold division of mankind, there is likewise (and this is a very curious coincidence) a threefold division of the various languages of the human family. Science has now grouped these also in three classes; one of which, the Aryan—or, as it is sometimes called, the Iranian or Indo-European—constitutes, in its many modified forms, the language of the Caucasian race, and includes the Sanscrit, the Greek, and the German. Another, the Turanian, is the language of the Chinese, and (strange to say) that, although with some peculiarities, of the American Indians; and the third is the language of the negro race. Each of these families of languages may be regarded as having existed as long as the race of men which uses it.

In this brief summary of the principal facts which modern science has brought to light, relative to the antiquity and original condition of man. I have merely put together results, which I have taken, and which you might any of you have taken, from the common popular works upon the subject. I have not examined, and in many cases I should not be able to judge of, the evidence—historical, archæological, geological, ethnological, and grammatical—from which these results have been deduced; but I accept them, as I accept the phenomena of natural history described by Darwin, upon the authority of the various scientific men who have made these several branches their peculiar study, and whose characters justly entitle their statements to credit. They certainly present to us a problem the solution of which, while it is a matter of no small interest, is one of very great difficulty. I do not pretend to be able to solve it; but I trust to be able to satisfy you that, if it ever be solved, it will be in a manner consistent with the truth of the Bible.

But, before proceeding to compare these facts with the statements of the Bible, it is necessary to notice

some of the inferences which have been drawn from them, and which, although all conjectural, and some in my opinion certainly erroneous, are usually assumed to be as certain as the facts themselves. This is one: from the circumstance that Denmark, and perhaps Switzerland (although this is by no means certain), was occupied successively by races which used stone, bronze, and iron for their tools and weapons, it has been inferred that in the history of mankind a stone has everywhere preceded a bronze, and a bronze preceded an iron age. But this is a quite unauthorised generalisation, and, so far as I know, entirely unsupported by facts. I am not aware of any traces of a stone age in Egypt, or in any of the ancient Eastern empires. No [unclear: celts] or kitchen heaps have been found in those countries, which appear to have been the earliest abodes of man. No argument has been adduced against the hypothesis that, at the very time when the inhabitants of Denmark were forming their kitchen heaps, and those of Switzerland dwelling in their lake villages, the Egyptians and Assyrians had already attained a high state of refinement and skill in the arts. As has been remarked, the stone age has continued here in Australia even to our own day, and lake villages are mentioned by Herodotus to have existed in his time. The fact therefore, of a people rising only implements of stone or bronze does not prove them to have been more ancient than others which had learnt the art of smelting and manufacturing iron.

Again, it has been inferred that those ancient people, who at the first only used stone implements, gradually advanced in their knowledge of the arts—first finishing more highly their tools of stone, then discovering the art of manufacturing bronze, which, as bronze is a compound of two independent metals, would require no small degree of knowledge and skill, and afterwards becoming artificers in iron. But I have found evidence whatever of any such gradual progress. The lake villages of Switzerland were certainly destroyed by a hostile race; and the earlier races in Denmark may have been in like manner exterminated by others more warlike, and more skilled in the arts than themselves.

Of a similar character is a third inference, which, in my opinion, is utterly groundless—viz., that all the most highly civilised nations of the world emerged from the same original state of barbarism, and gradually advanced to their present condition of civilisation. Of this, the facts that I have stated afford no proof whatever. So far as we learn from Science, there never was a period, at which the Egyptian and the Chinese were ignorant of the arts. Nor would such ignorance, if it existed, necessarily imply a state of barbarism. It would not imply any moral or intellectual deficiency. We might as well speak of our great Alfred as a barbarian because he was ignorant of the use of the compass, and the art of printing, and the manufacture of gunpowder; or describe Bacon and Newton as living in a barbarous age because men were then unacquainted with the use of gas, the power of steam, and the electric telegraph, as infer that a race of men were barbarians because they could not manufacture iron or bronze. Science really gives us no date for determining, with certainty, what was the moral and intellectual condition of man, or what knowledge of the arts he possessed, when he first appeared upon the earth. It does not enable us positively to decide whether the savage races who have heretofore existed, or who now exist, have gradually sunk into their present low condition, or whether the civilised nations of the world have gradually risen out of a state of barbarism. For myself, however. I should have no doubt, even if I had only the light of Science to guide me, that the former alternative contained the true explanation of the phenomena. The indications of ancient civilisation in America and other parts of the world, the traces which many existing savage tribes exhibit of having formerly held a higher rank in the human family, the instances which history has recorded of the degeneration of nations—all appear to show that the natural tendency of man is to fall rather than to rise. I have dwelt at some length upon this question, because the view which we take of the condition of primeval man has a direct bearing upon his antiquity. If we assume that man originally was in the condition of the aboriginal Dane, or, to make the nature of the assumption more clear, the aboriginal Australian, we may certainly conclude that it must have taken many thousands of years for him to raise himself to the condition of the ancient Egyptian. I do not believe that he ever could have so raised himself. On the other hand, if we believe that man in his primeval condition was a being of high intellectual power, then there is no difficulty in conceiving that within comparatively a few years—so soon as the race had begun to multiply upon the earth—cities and empires, like those of Egypt and China, were built and established.

The inferences which have been deduced from geological calculations respecting the age of the relics in the caves at Brixham in England and at Abbeville and Amiens in France, and of those in the mounds and peat-bogs of Denmark, and in the lake villages of Switzerland, carry with them more authority. But the calculations from which they are drawn are based upon hypothetical data of a very uncertain nature, so that even they cannot claim to be regarded as certain conclusions which we are bound to accept as Science. At the best they are only probable conjectures.

One other circumstance I wish you particularly to observe, viz., that science, although it traces up the characteristic differences which now exist between the various races of man, and the languages spoken by them, to an unknown antiquity, does not enable us to discover the origin of these differences. In respect to language, Max Muller appears to have traced out with wonderful skill the affinities which exist between them, and the modifications which some of them have experienced in the lapse of years; but so far as I can learn from

secondary information (for I have not been able to find time to read his works), he has not established the possibility, still less has he proved the fact, of all having grown out naturally from a common parent stock. Science, therefore, does not disallow the belief that the diversities both of race and language which now exist all originated at one and the same period, and not according to the order of nature, but by a supernatural agency.

Here let us pause, and before we turn to the Bible, let us review the classes of facts we have to deal with. First, there is the acknowledged existence of the Egyptian and Chinese, and the probable, existence of other empires at a period of not less than, say, 2700 years B.C. Secondly, there are the visible remains of a race of men who lived before many species of animals had become extinct, and when the surface and climate of the earth, at least in the northern parts of Europe, were very different from what they now are; also the remains of one or more uncivilised races, which inhabited Denmark and Switzerland in prehistoric times. Thirdly, there are the differences of races and languages, which can be traced up as far as we have any knowledge of the human family. These are, I think, the only facts which Science has, as yet, established. The length of time since these several races inhabited the countries where their remains have been found, the condition of primeval man, and the origin of existing races and languages, are all matters only of more or less probable conjecture.

And now what does the Bible tell us? It tells us, first of all, that God said, "Let us make Adam" (so it is in the original Hebrew, without the article) "in our image, after our likeness;" and in the following verse, "So God created the Adam" (here the article is prefixed) "in his own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them." In the next chapter of Genesis we have a more particular account of man's creation. "The Lord God formed the Adam of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the Adam became a living soul." I may here notice, in passing, that the Hebrew word for ground is *Adamah*, which, as you will observe, is closely allied with *Adam*. The *Adam* was formed out of the *adamah*. The narrative proceeds to tell of God placing the *Adam* in the garden of Eden, of the provision made for him, and the commandment imposed upon him; and then it relates how God brought all the various animals to him that he should name them, and how he gave them all their distinctive names. But it tells us that there was not found for *Adam* (not the *Adam*) an help meet for him, and therefore God took one of the ribs of the *Adam*, and of it He formed woman. From this account it is evident that *Adam*, or the *Adam*, was, according to the Bible, no savage, but a being of great intelligence, as well as of a perfect moral purity. Afterwards, as is related, by his transgression of the divine commandment he lost his moral purity, and so sin entered into the world, and produced its baneful consequences on all his descendants. Cain, who, as we infer from the Bible narrative, was his first-born son, became a fratricide, the murderer of his brother Abel. Thenceforward the corruption of morals rapidly increased, until the wickedness of the *Adam* became so great upon the earth that God, we are told, destroyed the whole race, with the exception of Noah and his family by a great flood of waters.

This catastrophe, which in reference to our present subject is the second great event related in the Bible, took place, according to the chronology of the Hebrew text, which is retained in our authorised version, in the 1656th year after the creation, We are able to fix this date from the genealogical record in the fifth chapter of Genesis, and a similar genealogical record in the eleventh chapter enables us to calculate the period from the flood to the birth of Abraham. According to our English Bible, this was 352 years; and from other data which the Bible supplies the period from the patriarch's birth to the commencement of the Christian era has been calculated at 1996 years. Thus, by this reckoning it appears that less than 6000 years have elapsed since the creation, and less than 4400 since the deluge. Both these numbers make the origin of man to be of a much more recent date than the facts which I just now stated, in the opinion of scientific men, indicate. Hence, as formerly in respect to the six days' creation of the world, different attempts have been made to bring the Bible narrative into agreement with the received theory of Science. For effecting such an agreement two suggestions have been offered. One is, that in the account of the creation the word *Adam*, which appears to have been often used by the Hebrews of man in general, and is frequently rendered by "man" in our English Bible, denotes, not an individual called by that name, but the human race; and that many years may have elapsed, and many countries of the world may have been peopled, before Cain and Abel were born into it. This is the hypothesis of my friend, Dr. Bromby. The other, which has been proposed by M'Causland, in a work called *Adam and the Adamite*, and by an anonymous writer in a book entitled *Genesis of the Earth and Man*, is of quite an opposite character. It supposes *Adam* and his descendants to have formed only one of the races of mankind—the Caucasian; and that the two other races—the Mongolian and the Negro—existed long previously, but that of them the Bible tells us nothing.

But besides others, which I need not now stop to mention, there is one objection to both these hypotheses, which appears to me quite conclusive, viz., that they are inconsistent with the doctrine of the New Testament Scriptures. For, first, in his epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, St. Paul makes the personal individuality of *Adam*, which he assumes as an acknowledged fact, to be the foundation of his argument concerning our redemption by and resurrection with Christ. If you look at Romans v. and I Corinthians xv., you will see that not only the correctness of the apostle's statement, but the truth of his doctrine, would be invalidated by

supposing that the first Adam by whom sin entered into the world, and death by sin, was not one man in the same sense as was the second Adam, our Lord Jesus Christ, who redeemed us from sin and death, and obtained for us the gift of everlasting life. Again, if there existed upon the earth races of men not descended from Adam, such races would be excluded from redemption by Christ. For only those who die in Adam shall be made alive in Christ; only those who have borne the earthy image of the first man shall bear the heavenly image of the second man. That none are so excluded we have also, blessed be God! experimental proof in the actual turning of men of every race from darkness to lights, and from the power of Satan unto God, by the power of the preached Gospel. I have therefore no hesitation in pronouncing each of these hypotheses to be inadmissible.

Nor does it appear to me that either of them is needed. For the facts of Science which we are now considering do not, furnish any sufficient cause for rejecting the plain statement of the Bible, that all the races of mankind now existing on the earth have descended, not only from one common parent, Adam, but also from a second common parent. Noah. What has Science to allege against this assertion? I have already pointed out that the ages of the aboriginal races, as we usually call them, in England and France, in Denmark and Switzerland, are at present altogether conjectural; and no mere conjecture can reasonably be urged to invalidate the truth of the Bible. There is, however, real historical evidence of the establishment of the kingdom of Egypt and the Chinese empire some hundreds of years before the date which our English Bible assigns to the deluge; and there is also the existence within a short space after that date of the same different races of men and families of languages, as at present, to be accounted. Can we reconcile these facts with the Bible story? Yes, I think we can; not, however, with the chronology of our English Bible. But here is to be noticed one of those providential circumstances which teach us, while we put entire confidence in the Bible as inspired of God, not to pledge the truth of God to the correctness of every particular word or sentence contained in the volume which we call by that name. Our English Bible was translated from certain Hebrew manuscripts, the oldest of which is not older than the fourth century after Christ; but there is a Greek version of the Pentateuch—the Septuagint—which was certainly made from manuscripts of a much earlier date; and there is also the Samaritan Pentateuch, the manuscripts of which are likewise older than the Hebrew. Now in both of these the number of years from the flood to Abraham is sufficiently lengthened to answer the requirements of Egyptian and Chinese history, and it has long been a question in dispute among Biblical scholars whether the Hebrew or the Septuagint numbers are the more correct, You have doubtless observed that in many editions of the Bible the dates, are given systems of chronology—the one being that of Archbishop Usher, which is founded on the Hebrew manuscripts; the other that of Dr. Hales, which is based chiefly on the Septuagint version, if we assume the latter, which we very properly may, to contain the true rendering of the Bible, the historical difficulty altogether vanishes. For when we reflect that Noah and his sons probably possessed all the knowledge of the arts acquired by mankind during the period of 1656 years between the creation of Adam and the deluge, and when we reflect further that during the next thousand years the length of man's life was only gradually shortening from 600 to 200 years, and, therefore, the increase of population must have been very much more rapid than at present, it is perfectly credible that great cities should have been built, and mighty empires founded within a very little while after Noah and his sons went out from the ark. Indeed, the Bible itself tells us as much; for it mentions the kingdom of Nimrod and the cities that he built, and Nimrod was only a great-grandson of Noah, and was probably born within fifty years after the flood.

There remains, however, for us to account for the differences of race and language which existed at so early a period. Science, as we have seen, does not in the least help us to explain their origin. Does the Bible? It does; for the next great event after the flood, which is recorded in the Bible concerning man, bears directly upon the question. In the accounts which the Bible gives of the confusion of tongues, and the simultaneous dispersion of the human race "upon the face of all the earth," we have, as is pointed out in a very able book written towards the close of the last century, and lent to me some time ago by a friend, not only a positive statement of the origin of all the varieties of language, but also another fact on which we may form a very probable explanation of the origin of all the different races of men now existing on the earth. The importance of this portion of the Bible story seems to have unaccountably escaped notice in the present controversy, but it well deserves that we should spend a few minutes upon its consideration,

As to language; The affinities which have been found to connect all the manifold languages of the world with one another, and their consequent arrangement into divisions and sub-divisions, are sometimes regarded as indicating a natural growth, and inconsistent with a sudden supernatural origin. But the affinities between all the manifold kinds of animals, and their classification in orders, families, genera, and species, might in like manner be regarded as inconsistent with their creation in the manner related in the Bible. Such a notion has, in fact, led to the absurd theories of progressive development and natural selection. But there is really nothing in such affinities inconsistent with a divine origin. On the contrary, they are in analogy with all the works of God, in which he has been pleased to combine a wondrous unity with the greatest imaginable diversity, and to connect together by an innumerable number of intermediate links things which appear most strongly contrasted

with each other.

Again, as to the various races of mankind;—The arguments for the unity of the human family, independently of the Bible, appear to be generally admitted as conclusive; but Science can address no evidence of the possibility of the European ever sinking into the Mongolian or Negro, or *vice versa* the Mongolian or Negro ever rising into the European. Such a change I believe could only be effected by a supernatural agency, or, at least, by an agency of whose operation we have now no knowledge; yet it is to be observed that these races, widely different as they are from one another, have nevertheless, like the languages which they speak, their intermediate connecting links. Of many nations or peoples it is difficult to say to which race they properly belong. It is not unreasonable, then, to conjecture that when God changed men's speech, and "scattered them abroad (in what manner we do not know) upon the face of the whole earth," he also changed their bodily construction, so that they became fitted for the different climates in which they were thenceforth to live. The description of the peopling of the earth by the descendants of the sons of Noah, in the 10th chapter of Genesis, seems to favour this conjecture. It gives the result of that confusion of tongues which is related in the following chapter; and the points to which I would direct your attention are the systematic manner in which the dispersion appears to have been effected and its great extent. Thus, of the descendants of Japheth it is said. "By these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands, every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations." Observe the gradations—nations, families, tongues; and the same expressions are used in describing the settlement of the descendants of Ham and Shem—they are distributed in their lands after their families, after their tongues, after their nations.

So far we have been following the Bible history. Let us turn once more to Science. Has it anything more to tell us? Yes; it furnishes very remarkable testimony in confirmation of the fact for which I am now contending, that the whole earth has been peopled by the descendants of Noah, and that every race of man has sprung from some one of his sons. It tells us that a tradition of the deluge, from which Noah and his family alone were saved, has been preserved in every quarter of the globe—from China in the east to America in the far west; that it existed among the civilised Chaldeans and Greeks, among the Syrians and Armenians, among the Persians and Indians, and that it now exists even amongst the savages of the Fiji islands. Of all the great ancient nations, the Egyptian is the only one among whose records there is not found some trace of it. In the tradition current among the Chinese, the resemblance to the Biblical narrative is said to be extraordinarily close. How could such a tradition have originated, except in the fact that their progenitors had actually witnessed that great flood of waters, and been preserved in the almost universal destruction of the human race occasioned by it? You will observe that the tradition does not show the deluge to have extended over the whole earth, which seems to have been disproved by geology. It only shows that the waters overflowed all that portion of the earth which was then inhabited, and that all existing nations have sprung from the remnant of mankind that escaped from them. This traditional evidence in favour of the descent of all mankind from Noah alone appears to me greatly to outweigh the argument to the contrary, which has been drawn from the long periods of time calculated to be necessary for the changes in the earth's surface and destruction of extinct animals in the caves of England and France, for the formation of the kitchen heaps and peat-hogs in Denmark, and for the rise and fall of the series of lake villages in Switzerland. Hereafter Science will probably enable us to determine with more certainty the length of those periods. When it does, I, for one, shall be prepared to accept the result without any fear that my belief in the Bible will be at all shaken by it.

There is one other proposition which I think necessary for the due completion of my task to submit to you. It is this:—

The evidence which we have of the whole Bible being inspired of God and, therefore, substantially true, is so conclusive, that we cannot conceive of any facts discovered by Science, or any theories grounded upon such facts, being able to invalidate it. To adduce in detail the proofs of this would be to try your patience for another hour and a half; but I trust to be able within a very few minutes, by briefly bringing under your review the several kinds of evidence which combine to prove the divine inspiration of the Bible, to show you that I am not making an unphilosophical or irrational assertion.

The evidence to the inspiration of the Bible is manifold, and its weight can only be duly estimated by bearing in mind its cumulative character. First, there are the historical and philological proofs, by which the authenticity and credibility of the several books of the New Testament, regarded simply as human writings, are established. They are of the same kind as those on which we receive the works of Herodotus and Thucydides, Demosthenes and Cicero, Horace and Virgil, and other ancient authors; and I may affirm without fear of contradiction, that they are stronger than can be alleged on behalf of any of the standard classics. Similar proofs, not equally strong, yet conclusive, attest the authenticity and credibility of almost the whole of the Old Testament. As I have remarked, this evidence in itself only proves the various writings to be genuine and trustworthy; but in proving this it really proves also the truth of the miraculous events which they relate; for these are so interwoven with their context that it is impossible to separate the one from the other. We must

receive or reject all together. Hence this external evidence would alone be a sure foundation for our belief in the New Testament Scriptures, and in the chief portion of the Old Testament Scriptures likewise, But besides this, there is the corroborative evidence which the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament mutually bear to each other. For it is to be remembered that, although we rightly regard the Bible as one whole, it consists of two parts, and that one of them contains the sacred books of the Jews, who do not believe in the Lord Jesus as the promised Messiah. The harmony, therefore, which subsists between the Old and New Testament, the express testimony which the writings in the latter bear to the truth and inspiration of the writings in the former, and the fulfilment which is recorded in the one of the types and prophecies contained in the other, all afford strong presumptive proof of the truth and inspiration of both. Then, again, there is internal evidence of many various kinds—*e.g.*, the composition of such a perfect whole out of so many diverse parts; the oneness of mind in so many writers of different ages, characters, and conditions; the numerous undesigned coincidences which have been observed both in the Old and New Testament; the morality which characterises the entire volume, and which, as fully set forth in the New Testament, is not only incomparably superior to that of any of the ancient schools of philosophy, but is in many particulars of quite a distinct character; and (not to mention any more) the unique, and in all the several narratives of Him, perfectly consistent, character of the God-man, Jesus Christ. Lastly, in addition to all these, there is in every true Christian the inward witness whereof the Apostle speaks—"He that believeth hath the witness in himself." This, although it cannot be alleged in argument with an unbeliever, is to him that hath it indisputable.

Now, what I affirm is, that no argument, based upon any discoveries of Science can at all impair the force of such cumulative evidence. Nor is this an unphilosophical or irrational assertion; for evidence of one kind may be so conclusive that no evidence of another kind, however strong, can shake our belief in it. Although we may not be able to rebut the one, we do not the less continue to believe the other. Whoever, then, is fully convinced by such evidence as I have referred to of the truth and inspiration of the Bible, will not be shaken in his belief, and ought not to allow his mind to be disturbed, by any allegations which maybe made in the name of Science to the contrary. If he cannot answer these allegations, he may put away the thought of them, and may quiet himself with the assurance that they are grounded upon some false assumption, or some illogical inference, which will sooner or later be discovered.

But some of you, perhaps, may be disposed to ask whether the inspiration of the Bible, as a whole necessarily implies the correctness of every statement contained in it. I think that it does, but herein, I am aware, all true lovers of the Bible may not agree with me; and, therefore, I would not condemn every one who does not think so as a heretic or unbeliever. It is, however, to be observed, and on this account I attach so much importance to my present proposition, that the object of these writers who are now endeavouring by means of Science to disprove particular statements of the Bible, is not merely to persuade their readers that the Bible cannot safely be relied on in scientific matters, but to undermine the whole edifice of the Christian faith, and to banish from the minds of men in this enlightened age the unphilosophical idea (so they regard it) of a revelation from God. All who read their works must perceive that they disbelieve the New Testament as well as the Old, and that they would, if possible, make all other men unbelievers like themselves.

And now, if I may venture to do so, I will assume the privilege of an old man, and conclude my lecture by giving my younger friends in this assembly some advice, which has been suggested by its preparation.

In the first place, if you would escape having your faith shaken, or your minds disturbed, by unexpected discoveries of Science, and by the use made of such discoveries by sceptical writers, take pains to acquaint yourselves with the evidences, external and internal, for the truth and inspiration of the Bible. For this no great labour is needed. Any popular work upon the evidences of Christianity such as those of Archbishop Whately and Bishop M'Ilvaine, will give you all the information that you require; only you must really apply your minds to the subject, so as to understand and remember what you read, and thus be able to give an intelligent answer to every one who asks you a reason of your belief.

Secondly, if you are desirous of satisfying yourselves as to the relation in which Science stands to the Bible, read some of the excellent books which have recently been written upon this subject by true Christian philosophers, such as *The Bible and Modern Thought*, by Birks; *Modern Scepticism and Modern Science*, and *Science and Scripture*, by Professor Young; and *The Reign of Law and Primeval Man*, by the Duke of Argyle.

Thirdly, if any works such as I have been reviewing this evening, or any of the many pamphlets, now so common, impugning the veracity of the Bible, come in your way, do not read them cursorily; and do not, because of the scientific reputation of any author, assume the truth of his conclusions. Analyse every argument, distinguishing between what is an ascertained fact, and what a mere conjecture, what the record of an observation and what an idea of the imagination, what a crude hypothesis and what an established theory. You will thus be able to determine their real character, and the weight which is to be attached to them.

Fourthly, if any facts of science seem to contradict a statement of the Bible, do not at once assert that they cannot be true; but compare the facts and the statement carefully together, and see whether they do not admit of

being reconciled with one another. If any new reading or interpretation of the text be proposed in order to reconcile them, give it due consideration, and if it appear reasonable, accept; if unreasonable, reject it. If no satisfactory solution of a difficulty can be found, regard it as intended to try your faith, and patiently wait. You may be sure that all questions relating to science will eventually be settled without any discredit to the Bible.

Lastly, and above all, read constantly, day by day, the Bible itself; and not only read the Scriptures, but "mark, learn," and pray that God will, by His Holy Spirit, enable you to "inwardly digest them." Then shall you be armed against all the wiles of the devil, and having heartily embraced, shall continue to "hold fast, the blessed hope of everlasting life" which God has given us in His Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

vignette

Mason, Firth and Co., Printers, Flinders Lane West, Melbourne.

MURIEL'S STORY.

The sweetest recollection of my youth
Is now the saddest, so I lay it by,
Aloof from frequent contact of the day,
And only bring it to this Christmas fire
When twilight's wings of shade, outspreading broad,
Give the pale Even shelter, as she lies,
Heavy with sorrow, on the breast of earth.
The Christmas log is burning clear and red!
Ah—once I clapped my untired hands with glee,
A happy child, to watch the gay sparks fly,
For Yule-tide claimed a welcome from me then!
The buried years are very deep entombed
'Neath snows of winter and dead summer flowers:
I look upon their graves with many tears.
Joy is too niggard of her precious gifts,
It must be thus within the weary world.
How long ago—how dreary long it seems,
This night of all nights, since I toyed with life!
Yon mirror shows a wan white face for mine—
Pale lips compressed in constant, stern resolve
To stifle the faint outcries of the heart
That yearns and yearns, yet makes no patent sign
To touch world-pity, and a few weak friends
With languid consolations for my grief.
These eyes have quite forgotten how to shine,
And were he here he could not call them fair.
Yea, were he here—oh! would they shine again,
As skies are lit with presence of the moon?
But, blind to brightness, they have scanned the ground,
Unchidden for their weeping, through the years.
On such a night as this we said farewell.—
He gave no signet troth of oath, or ring,
But yet he loved me with a deathless truth.
I—Muriel—the chosen,—felt it sure:
Ay, it was good to live with bliss so rare
Rocking me ever in fond Mother-arms!
My love, mine own, you took my lonely days
Into a Paradise to feel the sun
That in the midst of glory set apace.
Yet I was brave in parting; each hope strong
For any future—save the one that came.

"Some laurel leaves for bridal garland culled
I'm fain to bring you when I come once more.
Dear, I have toil before me, and must pause
At words my soul would utter—yet I go
Glad in my faith in you and womanhood."—
Yes! Reginald was earnest when he spoke;
I know my love spake truly, but—O God!—
He calls another by the name of "wife."
Ah, when I heard the news youth drooped and died,
Death-stricken by the fierceness of my woe.
Still, Reginald, I gave you faith with love
And never wronged you in that agony,
And after death, when all the soul-mists fade,
Changing to glories, I may see your face
Beam on me in a holy calm of joy,
And learn why we were severed, left to life.
For I do think the help-meet at your side
Was linked by chain of duty to your lot,
She was your ward, but scanty wealth was hers,
Impulsive, vain, and very beautiful.
Stern rumour said she gave her love to you
Unmasked—unsought, and lost her pride of race
To follow you, the time you went to Rome,
Meeting insult, and scorn upon the way.
You married her, and saved her from the world,
And now the self-same rumour hisses out
In serpent whispers, that her fancy's o'er,
The Lady Maud regrets her luckless step,
And murmurs that she did mistake for love
An idle glamour of romantic youth.
This rumour may be false, I question not
What e'er should be concealed from worldly ken,
And am content to trust you, Reginald.
I know you only great, and grand, and pure,
I love you as the noblest work of God;
Enshrined for me to honour in my soul!
My happiness I owe you, and my tears,
And now I cannot separate the twain
That share my lot between them till I die.
P'shaw, Muriel! you're weak indeed to night
To weep such scalding drops, and cry aloud
As if the dark could bear your voice afar
And draw him towards you for one moment's space.
The wild wind ceases sobbing with a sigh
(A mocking echo of the sigh I breathed.)
Ten long years since our parting passed full slow,
Your broad white forehead then was very smooth—
Ah! Love, you were face-eloquent as truth!
Such wondrous eyes you had—rich chestnut brown,
Soul lit to radiance, that with depth of shade
Sunk into lustrous sadness, or arose
Aflash with splendours when you smiled, or spoke;
And these dark eyes were closed, as jewels rare,
In lids a sculptors' hand were fain to carve.
O Eyes beloved, are ye dreamy now,

Or sadder than I knew ye often-times?
I shall not falter from your gaze again
That told me of high love in perfect speech;
And there hath fallen silence on my life
Because no tender voice says "Muriel,
My Muriel, God made your love for mine."
Not a slight trick of gesture—not a curve
Of brow or mouth but memory doth paint
In vivid colours for my starved sight:
So I must wail above my precious dead
Just this to-night—to morrow brings fresh cares,
And sordid cares they are, for I am poor,
Striving on daily for what price they give
For verses and life-histories I weave.
Jarvis, my trusty servant, and old Joan
From childhood have been with me, so my skill
Must gain us livelihood and comfort's cheer.
Good Joan is sorry that I do not wed,
For wooers found me in these later years
And seek me on, with zeal I merit not,
But I do live on friendless and alone.
I did not love my sister-women much,
Because the nearest to me came not close
The thoughts and pleasures that I valued most.
I was not drawn by tie of flesh and blood
To human kindred, since that none exist
To call me "daughter"—"sister"—any more;
And I have cast all friendship back with pride,
In all my sorrow seeming hard and cold
To kind advances, as the haughty rock
Frowns 'mid the sunlight with a moveless front.
Just punishment tonight—I am alone!
And loneliness is bitter in its gloom.
My cousin Ida, on a Christmas Eve,
Came like an hour of summer hitherwards,
And with her light-pressed kisses made me gay:
My cousin Ida! she was blithely fair,
As a June morning set in golden haze;
She seemed a child to me, though full five years
Had made her rosy-healthful ere my birth.
Hers was a nature born for constant youth,
And, were she living, would be child-like yet,
And borne on waves of Hope beyond a care.
But laughing Ida died, and I must live!
Sooth! what avails the fame I've won—to night!
This heart of mine, doth, mournful, long for peace, And like a fragile bark is rent and wrecked
By the rude breakers of this surging life,
Or as a broken anchor swamped in sand.
The air was gentle when it touched me first;
Men said I had some genius for my dower;
The coin I lavished for a foolish praise,
Dreaming it might surround the Love I loved,
And therefore prove for me a blessed boon.
Then with my puny hands I tried to hurl
Strong thunderbolts upon the ills I saw,

Till unprevailing efforts made me sink
Nerveless and conquered, doomed to meet despair.
I was a weary worker in the hive,
And searched within my heart's-deeps, bleeding fast,
For humbler knowledge of dire every-day.
I *am* a weary worker—but I write
From Nature's open book what there I see,
And timid read from it what God hath scrolled
For poet-guessings and Humanity.
I wonder if my words have wandered hence
To where my well-beloved dwells apart
From out the sacred unity of Home—
And if his lovely wife, the Lady Maud,
Hath paused in ball-attire to scan a page
Unwitting of the anguished soul that spoke.

* * * * *

Ah, here are letters with unbroken seals
Brought in by Jarvis well an hour ago,—
My reverie hath held me in its dark
Too long—and cold the light of life doth wane
With aspirations chilled at one outbreak;
Ambition may not charm me from myself!
Or mould this note, that is so scant of speech
As if the writer's time had missed a step
Up stony Pegasus, and days were few.
Tis business matter—ay, and this the same—
Discourteous slightly, no command of terms
For hiring cheap the brain-machine I own;
The morrow will be soon enough for these.
But what is this?—my senses reel as smote—
The silent paper seems to burn like fire!—
Oh, Reginald! is welcome death a near
That you have found me once again on earth?
My heart is bursting with a sudden pang—
The lamp is whirling in fantastic dance—
Shall I unveil the Past and know its lore?
Nought could he say that I should shrink to read,
My Love's the Prince of Honour in my soul—
The dear familiar characters are blurred
As if unsteady fingers grasped the pen.
Come, Muriel, cast coward fears away,
Not Lady Maud would blame your loyalty,
Tis not that gold can ever change from gold,
And good remaineth good, in steadfast eyes.
Ah, now my courage will be calm for aught
That's here inscribed—nay, I shall swoon—shall fall! The Lady Maud is dead!
A year ago
She slept beneath the mould of Italy—
And he—my love—my love, is England bound
Unchanged (bless God!) to claim me for his wife.
He "will lay clear the mystery of fate
The why and wherefore of our severance"

(I thought to hear the tale from spirit-lips.)
Ay, so he says, but I with fullest trust
Will stay explainings in my perfect faith,
And by the ceaseless love that's mine eterne
I feel the love of God strike warmly down
Unto my human nature dulled with woe,
And aye my soul in gratitude shall kneel.

To morrow you will come, my Reginald—
To morrow—prove reality of bliss,
To morrow—look upon me as of old,
And with caressing murmurs name my name
As music by a happy household sung—
Then will you take me to a palace fair
Where only greatness and nobility
Do move, and where my freely breathing mind
Must doff her flimsy raiment for the robes
That crowned Womanhood doth stately wear.
Love! in this sudden shining of the sun
What heart-flowers may not bloom for endless days!

Ellys Erle.

CHRIST AND HUMAN AFFAIRS.

The writer of the article on the "Christian Hypothesis" in the March number asks whether to inculcate such a precept as "take no thought for the morrow" is not to lead man from the path which the highest reason would dictate? Let those who think it is, read the whole passage (Matt, vi, 19—34), bearing in mind the usual tenour of Christ's teaching, and they will surely perceive that the words in question form part of an expansion of the recommendation to serve God rather than Mammon; and the spirit enjoined is not improvidence or recklessness, but trust in Him: as if the Lord had said "Do not, out of anxiety for the future, sacrifice the service of God for that of Mammon; (as may be done by unrighteous and fraudulent dealing, or by too great preoccupation of thought and affection;) "for if you are mindful of God, He will be mindful of you." In like manner, when the claims of duty weighted the other scale, Christ could bid his disciples let go the present, and fix the thought rather on the future. "He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." "There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or lands, &c., for my sake and the gospel's, but he shall receive a hundredfold now in this time, and in the world to come, eternal life." In all these and kindred precepts the spirit is the same. Put God first, have respect before all things to Him and His claims, obey him now, follow to day what seems the path of right and duty, even when it demands a sacrifice of earthly interests; and then commit yourselves soul and body to His care, letting the future rest with Him. It should be observed that scholars tell us the words "Take no thought" should have been rendered "Be not careful," and Dean Alford in his new translation of the N. T., has so given it in Matt. vi. 25, 31, and 34. St. Paul, (who recognises the duty of parents to lay up for their children, 2 Cor. xii, 14) echoes this when he says "Be careful for nothing, but in everything make your requests known unto God; and St. Peter when he adds, "Casting all your care upon Him, for He careth for you." Such noble carelessness befits the dutiful children of such a Father; and is an element in the peace of those whose mind is stayed on Him.

The above question, however, occurs only as a branch of a larger one: "Might it not have been expected that a member of the God-head, come expressly to teach all social and moral truth, would have elaborated out of his omniscience a more complete system for the regulation of human affairs?" Now the idea let it be remembered, that the Messiah would do this is not overlooked in Scripture; for it was early predicted of Him, that he would exemplify such a system in a model kingdom, over which He was to reign as King, "with judgment and with justice," "judging, and seeking judgment, and lasting righteousness." It is said of this King that he should "reign in righteousness," "with righteousness judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the

meeke," and "execute judgment and justice on the earth," and that "in mercy should his throne be established;" so that it could be said, "the extortioner is at an end, the spoiler ceaseth, the oppressors are consumed out of the land." (See Isaiah ix, 7, xi, 1-5, xvi, 4-5, xxxii, 1-5. Jeremiah xxiii, 5-6.) It is further stated that other nations should be attracted by the sight of this glorious King and kingdom, that their kings should do homage to him, that "he should not fail nor be discouraged till he had set judgment in the earth, and the isles should wait for his law." (Isaiah xi, 10-12, xlii, 1-6, xlix, 1-8, lv, 3-5, lix, 19, lxii, 1-2-11-12; Ezek, xxxvii, 21-28, and that the kingdom which was thus to regenerate the earth was to be characterised by prosperity, peace, and cessation of war, (Is. ii, 2-4, xi, 6-10, xxvi, 1-13 xxxv, Ixv, 17.25., Ezek. xxxiv, 23-31., Zeck. viii, and other passages.) Some of the above passages may have found a partial fulfilment; but let it be particularly observed that the setting up of the *kingdom* is associated in many of them with the Messiah's accession to the *throne of David*; which was as much an earthly throne in some aspects as that of Queen Victoria. Why then, if Jesus was the Messiah, and the Son of David, did he make no effort to take possession of this throne, in accordance with the prophecies, (see also Luke i, 32-33), and the continual expectations of his disciples, founded upon them? We must take his own answer. "He spake a parable unto them, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought the kingdom of God should immediately appear." It spake of a nobleman going into a far country to receive a kingdom and to return; but whose citizens declared, "We will not have this man to reign over us." (Luke xix 11.) It was because Jerusalem assumed this attitude towards the Son of David, that the setting up of the kingdom, as a kingdom, has been long postponed. But it may be said, surely, if he was also the Son of God, he could have summoned armies, or legions of angels, to make her submit. True, and had he surrounded himself with any kind of pomp, and demonstration of royalty or prowess, earthly or heavenly, she would have been only too glad to submit; and so far from hypocritically arraigning him before Pilate, on the false charge that he had rebelled against the throne of Cesar by calling himself "Christ a King," would have enthusiastically rallied about him.

But the kingdom was to be founded on the acceptance before all things of spiritual principles; and it was to test the spirit of the people in relation to these that Christ appeared in poverty and plainness, and commenced his work by enunciating those fundamental principles of righteousness and love, towards God and man, which it was necessary the people must first accept in their hearts, and for their own sake; he therefore avoided dazzling their eyes by any display of majesty; and when he used his supernatural powers, it was not to compel their faith, but generally to confirm that of those who had already shown a willingness to believe in him. Had the *nation*, with its rulers, received his teaching, been penetrated with it, and recognised its Divinity, there is reason to believe that he would not have waited long to make Jerusalem a praise in the earth, reigning over her in righteousness and glory, and holding her up as the model and instructor of other nations; exemplifying his principles embodied in political and social life. But she despised and rejected him; therefore a long interval has been interposed; while another people is being gathered from among all the nations of the earth, in place of those to whom he was first sent, to prepare the world for the full establishment of the Kingdom. When his first disciples,—who had with difficulty learned that the fulfilment of the pathetic 53rd of Isaiah must have its place as well as that of his more joyful prophecies, supplying a strong additional support to the claims of Jesus to the Messiahship,—returned with hope re-animated to the question, "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" he replied "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons,..... but after the Holy Ghost is come upon you, ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Acts i, 6-8. "This gospel of the kingdom "he said before "shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Lu. xxiv, 14.

This witness was to include dissemination of those spiritual fundamental principles with which he began among the Jews, not developed into various forms and adaptations calculated to meet the varying conditions and circumstances of different nations and states to the end of time, but applicable in spirit to all; for the people now to be gathered, Christ's true and spiritual disciples, would constitute no state or states, but form a sprinkling among all states and nations whom they were to prepare by their influence, for the time when He who yet remembers in the heavens that he is "the root and offspring of David," shall come again as "King of kings, and Lord of lords; when Jerusalem shall greet him with a late repentance, (Zech xii, 10-14, Rev. i, 7,) and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, (Rev. xi 15, xix 16, xxii 16.) His first coming was as the "morning star," heralding the dawn; but the second will be as the rising Sun, (Mat. iv. 2) flooding the world with light. Till then, "the kingdom of God," he said, "cometh not with observation, neither shall they say lo here! or lo there! for the kingdom of God is within you," Lu. xvii. 20-21, and St. Paul described the same "kingdom of God" as righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Inward are those principles which in full development would establish the kingdom of God on earth, and which even now influence legislation and social life, in proportion as the true Christian element makes itself felt in any given people.

That this heaven does so work, who can deny? It is true that of numbers who profess Christianity, and of

many even in ecclesiastical office, St. Paul's question might well be asked, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" so little do they evince of his influence;—there are many into whose hearts the seed has never really sunk, and from which it has been caught away ungerminating;—there are those in whose minds it has quickly sprung up, but been as quickly withered by opposition, or choked by earthly cares and interests; but where it has really taken root in honest and good hearts, it bears more or less abundantly its proper fruit; though in the world this is found mixed with innumerable tares. Meanwhile there come here and there within the sound of Christ's message, certain ardent idealistic spirits; who, with hearts sufficiently good and honest to respond to his moral teaching, yet rejecting its supernatural claims and sanctions, seem to imagine that natural religion may suffice to regenerate the world. But perhaps they are not fully aware how much the enlightenment of their own consciences is due to the gospel which has appealed to it. Let them look at the condition of regions where the natural feelings of man have had opportunity for uninterrupted play, as in heathen lands; let them look again at the transformation which takes place in all life and manners in such regions, when the gospel is really received, (as is notably the case just now in Madagascar;) and among our own heathens at home,—not the idealistic, but the low, coarse, and brutal;—and then let them ask what agency has yet proved so powerful for reforming and elevating man as Christianity; and also what community has, in spite of its faults and the lukewarmness of many of its members, been on the whole so compassionate, so enterprising, so laborious, so self-denying, so persevering, and so efficient, in seeking to raise the ignorant and vile, and ministering to the several wants of soul and body, as the Christian Church, carrying in its hands the gospel. We shall see, or posterity will see, when a sufficient number of centuries have been allowed for the experiment, whether the "Social Progress Association," which seems inclined to assume the title of a "New Church," with its Idealist, its Book of Wisdom, and its pamphlets, will accomplish more.

H. L. M.

1.—The particular precept—"take no thought for the morrow," certainly bears the construction that H.L.M. puts upon it; but although Jesus was not so impregnated with the spirit of asceticism as many of his contemporary compeers—(we do not allude to the Pharisees, whom he denounced, but to the Essenes, and John the Baptist,) that particular passage was selected at random when referring to this spirit, prevalent at all periods of untempered religious fervour, and to the lack in Christ's teaching of a resolute confronting of the great problems of social life, and of an exposition of the principles of practical wisdom. Yet this only detracts from his greatness when the omniscience of imaginary Godhead is attributed to him.

2.—The explanation given of the nature of Christ's mission might be an answer to some Jewish Rochefort or the still lower gaping of the populace for the restoration of the kingdom of David. We are not conscious of having expressed the discontentment of disappointed Radicalism; nor even of echoing the aspirations of the prophets—*unfulfilled inspired* prophecies by the way—who sighed for a benign despot, who should "crush the evil-doer." When the writer speaks of what Christ might have done had he not been despised and rejected, it is equivalent to saying that he was mistaken and disappointed in calculations which, it seem, the insight of modern thinkers would have been equal to; and in this case, where the omniscience of [*unclear*: Godhead]? We must then repeat our conviction, that had Jesus elaborated the laws of social equality and government,—we mean in theory, not in action,—his followers might have been preserved from the thousand errors and infamies that disfigured the sixteen centuries after his death; and more especially those latter ten of them when his word was enthroned over Europe. We repeat, also, that he himself did not assert his divinity in any such sense as it has been ascribed to him, and that his teaching remains a shining marvel of right thought, however incomplete it might have been.

The divinity of Christ then is accepted by transcendentalists in a realler sense than by so-called Christians, when they are conscious of oneness with the Universal Spirit, of which Carist was the embodiment in such a pre-eminent degree as to lead to his being received as the Son of God.

3.—Touching the influence that Christianity has exercised upon the world, who can marvel that so glorious a code of morality should have done much, when aided by the attractions and terrors of the supernatural, that are so potent with ignorant and unenlightened minds, that potency being the result of the faith in the supernatural doctrines, independently of their abstract truth. When one contemplates the moral as well as intellectual darkness that was so stationarily universal—as manifested in the Wars, Barbarisms, cruel customs, unjust laws, &c between the 8th and 15th centuries, in spite of the uncontradicted supremacy of the Christian faith,—when one traces the results that followed in organic sequence on the invention of printing, each century being a progression into less gross darkness (though, Heaven knows! it can still be felt) in proportion to the advancement of knowledge, one is inclined to wonder how it was that the omnipotent influence of the Spirit of God, that is so potent on believers, according to the Christian Hypothesis, was unable to modify the savageness of human society without the help of a puny German who, five centuries ago, bethought him to cut wooden letter type from the bark of a tree. If it is assorted that during all these centuries mankind has been discovering the meaning of the precepts it has been uttering from the teeth outwards, shall we not recognise the importance

of the influences that have enabled mankind to solve that meaning? Does it not appear that in acknowledging the power of faith, or of some supernatural influence, we are engaged in a kind of fetish worship, that is akin to the act of the parched African who grovels before the Medicine Man and his devilries, and has no thought that can reach to God's winds and clouds.

We hold that as for bygone ages the Framers of the World-Scheme planned and missioned Apostles, Luthers, and a host of progressive thinkers who stood up for Him and His truth against the unheeding multitude, so this century has made its advances on the God-line of Truth; and that Emerson and Carlyle, the followers of science, and those who are shaping what is highest and most characteristic of this age,—that these, rather than aproned bishops wrangling in Œumenical Council—that these, rather than heaven-appointed beneficed younger sons—are the speakers for God and His truth in this present generation; these the successors of Christ and the olden prophets. As regards the instrumentality of the Social Progress Association, if it help to record and interpret what the age produces, it will be fulfilling its office, however insignificant, in the Divine Cosmos. [ED.]

The Teachings of Carlyle.

By ELEANOR STREDDER, Prize Essayist.

WHEN we gaze upon the beauty of the dying day, and watch the golden glory of the setting sun, what can enhance the charm of the summer twilight like the presence of life? If only the timid hare darts across our path, how, with instinctive interest, the eye pursues it to its shy retreat! Or if a weary gleaner pauses to rest upon the stile, or a ploughman passes by by his homeward road, what artist would hesitate to place their rustic figures in the foreground of the landscape as the one thing wanting to complete the scene? Nor is this less a truth in effect, than in reality. Are we not all aware that the heart responds with a deeper thrill to the presence of the living than to aught beside? Do we not know that if one cry arose from the depths of the passionate human heart beating beneath that rustic garb, the loveliness of the eventide would be at once forgotten, and we should listen absorbed and breathless for the explanation? Put back the veil of social mannerism, and outward appearances for one moment, and sympathy springs to life.

"One touch of nature makes the whole world kin."

Could we see as God seeth, and look upon the heart, how different our estimate of our fellow man.

To slip aside the social mask, to penetrate the external shows, and reveal to us the man is the peculiar gift of Carlyle.

Other biographers tell us when and where such deeds were done, but he dwells chiefly on the how and why, and names with which we have long been familiar become revived in his hands.

The false prophet of Arabia, but known to us through his followers,

"That saintly murderous brood,"

"To carnage and the Koran given,"

"Who think through unbelievers' blood "

"Lies their directest path to heaven,"

stands out on Carlyle's page as one of the Earth's noblest; a man who caught the slanting rays of truth, wafted by idle rumour from far Judea, and called his countrymen from the darkness of idolatry to the worship of the one God. Suffering and persecuted for the truth he would maintain, yet with one faithful heart by his side, believing all his utterances, and clinging to him with a woman's devotion, until amidst strife and confusion the light grew stronger, and the darkness waned.

What then, we would ask, are the results of this deeper insight, what the teachings of this nearer view? That the man is everything, and the outward surroundings, the appearances to the world, the shows of life, nothing. Call the external what you will, the soul's habiliments, a screen, a covering, it is valueless, and of the nature of a lie, if by it we think to form our opinions. Yet by this many continually pass judgment, both upon themselves and others, forgetting that no mendacity, be it in the life, or on the lip, can end in anything but ruin and confusion; nor hypocrisies and lies evoke order from chaos, for is not falsehood in work still more disastrous than falsehood in word?

An eye so blind that it cannot see the truth in the fact; a mind so superficial that it cannot recognise the reality beneath the surface unless it be blessed with a passivity equal to its opacity, must, if it work at all, become a curse where-ever it is found. It will heap up chaff instead of grain; it will gather together wood, hay, and stubble, to build the edifice it designs to withstand the testing fires of time, disregarding the stone that lies

unhewn in the quarry, and passing over the iron, unrecognised in its drossy ore. To use Carlyle's own words, "When the general life element becomes so unspeakably phantasmal as under "Louis the fifteenth, it is difficult for any man to be real; to be other than a "play-actor, more or less eminent, and artistically dressed. Sad enough, surely, "when the truth of your relation to the universe, and the tragically earnest "meaning of your life is quite hid out of you by a world sunk in lies, and you "can with effort attain to nothing but to be a more or less splendid lie along "with it. Your very existence all become a vesture, a hypocrisy and hearsay "nothing left of you but this sad faculty of sowing chaff in the fashionable "manner.

"What is truth, falsity, human kingship, human swindlership? Are the ten "commandments only a figure of speech then? Questions might rise, had long "been rising—but now there was about enough; the RESPONSE to them was "falling due—was preparing.—It is now well-known as French Revolution or "Apotheosis of Sansculottism."

Could the seed sown produce other harvest? Could the firebrand flung among such fuel produce other than a general conflagration? Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he reap, is a law of our being immutable and inevitable as the law of gravitation itself, true for the nation as for the individual, Men stand not solitary in this world;—from all our deeds there is an after growth, a complete heritage for the coming generation.

The noisy babblement of idle tongues that darkens knowledge with multitudinous words tends perpetually to bewilder the common sense of men—

"Good sense which only is the gift of heaven;"

a gift rarely appreciated to the full, outweighing taste and talent, and without which for helmsman the most richly freighted bark is apt to founder. This same good sense, were it simply left to grow unchoked and unencumbered, would prompt everyone of us to trace the relation between cause and effect, and reject the lie, acted and spoken; better still when that heroic something is present in the soul, making it long to comprehend the divine laws and inner harmonies of this universe. In plain words, the sense of difference between right and wrong, which becomes so sadly clouded in the perplexities of life, which, in fact, it is the very business of the spirit of evil to distort, confuse, and destroy; easy work, where minds dwell in such a chaotic state that the very light becomes darkness. It is in this misty twilight of the soul that evil passes for good, and good for evil, a very frequent condition in the present day, with its half beliefs, and never ending discussions; with its various views on all topics, and widespread suspicions that the forms and phrases of our fathers are becoming obsolete. No wonder, when we have hoarded the vesture, and let the spirit go. Where is the love of truth that animated England in the days of Cromwell? Then men said what they meant, and acted as they said, scorning and scouting the shallow and the hollow, which are never absent from life's stage. To mind our own business, that is—to look well that it is grain we give, and take, not husk and chaff, for it is with the substance, and not with the semblance, we have to do, that which is within the man being the grand concern for us and him, not that which is without:—such in brief, is the underlying truth of all Carlyle's teaching; a truth which cannot be ignored and slighted without destruction to national and individual life.

"For the soul is dead that slumbers,
"And things are not what they seem."

The Impoverishing Effects of the Reformation.

"TOO strange not to be true" was the title of a book considerably advertised some time ago; "Credo quia impossibile" was the assertion of Tertullian. Some such sentiment passed through the writer's mind as he plunged lately into the little volume considerably advertised now,—Cobbett's History of the Protestant [he means English or British Protestant] Reformation.

It requires a mind as vigorous as Cobbett's own not to be fatally shocked by the startling overthrow he administers to all our ordinary preconceived opinions. I will not mention the language that he applies to Luther, Zwinglius, Calvin, and Beza; while of Hooper, Latimer, and Ridley, he says they were indeed "inferior villains to Cranmer, but to few other men that ever existed." (Page 145.)

Burning Mary becomes a Saint in his hands; (though I believe much that he says is correct; I believe her to have been sincere, most pious, and perhaps disinterested.—Would bestial Harry, or Virago Bess have restored a million and a half of money to the Church?) and Elizabeth the most unfeeling and unprincipled of mortals. Cobbett asserts himself to be a staunch Protestant (Page 284), and to have had no motive but the truth, and though his book reads singularly like that of the most rabid Papist, I credit his assertion. But Cobbett, a man of narrow sympathies, was a man of most vigorous mind, and as has been pithily observed, when he handles a

subject to his heart, strips it as a dog does a bone. Most certainly his book is very interesting, and extremely bustling and muscular; the subject is vigorously handled, the reader is carried along with unflagging interest, the facts are vividly marshalled, the cases are succinctly put, and the arguments powerfully and tersely stated. Cobbett indeed is perhaps the prince of common sense writers, born of the humblest origin, gifted with a vigorous intellect, relying upon nothing but his own native insight, deriving virtues from his very faults;—concentration from his narrowness, and force from his partiality;—a self-made and self-taught man, a robust thinker and a thinker for himself, he teaches us, however we may distrust him occasionally for his one-sidedness, however we may suspect him, as we suspect most robust thinkers—men, who think in italics—of wrongheadedness, the energy that may be gained from thoroughness, the strength that hobbyism gives, the difficulty even of drawing the distinction between hobbyism, and a point merely pertinaciously and vigorously pursued, and last, not least, the independence that independence can acquire, the diametric stand point which it may occupy from our own, and the healthiness which even the most rationally rooted opinions may derive from collision with such vigorous intelligent discrepancy from themselves.

In the tyrannous limits of space I can confine myself only to one point in Cobbett's book. It is this,—that the "Protestant Reformation" in England and Ireland has impoverished and degraded the main body of the people.

To put it in a nutshell, Cobbett's argument is this,—Before the Reformation, monasteries, priories, nunneries, and friaries, to say nothing of churches and hospitals, spotted the country all over; these religious institutions received large incomes, and spending them among the circle of which they formed the centre, diffused an amount of general comfort which it was ruination to destroy, but which the confiscation under Henry the Eighth did destroy, and which originated the hideous names and facts of paupers and pauperism. Three hundred and fifty-six monasteries, he says, were suppressed, and not less on the average than fifty religious establishments of all sorts per county. A million and a half of money was restored to them by Mary, and this was only a portion, for the bulk of it had gone to what Cobbett calls "bribe" the great, or as he terms them, the plunderers.

Now whatever inaccuracies there may be in detailing Cobbett's work, his main fact is undisputed and indisputable. All the world knows the monasteries *were* plundered, and that their resources were something fabulous; moreover—and here is the rub, the sting, the gall and venom, the morsel that Cobbett could never digest, and died loathing and execrating,—this hoard of El Dorado, suddenly grasped by violence and wrested by murder, went to endow no similar institutions, but a set of lay grandees. Some, it is true, went afterwards to endow the Church of England, but the Church of England had *no obligation* to give away one-third to the *poor* (the *grand feature* in the Catholic system;) and moreover the Church of England was administered by a *married* clergy; a fact which, whatever may be said for it, undoubtedly introduces a train of consequences, as very skilfully shown by Cobbett, not favourable to the poor.

As for the grandees, essentially secular, they spent the money essentially on themselves. Bribed in this Danae shower auriferous, unexpected, they gave themselves over to the most shameless prostitution; for the Devil indeed was never known to misuse a chance offered him.

Once in the hands of the laity, they stuck to it; and, forsooth, soon set about raising the heaven-born (!) cry—the "Eternal Rights of Property;"—a cry that has descended, with all its hollowness, to this hour.

It is the Rights of Men that are alone eternal; the only eternal rights of property are the rights that property ought to have. The rights of six-pence too much are nil. Property *has* its rights (or society were baseless), but its exact rights—the golden mean, the magic line,—have not yet been discovered. Its wrong rights; its right of having too much are

"Gross as a mountain, monstrous, palpable."

Cobbett argues much in favour of Popery, because it was the religion of our forefathers for 900 years;—yes! but it might be retorted 900 years too long; or, if he wants logic and not a repartee—so were witchcraft and all sorts of diablery, the belief of our forefathers for 900 years. Then again he rails at and ridicules the Protestants for being split up into so many sects The same charge has been brought against the Liberal Party.—True! and it is their great badge and glory; the necessary result of their *raison d'etre*. It is seen with a moment's reflection, that the independence, the spirit of *freedom*, that led the party originally to secede necessarily generates infinite difference of opinion. So far from being a reproach to them it is their distinctive glory. In such matters I shall disagree with Cobbett, but in so far as the drift of his book is logically either to the old thing back, or *some form of communion to supplement the deficiency*, I think his argument claims the most serious consideration; and I do unreservedly, on the face of it, consider with him the *absenteeism* to which the suppression of the monasteries gave rise, and the destruction of the *Centres of beneficence*, an evil whose magnitude can hardly be overstated. I hold with him that Poor-Rates in themselves are a hideous institution, that they are distinctly to be traced to the cause he assigns, that Pauperism threatens to engulf the land, and that it was infinitely better to relieve the wants of the people from notions of religion than at the heartless

dictate of law, that our Great Proprietors are attainted before God and man, that they are morally responsible, that Property's Rights are not yet defined, but everywhere largely overrated, and that unless some supplement of the sort be discovered, that shall draw by the silken cords of brotherhood, and fit like a glove and not like a handcuff, we may expect some social Etna, that for aught I know may outhorror the French Revolution.
Alexander Teetgen.

ERNINA LANDON.

A Patched Society. (*Digest:—Continued.*)

IV.

WE will specify more particularly the rationale of the assertion that the system of uncurbed competition is pernicious, and baneful in its effects.

Of the writers whose influence is manifested in the wiser utterances of this age's thought, few of the more noteworthy are more powerfully directing the decided, though hidden tendencies of modern thought than Mr. Herbert Spencer, to whose work allusion has already been made. Although some of his dicta must be guardedly mistrusted, his broad general principles are for the most part lucidly enunciated, and of irresistible truth, with a single remarkable exception. By accomplishing the object which he set before him of indicating a sure and unimpugnable basis for the Science of Morality, and for a trustworthy moral code, he has rendered a signal service to humanity, as likewise by placing so vividly before the eyes of a self-steeped world the divinely-appointed and immutable law that so clearly defines the inalienable, though disregarded, rights of all men. It will be useful therefore to sift the pure ore of this really remarkable work from statements which from their erroneousness or incompleteness must mislead the too confiding reader.

In disposing of the difficulty that arises in the allotment of the earth's surface, resulting from the equal right of all men to the use of the soil, he concludes, justly enough, that the land must be rented by the holders of the soil of Society. When however, shortly afterwards, he is prompted by some incomprehensible freak to run a tilt against the French theory of the "*droit au travail*," or as interpreted by himself "the right to the opportunity of labouring," he feels compelled to ignore the synonymousness of the two expressions, and must needs make a distinction without a difference between the use of the raw material of the earth, which alone confers the possibility of work being performed, and this same opportunity of labouring. And further, although it was a simple matter that Society should let the land to one of its members *i.e.* A.B.C. and D. to A. he finds it an inconceivable absurdity that A.B.C. and D should guarantee his natural right, or the equivalent of this use of the soil to B.—(" *Social Statics*." pages 123, 313.)

In his "Social Statics" he elaborates merely such general principles of social organization, as are applicable to the perfect condition of man, which he admits are *not* applicable to this imperfect and unadapted state. Yet in defining and limiting the proper functions of Government, after proving that all Governments are compromises rendered necessary by Man's unadapted condition, he lays down the unyielding dogma of *laissez faire*,—or that no circumstances can justify the modification of that compromise which must be limited to the administration of justice. Taking, for instance, his dictum respecting Poor Laws—he somewhat triumphantly proves that every million of money collected in rates is directly taken from the pockets of the labouring classes themselves; *i.e.*, from the wage fund of the country, thence concluding, with strange imprudence, that all such efforts stultify themselves. He does not appear to see that the Poor Law is a species of insurance—though of clumsy and undivine contrivance—that Society effects for the benefit of such of its members as misfortune may overtake unawares. Supposing, by way of example, that in any given section of the Country twelve and a half millions form the wage fund, that is to be divided amongst twenty-five thousand labourers, and that half-a-million be levied from this amount as a poor's rate. Now under the competition system it is a matter of certainty, that a very considerable number of labourers will at all times be out of work by the chances of circumstances beyond their own control, and it cannot be asserted that were that half million unlevied it would flow spontaneously as wages precisely to these unemployed. It is, on the contrary, a matter of certainty that such would not be the case, and it is equally certain that until we can achieve the tremendous impossibility of rendering crowds of labourers as mobile as water or air, causing them to move instinctively and instantly, before their stomachs can feel the pangs of hunger, to the distant and unknown locality where work may be waiting for them, some Poor Law scheme must be the concomitant of the competition system. When philosophers allow themselves to float enraptured in blissful confidence in their laws of compensation, and of supply-and-demand that are streaming

their "beneficent currents" whithersoever there may be a void, and that even as the ocean, and air require no "tinkering at human hands," it might prove instructive to such optimists were they to experience the compensative blessedness of the West Indian hurricane, or the regulated largesse of the Simoon, or were they planted in the position of operatives that unforeseen sickness, or slackness of trade, has reduced to the last extremity. They might then discover the fact, that the divine scheme of compensation includes as an element the wise co-operation of rational human beings.

The attitude of the upholders of the "*laissez-faire*" theory is this. They see the great body of the labouring classes, forming the majority of mankind, down-crushed by the ponderous iron-loaded fetters of circumstances into the mire of ignorance and vicious propensities, and to the helpless mortals writhing beneath the intolerable weight they, in the plenitude of their inspiration, cry—"Individuate yourselves as speedily as ye may! Forthwith adapt your constitutions to your condition, and mould your own social surroundings and institutions! Great is Allah. When you have developed the laws of morality out of your own consciousness in the midst of your toil you will be moral. When you have discovered the laws of intellectual development, and learnt to appreciate education, you will educate your children, and want no help from Society, nor from any Government. When you do not work, or get out of employment, you will starve. Whilst you are so ignorant as not to educe by your own power of ratiocination the rationale of cholera, or the conditions of typhoid fever, you will die. Allah is Great. Speedily individuate yourselves. Beware the blundering would-be regenerators, who would help you with teaching or with laws."

Were some communistic form of Society established amongst us in which each individual bore an equal share of life's burdens and labours; and had Nature gifted all men with equal faculties then [*unclear: ceieris*] *paribus*, it might be true that self individuation should be left to be achieved by all men for themselves. But when we see certain individuals supremely gifted with capacity, or by the favour of fortune freed from the cares of providing for physical wants, how can we otherwise conclude than that the appointed work for these is the elaboration of the principles of Social and other sciences, and the imparting to their fellows such instruction as may enable them to profit by the results of the great mind work in which they have been prevented from taking an active part. If we summon before us the different gradations in the past career of human progress since man emerged from the gloom of the dark ages, and since printing and science, with slowly brightening lanterns, enabled Religion to know herself more and more, and to go on up to this present moment doffing sundry wrappages and muffling gear of the ugliest for so fair a form,—still remaining other unaesthetic petticoats yet to follow the rest,—is it not instantly cognizable that the wiser and more gifted have precisely in this way effected all that has been accomplished?

But it might be urged that this is a truism, and that the question at issue is whether these more capable persons shall be limited to teaching by precept, or should be armed with the powers of Government. Whilst it is acknowledged that the tendency of the various enactments of paternal governments is to paralyse individual energy, foresight, and self-help in the community, and whilst it is a deplorable fact that the vast majority of men have at all times been content, and do universally submit to have their religions and their institutions thought out and framed for them, inducing a state of things that nullifies all such governmental efforts, it can be as certainly asserted that Governments whose constitutions comprise the due degree of the democratic element can in many ways work beneficently with a contrary result, Whilst they should abstain from the assumption of functions which the ideal of a healthful Society demands should be performed by the members of the community, or by local organizations, the conditions and necessities of the social state dictate another duty,—the intervention in instances, capable of definition and limitation, for the protection of certain classes from such intolerable oppression of circumstances as renders the due exercise of some faculties impossible to them. In short, Government machinery may and must be employed for the purpose of furthering the desirable object of rendering all individuals capable of governing themselves, and affording an invaluable incentive to all to exercise their higher faculties in the establishing an organisation which shall aid, instead of impeding, the general growth towards a more perfect state. It is useless, to instance a common objection, to bring forward the sceptical query,—shall we then turn the state into a patent educator? and if so, what shall we teach? The reply to this, if reply is needed, is, that the function of the state is to provide, instead of the so-called National School Masters, the most capable teachers it can find, to do a needful work,—the imparting amidst this chaos of nescience what little knowledge and science the world's brain has evolved, as speedily as possible to all, and not to dogmatise about abstract principles of morality or forms of creeds that shall be inculcated. What are the decrees of a democratic government but the embodied wishes of an association of persons who fashion the conditions of their intercourse with one another after the wisest ideas that are current amongst them. The argument that, since man's ideas are constantly progressing towards an exacter conception of the perfect condition, to crystallise the crude opinions of one generation in government institutions that must eventually be demolished and cleared away to make room for more perfect forms has, as we have seen, some force, and must be accepted as finally condemnatory of State Churches and State-supported religious institutions, because these

do not admit of modification by the human reason, which is the moulding agency of all normal institutions, and are incompatible with man's right to the fullest freedom.

This consideration of the requirements resulting from man's progressive state must also modify most legislative enactments in some degree, although the conservative policy prompted by the selfishness of persons interested in the perpetuation of effete institutions may be expected gradually to diminish to the minimum of resistance desirable in order to afford a safeguard against too hasty and ill considered innovations, as the choice of such persons becomes better regulated by man's improved moral sense.

All this leads to the conclusions, that as long as the unlimited competition system continues, Society will be compelled to organise some more or less efficient protection against the chances of destitution;—that the vicious and ignorant parent who prevents the education of his child is interfering with the development and exercise of faculties that are needful to his harmonising with the requirements of the modern social condition;—that to refuse to accept and follow the direction of the best authorities on sanitary matters is to infringe that liberty of others which Governments are created to protect. Further, if Governments and governing institutions are insufficient and bad, they are so in precise proportion to the imperfect condition of the elective body, and whilst the evil of having bad laws and bad institutions is altogether secondary to the internal immorality and molecular rottenness of which it is the fruit, it serves as a useful index by which a people may know itself.

By such considerations then we have been persuaded that—"all this mammon gospel of supply-and-demand, competition, laissez faire, and devil-take-the hindmost begins to be one of the shabbiest gospels ever preached on earth, that all social growths in this world have at a certain stage of their development required organising, and Work the grandest of all human interests, does now require it". Such organisation cannot, however, be originated by any existing government: it must first be elaborated, and familiarised to the national mind by the efforts of a few devoted teachers, and subjected to the most crucial testing of experiment. The principles of such an organisation as applied to a small country town may now be indicated.

V. PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL ORGANISATION.

1.—*The essential Desideratum.*—The essential desideratum which it should be the end of every social organisation to secure, is—that as Society has monopolised the use of the Earth's surface, which is the natural right of all men alike, it should guarantee to every individual the opportunity of acquiring by due industry such a share of wealth as to admit of the normal exercise of all his faculties, and that he be not precluded from participation in any natural enjoyment.

2.—*The right of property.*—The maintenance of the right of property under existing circumstances is necessitated by our essential ideas of justice, and its abolition in any ordinary and imperfect, condition of Society would entail irremediable confusion, and, probably, seriously impair the production of wealth. Should man however, attain to such a state of morality, and education, as to be able to mete out to every individual the work most adapted to his or her capacity, the proportionate numbers of workers in all classes being equalized, and secure the requisite industry from all, an equal amount of remuneration might be decreed: but even then man's desires must be as regulated as his virtues before property could be abrogated. Meanwhile, whilst retaining the institution, Society in its corporate capacity is justified in framing such laws for the regulation of its members as will tend to prevent such accumulation of wealth, without the exercise of beneficial and creative industry, as may be attended with results injurious to the general community.

3.—*The Community.*—Under the new system the inhabitants of a district, whose extent will be determined by the circumstances of existing localities, will voluntarily form themselves into an organised community for the attainment of certain objects by means of regulations that each one will undertake to observe. The means of effecting this must be accurately estimated, and the amount of persuasive influence required to induce all the unthinking, indifferent, and prejudiced persons of the locality, to voluntarily aid in so novel an enterprise. In any first experiments it is certain that the clearest assurance of accruing benefits, without more cogent arguments, would be ineffectual. A legitimate use of the power possessed by persons, influential by position and wealth, or by proprietorship of the land, which is the only mode of securing the deferential respect of the great majority of people, in their present condition, must be combined with more rational inducements. The attention of the people once secured by this extraneous aid, wisely directed efforts would convince great numbers of the immense advantages to be obtained by avoiding the suicidal squandering of wealth that results from the lack of Association, and they would soon be prompted to self-initiated exertions.

4 *The Committee of Public Welfare.* For the carrying out of the regulations of the social organization, and the wise arbitration of all differences, the ablest persons in the locality will be chosen by a method that will secure, as far as possible, that the preference be influenced solely by the superiority of capacity in the elected. The members will be nominated by a permanent magistrate, who shall act as the President of the

Committee—himself eventually appointed by a Central Body elected on similar principles;—but his nominations may be vetoed by a majority of one-fourth of the community.

5.—*The Register*.—All members of the community and their occupations will be registered, and all employers of labour will make an entry of the number of persons for whom they can provide employment. This registration will be conducted under the direct superintendence of the Committee of Public Welfare.

6.—*Guarantee of Employment to the Industrious*.—The members of the Community having in the first instance been duly apportioned on the soundest, economical principles to the industrial requirements of the district, it will be the business of the Committee to aid, if necessary, in negotiating for employment for such of its members as may be in need of it. Should there be any one for whom suitable employment is not available in the district, they will correspond with other localities with a view to aiding him to obtain such. Such aid will be so given as not to impair the power of self-help and self-reliance in the individual, and will rather assume the form of kindly and impartial advice from wise friends, as to the fittest employment for his or her capacity, and the Committee will not unnecessarily interfere between employers and employed further than directing the alteration in the Register necessitated by any change. It will, however, furnish all with certificates of recommendation, which will be of three classes representing different degrees of trustworthiness and merit; and when any person has forfeited confidence by having been dismissed for misconduct, he would be only recommended for service in a lower capacity.

8.—*Payment of labourers*.—The wages of labour will be regulated by the general laws of supply-and-demand that prevail in all localities, and the improvement in the condition of the working-classes will mainly spring from the immense benefits conferred on all the inhabitants by the improved circumstances resulting from association. The system of making a certain proportion of the wages take the form of a percentage on the profits of the employer will, however, be as largely adopted as may be found practicable, and this will undoubtedly greatly increase the efficiency and productiveness of labour, it being a wise and legitimate application of the stimulus of self-interest. This system

[*unclear: gely*] applicable in all branches of industry, with the exception of agriculture, even farmers could without difficulty partially adopt a similar plan by seeing to give their labourers a bonus on unusually good crops, when they attended with profits to themselves. The proprietors of the cultivated [*unclear: nds*] of the commune, as members of the Society, will agree, in letting the [*unclear: nd*], to impose on the tenants the condition that they shall make such arrangements, with the labourers as will permit of their participation in the advantages secured by association, that will so materially modify their condition, and to do as much as possible towards providing suitable dwellings for the workmen, conveniently near the central schools and stores.

9.—*Distribution*.—The whole of the retail trading of the district, which is at present carried on by such a number of petty dealers, involving, as has been seen, the worst morals, together with a frightful squandering of work-power, and of wealth, and the violation of all economical principles, will, under the new system, be conducted on the co-operative plan. To the assertion that retail tradesmen are, as a class, parasitical and unproductive, it has been objected that they add to the different productions of industry the property of being where they are required. The person who would assert, however, that the causing an article to be transported a few miles has added 50 or 100 per cent to its value, cannot expect much attention. In the organized society the whole of the retailing will be performed for the community in one large establishment, with commodious warehouses for the different departments of trade, on methods that secure the avoidance of loss from waste and decay, each department being superintended by experienced and prudently selected persons. The same prices, with such a slight reduction, only, as will prevent local competition, will be charged at the store, and purchasers will, be assured of obtaining every production of the world of the finest quality, with the guarantee that there have been none of the incentives to adulteration, and to mis-representation of the value of any goods. Local producers, having produce to dispose of within the districts, would receive the market value at the store, but would be at liberty to send it to a distant market at their option. There are other trades which will be similarly carried on for the community by its agents, which do not consist in distribution only: they are those of the tailor, shoemaker, confectioner, livery-stable keepers, &c., and even the builder and painter. The most competent would be chosen as superintendents of these departments, and the workmen paid according to their capacity, or when possible, by piece-work. Due attention must be given to the notorious fact, that the negligence of paid agents, when opposed in competitive enterprise to efforts that are directed by a proprietor, urged by all the impulse that self-interest imparts, almost invariably fails most signally. But this fact, fortunately, presents no obstacle to the co-operative movement: the spur of self-interest is, on the contrary, much more effectually applied, and to the *actual labourers*, who, under the old system, are mere salaried workmen; and this, too, without entailing results dangerous to morality, and liable to prevent the development of noble aims in those engaged in such occupations. The shopman, or employee who is at present impelled to his duty by the fear of an absent master only, in the cooperative system has his master in every member of the public for whom he may be working; who has power to procure his discharge if he manifests dishonest

negligence. But the difficulty, should it in any instance prove to be serious, can be at once effectually disposed of by the simple method of making the superintendent a partner in the concern.

When the enormous economy effected by co-operation carried thus far (amounting in our small town to several thousand pounds annually,) a sum sufficient to provide the whole population with the best educational facilities, and with improved surroundings such as the rich only can at present command,) has been fully experienced, the system will soon be extended to the details of domestic economy. The contests, lawsuits, and competing rivalries, in which the existing social organisation is so fruitful, once abolished, and men's tastes, and ideas harmonised and elevated by increased culture, it would soon be possible to carry Association so far as to avoid the daily wasteful repetition in a hundred houses of so many separate culinary and other operations; but, whatever improvements might be made in the dwelling of all classes by cooperation in mansions also, every family would always retain its own commodious home,—only—friendship, as well as blood, will constitute the family tie.

To be continued.

Poems, By Wrax All Hall.

(Chapman and Hall.)

Did these assume to represent in perfection of poetry the last effort of a great and finished poet, we could not give them unqualified praise, nor the commendation that is now fairly due to them. No poet of long experience in his art would have admitted lines that by some accident have been allowed to remain amongst generally superior verse; and the device of repeating certain phrases has been employed until it has lost all its force. On the other hand, to counterbalance these defects, there is much muscular thought, and downright utterance, often of a graceful sort, of many things that were precisely what wanted saying effectively.

"A Love Story; or, the Curse of Creeds," for instance, represents a phase of life, ideally treated, that must be of commoner and yet commoner occurrence in real life whilst the wrecks of the old religions are being broken up and borne away. Two lovers are separated by the persistent clinging of a pure-minded English girl to the faith which had been instilled into her, until the arguments which her Ernest has adduced, and her own reasonings and reflections are at length triumphant.

The strongest swell of true poetic impulse is in "Germ."

And the bravo and stalwart spirits
Of the grand and mighty dead,
Moving on our shadowed midnight,
Like white cloud-racks o'er our heads;
Follow, follow where they beckon,
Graves beneath, but God o'erhead!

* * * * *

Come, bestir thee, ancient mother,
Mix more lighting with thy clod,
Give thee birth to mighty spirits,
That shall lead us to our God!
Toll the knell of superstition
Spread the banner truth abroad!
Spell God's love, and not, his vengeance,
In thy myriad tinted Flowers,
Wreath thee hopes like yellow sunbeams
Round these aching hearts of ours;
Let Heaven's jubilante reach us
In the songs of summer bowers.
Let us see the true millennium
Coming up "the steep of time,"
Bearing proudly Truth's white banner

Lettered by the stars sublime.

* * * * *
* * * * *

We can, therefore, welcome Wraxall Hall as a useful member of the band of thinkers and speakers who will help to usher in a new era of more genuine religious feeling, and more generous social sympathies, and hopefully look for yet other song from her.

Correspondence.

DEAR SIR,

I, being a subscriber to the *Idealist*, and interested in the views promulgated by that publication, feel compelled to write to you in praise of the critical article, "Of the Christian Hypothesis" in this month's number, and also of the instalment of "Ernina Landon." These two pieces appear to me to make this month's number by far the most solid, genuine, and instructive one we have had set before us since the commencement. I would say to you—please, do so again; give us Bread, not Cakes. The *Idealist* is published for the dissemination and elucidation of transcendental views amongst those *interested* therein—but needing more light,—not for men such as Browning, Arnold, Teetgen, and other "Alumni," but for men like myself, having aspirations towards a better state of things—but wanting teachers. I should say the first duty of the *Idealist* would be to publish a Transcendental Creed, or Formula of Faith as held by its promoters; such points as are held to be fully thought out by the best heads amongst them to be stated as such, and other debateable ones to be discussed in its columns. This, no doubt, would be a great undertaking, but it is one that is called for imperatively, and is of the first importance and necessity. Novels and poems we can get elsewhere; let us have moral Truths, and the searching thereafter; we are not babes that we must have the truth presented to us sugarcoated!

I notice with pleasure a step in the right direction, the seeking by advertisements to acquire additional support for the publication. Praise is duo to the promoter thereof.

Would it not be possible, Dear Sir, to make the *Idealist* a monthly publication instead of a bi-monthly, and also then to contain more? There must surely be amongst the body of members a certain number to whom an extra sovereign or two per annum would be no great outlay, to whom *progress* in the *Faith* (for such it is, however otherwise designated) would be considered value received. I need not say, if favourably entertained, I promise my subscription; otherwise, surely the *practical* *Idealist* is a misnomer, Would you, Mr. Editor, think it advisable to make, an appeal to such amongst us that could afford it for the above purpose, making also an approximate calculation of the extra cost?

Having been sufficiently bold to make the above suggestions (for I am an "outsider", knowing nothing of the association, its formation, its promoters, or its directors), I would also in conclusion mention another matter in connection therewith.

Are there any meetings, conferences, or re-unions of the association? or do the leading members form a private charmed circle? There might be a few amongst the outside subscribers possessed of a black coat and an extra sovereign, to whom an occasional opportunity of conversing "Viva Voce" with Transcendentalists morn highly accomplished than themselves would be far more profitable than hours of such reading merely. Or is all this "Practical Idealism" and Social Progression only capable of demonstrating itself on paper? good for an four's reading, or a day's dreaming, but not good enough to produce a man or men, having leisure and capacity, that shall say to such that seek it,—we believe in these things, and will with pleasure confer with earnest seekers after truth I

I am, Dear Sir, Yours very respectfully,

A. G.

A special fund is proposed for the monthly publication Subscriptions to which will only be payable when the increased issue commences. Promises are Invited. We also hope, next year, to arrange periodical meetings. [Ed.

Operations of the Association.

The Social Progress Library.

Arrangements have been made for forming a collection of all such works by advanced thinkers as tend to further the objects of the Association, with a view to promoting their circulation, and to the dissemination of the doctrines which they advocate. The operations of the Library will be limited, for the present, to the supplying such works at the lowest possible price to those who will purchase them; and the profits, if any, will belong to the funds of the Association, and thus the readers will help to forward the views enunciated in such works.

They will always be supplied at the published price, post free, and when possible, *below* the published price. All who are interested in the objects of the Association, as well as members, are particularly requested to purchase as many as possible, in order to enable the Library to be carried on without loss to the Society. They should particularly observe that *any book*, whatsoever, can be thus obtained, as well as those enumerated.

A list of the books in the circulation of which the Library is chiefly interested will soon be issued.

They are principally those of Emerson, Carlyle, Mill, Prof. Newman, Theodore Parker, Goethe, Owen, Fourier, Froude, Louis Blanc, Tickers, Teetgen, &c.

Letters on this subject should be addressed to the Sec.—(Book Department) 27, Chilworth St., w., or to the Editor P. Idealist, Sandgate, Kent; from whom the price of any book may be learnt.

The Scheme of an Organized Society. This pamphlet by the President of the Association will be published as a partial reprint in June next: Price 6d. People's edition 3. It is purposed to circulate many thousands of this little work if possible. Members who will undertake to circulate them separately, can be supplied with them at 10s. 6d., and 7s. 6d per one hundred, respectively.

The Social Progress Association Press.—The Association has now established its own Press at a great cost, and will henceforth print all its own publications.

All members, &c. are earnestly invited to unite in having any publications they may have printed done by the Association, by whom they will be done at a price lower than that usually charged. The profits of such printing, if any, will be devoted to the purpose of enlarging the "Practical Idealist."

Publication of the Magazine.—The Practical Idealist will continue to be issued on the 20th of every alternate month (January, March, May, &c.) instead of on the 1st, as hitherto.

One Year in his Life. This poem will be continued in July.

All communications should be addressed to the Editor. Sandgate. Kent.

What is the Philosophy of Death?

THE philosophy of Death is the philosophy of change; not of change in the constitution or personality of the individual, but of change in the *situation* of the human Spiritual Principle; which instead of being situated in an earthly body, is placed in a spiritual organisation; and instead of living among the objects and personalities of the planet upon which the individual spirit was born, its situation is so altered as to fit it to live amidst more beautiful forms and in higher societies.

To the incurably diseased; to the oppressed and downtrodden; to those who are bowed even to the grave with grief; to those who are suffering and perhaps perishing in poverty; to those who are afflicted with the dread of coming death; to them, to all, I would say,—fear not, but follow Truth, tread boldly where she leads, and, with philosophic calm, and a majestic bearing, go on—through the seeming mysterious process of death; Truth still guides, with light revealing to the awakening and more interior senses, a habitation of harmony and blessedness.

Believe not that what is called death is a final termination to human existence, nor that the *change* is so thorough and entire as to alter or destroy the constitutional peculiarities of the individual; but believe righteously, that death causes as much *alteration* in the condition of the individual as the *bunting* of a rosebud causes in the situation and condition of the flower. Death is, therefore, only an *event*—*only a circumstance*—in the eternal life and experience of the human soul.

The lower we descend into the depths of mankind's history, the more we find that death has been unjustly magnified and exaggerated. It is distorted to be made the central horror around which all other horrors congregate; and it is the inevitable *end* from which none can possibly escape. The theology of all nations tends

to falsify the nature of death—even the Christian theology presents to the inquiring mind the "dark valley of the shadow of Death," and, also, the "Monster" who is terrible and gigantic even to the strongest intellect. But, as we ascend in the scale of human progress, we find already occasional illuminated minds that pass through a process so analogous to death as to be the same in all but its duration; and such minds uniformly testify that the transfiguration is interesting and delightful. I allude to those who have experienced the sensations which are wrought upon the human system by magnetic influences or who have otherwise had their spiritual perceptions sufficiently opened and expanded to behold some of the laws and universal tendencies of nature. In all ages of the world, and among all nations, there have lived such enlightened individuals; and with them are numbered Plato, Jesus, Swedenborg, Jacob Bemen, and every one who is sufficiently advanced to enter into the spiritual or interior state; (which state must not be confounded with the inferior exhibitions of somnambulism, and the misnamed clairvoyance of unprogressed minds;) and in consequence of the vast accumulation of experience and testimony thus flowing through intuitive and pure minds, the world is becoming gradually emancipated from the bondage which a false understanding of the nature and results of visible death has imposed upon it.

It is for the diseased and suffering, who feel and know that *death* is the only relief which they can expect from *the* character of their afflictions—I say it is for such especially, that the following disclosures are made; and yet they are addressed to all; for I know that the highborn and intelligent mind cannot gather much consolation or truth from the present doctrines and philosophies of the world—the world which is yet clad in the habiliments of Ignorance, and in which Error, fashionably draped and masked, presides over the theologies which live, like useless plants, in the gardens of present civilised society.

Let us now turn to the investigation. As I have said, death is but an *event* in our eternal life. It is a change in the situation and in the condition of the individual. And as it is a law of nature that every true and spontaneous change is attended with an improvement and advancement in the condition and constitution of the thing which is changed; so is man's death to the outer world an important and valuable change in his situation and condition. In other language, death is simply a *birth* into a new and more perfect state of existence. Nature, which is the only true and unchangeable revelation of the Divine Mind, is replete with the most beautiful and demonstrative analogies, or with universal processes which perfectly correspond to the phenomenon of physical dissolution. Everything is being incessantly "born again," or changed from one state of being into another; and this change is being accompanied, accomplished, and confirmed by transitional movements or processes which mankind term *death*. For illustration—let us think of a little *germ* which lies hidden in the earth. First, it is warmed by the vivifying elements of nature, which invite its innate essences and principles to unfold themselves and display their legitimate tendencies. And forthwith the germ is changed—or, to keep the analogy prominently before the mind, it *dies* to its original *form* and *mode* of existence. Simultaneous with this death there comes forth from out of the germ new forms and organisations; that is, a new body, with many branches, are unfolded and developed. And so, likewise, by a constant and harmonious succession of *changes*—or *deaths*—or *births*, in the various ascending forms and forces of the germ, the perfect flower is ultimately unfolded in all its fair and beautiful proportions.

Everything which has motion, life, and sensation, and which has not attained the human form, is destined to alter its form and mode of being; and every alteration is accompanied with a *death* among some, or all, of the parts and portions of the living organism. But there is no extinction of life, no annihilation of the personality of any human organization or principle in all the interminable universe; it is merely the mode of man's existence that is changed by death; and which mode, in accordance with progressive principles, is thereby vastly improved and elevated.

Here I am impressed to repeat what I have already said, because I know that it will instruct the reader's mind in the physiology of death, and calm the unhappy and suffering individual. Every human intellect should understand, that as soon as the human organisation is perfected in its form, size, and general developments, and as soon as the period has arrived when the spirit exercises its full control over the body, the process of transformation commences. The change is imperceptible, yet it is incessant and progressive. The body is not dying for a few hours only, but for many years—during which time the faculties and powers of the inner being gradually release their proprietorship over the form, and the soul continues its aspirations toward the higher spheres.

When the form is yet a child, it manifests all the angular, eccentric, and irregular traits of character, inclinations, and movements. When childhood advances to youth, the eccentricity gives way to more uniformity, and then is displayed the circular in every possible modification of that form. When youth ascends to manhood, the perfect circular and spiral make their appearance, and are uniformly displayed in the inclinations and characteristics of that progressed stage of development. At this period the process of dying or transformation commences. The spirit is continually developing and expanding its faculties, and putting them forth as *feelers* into the higher spheres. The tendencies of the spirit are no more descending, but ascending; and that, too, to an immensity beyond the power of language to express, or the most exalted intellect to

comprehend.

And as manhood progresses to old age, the body gradually becomes incapable of performing the office required by the spirit. Hence, when people are aged, their faculties seem buried beneath the worn-out and useless materials of the body. They appear weak in intellect, imbecile, and unconsociable to all around them that is youthful, blooming, and seemingly perfected. One faculty after another withdraws from the material form, and their energy, brilliancy, and susceptibility seem to decline. The body, finally, is almost disconnected from the spirit which gives it animation; and then the body is a dweller in the rudimental sphere, and the spirit is an inhabitant of the inner life, or the spiritual world. And when the moment of dissolution occurs, the *sensation*, or clothing medium of the body, is attracted and absorbed by the spirit, of which it then becomes the *material form*. At this instant the body manifests faint and almost imperceptible movements, as if it were grasping for the life which had fled; and these are contortions of the countenance, spasmodic contractions of the muscles, and seeming efforts of the whole frame to regain its animating soul.

Such are the visible appearances connected with the process of death. But these are deceptive; for the process occurring in the *interior* is far more beautiful than it is possible to describe. When the body contracts its muscles and apparently manifests the most agonising and writhing efforts, it is merely an open indication of joy unspeakable in the inner being, and of ecstasy unknown to all but itself. When the countenance is contorted, pain is not experienced; but such is an expression of ineffable delight. And when the body gives forth its last possession, a smile is impressed on the countenance, which of itself is an index of the brightness and resplendent beauty that pervade the spirit's home! In the last moments of outer life the spiritual perceptions are greatly expanded and illuminated, and the spirit is thus rendered competent to behold the immense possessions of its second habitation.

It is given me to know these things by daily experiencing them, and having them verified in the frequent transitions that occur within my being, from the outer to the inner world, or from the lower to the higher spheres. I speak, therefore, from personal experience, which is knowledge fully confirmed by the unvarying sensations and phenomena that occur.

The butterfly escapes its gross and rudimental body, and wings its way to the sunny bower, and is sensible of its new existence. The drop of water that reposes on the earth is rendered invisible by the absorbing invitations of the sun, and ascends to associate with, and repose in, the bosom of the atmosphere. The day that is known by its warmth and illumination, dispenses its blessings to the forms of earth, and sinks into repose in the bosom of the night. Night is, then, an index of a new day, which is first cradled in the horizon, and afterward perfected in its noontide light, beauty, and animation. The flower, being unfolded from the interior by virtue of its own essence and the sun, is variegated in every possible manner, and thus becomes a representative of light and beauty; but having attained its perfection, it soon begins to change its form, its colour, and its beauty of external being. Its fragrance goes forth and pervades all congenial and suitable forms, and its beauty is indelibly impressed upon the memory of its beholder and admirer, when the flower itself is no more. The foliage tinted with the breath of winter, no longer retains its outward beauty; but this is an index of new life and animation, which is perfectly exemplified in the return of foliage in the youthful season. As it is with these, so it is with the spirit. The body dies on the outer or rather, changes its mode of existence, while the spirit ascends to a higher habitation, suited to its nature and requirements.

DEATH is but a DOOR which opens into new and more perfect existence. It is a Triumphal Arch through which man's immortal spirit passes at the moment of leaving *the* outer world to depart for a higher, a sublimer, and a more magnificent country. And there is really nothing more painful or repulsive in the *natural* process of dying (that which is not induced by disease or accident) than there is in passing into a quiet, pleasant, and dreamless slumber. The truthfulness of this proposition is remarkably illustrated and confirmed by the following observations and investigation into the physiological and psychological phenomena of death, which my spirit was qualified to make upon the person of a diseased individual at the moment of physical dissolution.

The patient was a female of about sixty years of age. Nearly eight months previous to her death she visited me for the purpose of receiving a medical examination of her physical system. Although there were no sensations experienced by her, excepting a mere weakness or feebleness located in the duodenum, and a falling of the palate, yet I discovered, and distinctly perceived, that she would die with a cancerous disease of the stomach. This examination was made about eight months previous to her death. Having ascertained the certainty of her speedy removal from our earth, without perceiving the precise period of her departure (for I cannot spiritually measure time or space), I internally resolved to be present and watch the progressive development of that interesting but much-dreaded phenomenon. Moved by this resolution, I, at a later period, engaged board in her house, and officiated as her physician.

When the hour of her death arrived, I was fortunately in a proper state of body and mind to induce the Superior Condition; but, previous to throwing my spirit into that condition, I sought the most convenient and favourable position, that I might be allowed to make the observations entirely unnoticed and undisturbed. Thus

situated and conditioned, I proceeded to observe and investigate the mysterious processes of dying, and to learn what it is for an individual human spirit to undergo the changes consequent upon physical death or external dissolution. They were these:—

I saw that the physical organisation could no longer subserve the diversified purposes or requirements of the Spiritual Principle. But the various internal organs of the body appeared to *resist* the withdrawal of the animating soul. The muscular system struggled to retain the element of Motion; the vascular system strove to retain the element of Life; the nervous system put forth all its powers to retain the element of Sensation; and the cerebral system laboured *to* retain the principle of Intelligence. The body and the soul, like two friends, strongly resisted the various circumstances which rendered their eternal separation imperative and absolute. These internal conflicts gave rise to manifestations of what seemed to be, to the material senses, the most thrilling and painful sensations; but I was unspeakably thankful and delighted when I perceived and realised the fact that those physical manifestations were indications, *not of pain or unhappiness*, but simply that the Spirit was eternally dissolving its copartnership with the material organism.

Now the head of the body became suddenly enveloped in a fine—soff—mellow—luminous atmosphere; and, as instantly, I saw the cerebrum and the cerebellum expand their most interior portions; I saw them discontinue their appropriate galvanic functions; and then I saw that they became highly charged with the vital electricity and vital magnetism which permeate subordinate systems and structures. That is to say, the Brain, as a whole, suddenly declared itself to be tenfold more positive, over the lesser portions of the body, than it ever was during the period of health. This phenomenon invariably precedes physical dissolution.

Now the process of dying, or of the spirit's departure from the body, was fully commenced. The brain began to attract the elements of electricity, of magnetism, of motion, of life, and of sensation, into its various and numerous departments. The head became intensely brilliant; and I particularly remarked that just in the same proportion as the extremities of the organism grew dark and cold, the brain appeared light and glowing.

Now I saw, in the mellow, spiritual atmosphere, which emanated from, and encircled, her head, the indistinct outlines of the *formation* of another head! The reader should remember that *these super-sensuous processes are not visible to any one except the spiritual perceptions be unfolded; for material eyes can only behold material things, and spiritual eyes can only behold spiritual things.*—This is a Law of Nature. This new head unfolded more and more distinctly; and so indescribably compact and intensely brilliant did it become, that I could neither see through it nor gaze upon it as steadily as I desired. While this spiritual head was being eliminated and organised from out of, and above, the material head, I saw that the surrounding aroal atmosphere which had emanated from the material head was in great conamotion; but, as the new head became more distinct and perfect, this brilliant atmosphere gradually disappeared. This taught me that those aroal elements, which were in the beginning of the metamorphosis, attracted from the system into the brain, and thence eliminated in the form of an atmosphere, were indissolubly united in accordance with the divine principle of affinity in the universe, which pervades and destinates every particle of matter, and developed the spiritual head which I beheld.

With inexpressible wonder, and with a heavenly and utterable reverence I gazed upon the holy and harmonious processes that were going on before me. In the identical manner in which the spiritual head was eliminated and unchangeably organised I saw, unfolding in their natural, progressive order, the harmonious development of the neck, the shoulders, the breast, and the entire spiritual organisation. It appeared from this, even to an unequivocal demonstration, that the innumerable particles of what might be termed unparticled matter, which constitute the man's Spiritual principle, are constitutionally endowed with certain elective affinities, analogous to an immortal friendship. The innate tendencies, which the elements and essences of her soul manifested by uniting and organising themselves, were the efficient and imminent causes which unfolded and perfected her spiritual organisation. The defects and deformities of her physical body, were, in the spiritual body which I saw thus developed, almost completely removed. In other words, it seemed that those hereditary obstructions and influences were now removed, which originally arrested the full and proper development of her physical constitution; and therefore, that her spiritual constitution, being elevated above those obstructions, was enabled to unfold and perfect itself, in accordance with the universal tendencies of all created things.

While this spiritual formation was going on., which was perfectly visible to my spiritual perceptions, the material body manifested, to the outer vision of observing individuals in the room, many symptoms of uneasiness and pain; but these indications were totally deceptive; they were wholly caused by the departure of the vital or spiritual forces from the extremities and viscera into the brain, and thence into the ascending organism.

The spirit arose at right angles over the head or brain of the deserted body. But immediately previous to the final dissolution of the relationship which had for so many years subsisted between the spiritual and material bodies, I saw—playing energetically between the feet of the elevated spiritual body and the head of the prostrate physical body—a bright stream or current of vital electricity. This taught me, that what is customarily

termed *Death* is but a *Birth* of the spirit from a lower into a higher state; that an inferior body and mode of existence are exchanged for a superior body and corresponding endowments and capabilities of happiness. I learned that the correspondence between the birth of a child into this world, and the birth of the spirit from the material body into a higher world, is absolute and complete—even to the *umbilical cord*, which was represented by the thread of vital electricity, which, for a few minutes, subsisted between, and connected the two organisms together. And here I perceived, what I had never before obtained a knowledge of, that a small portion of this vital electrical element returned to the deserted body, immediately subsequent to the separation of the umbilical thread; and that that portion of this element which passed back into the earthly organism, instantly diffused itself through the entire structure, and thus prevented immediate decomposition.

It is not proper that a body should be deposited in the earth until after decomposition has positively commenced; for, should there be no positive evidences of such structural change, even though life seems surely to have departed, it is not right to consign the body to the grave. The umbilical life-cord, of which I speak, is sometimes not severed, but is drawn out into the finest possible medium of sympathetic connection between the body and the spirit. This is invariably the case when individuals apparently die, and, after being absent for a few days or hours, return, as from a peaceful journey, to relate their spiritual experiences. Such phenomena are modernly termed, Trances, Catalepsy, Somnambulism, and spiritual Extasis. There are many different stages, or divisions, and subdivisions, of these states. But when the spirit is *arrested* in its flight from the body, and when it is held in a transitional or mediatorial state, for only a few hours or minutes, then the mind seldom retains a recollection of its experience—this state of forgetfulness, seems, to a superficial observer, like annihilation; and this occasional suspension of consciousness (or memory) is frequently made the foundation of many an argument against the soul's immortal existence. It is when the spirit entirely leaves the body—only retaining proprietorship over it, through the medium of the unsevered umbilical thread or electric wire, as it might be called—that the soul is enabled to abandon its earthly tenement and interests, for many hours or days, and afterward to return to the earth, laden with bright and happy memories.

As soon as the spirit, whose departing hour I thus watched, was wholly disengaged from the tenacious physical body, I directed my attention to the movements and emotions of the former; and I saw her begin to breathe the most interior or spiritual portions of the surrounding terrestrial atmosphere. At first it seemed with difficulty that she could breathe the new medium; but, in a few seconds, she inhaled and exhaled the spiritual elements of nature, with the greatest possible ease and delight. And now I saw that she was in the possession of exterior and physical proportions, which were identical, in every possible particular—improved and beautified—with those proportions which characterised her earthly organisation. That is to say, she possessed a heart, a stomach, a liver, a lungs, &c., &c., just as her natural body did previous, to (not her, but) its death. This is a wonderful and consoling truth! But I saw that the improvements which were wrought upon, and in, her spiritual organisation, were not so particular and thorough as to destroy or transcend her personality; nor did they materially alter her natural appearance or earthly characteristics. So much like her former self was she, that, had her friends beheld her (*as I did*,) they certainly would have exclaimed—as we often do upon the sudden return of a long absent friend, who leaves us in illness and returns in health—"Why, how well you look! how improved you are!" such were the nature—most beautifying in their extent—of the improvements that were wrought upon her.

I saw her continue to conform, and accustom herself, to the new elements and elevating sensations which belong to the inner life. I did not particularly notice the workings and emotions of her newly awakening and fast unfolding spirit; except, that I was careful to remark her philosophic tranquillity throughout the entire process, and her non-participation, with the different members of her family, in their unrestrained bewailing of her departure from the earth, to unfold in Love and Wisdom throughout eternal spheres. She understood, at a glance, that they could only gaze upon the cold and lifeless form which she had but just deserted; and she readily comprehended the fact, that it was owing to a want of true knowledge upon their parts, that they thus vehemently regretted her merely physical death.

The excessive weeping and lamentation of friends and relatives, over the external form of one departed, are mainly caused by the sensuous and superficial mode by which the majority of mankind view the phenomena of death. For, with but few exceptions, the race is so conditioned and educated on the earth—not yet having grown into spiritual perceptions—not yet progressed to where "whatsoever is hid shall be revealed"—realising, only through the medium of the natural senses, the nearness of the beloved—watching and comprehending only the external signs and processes of physical dissolution—supposing *this* contortion to indicate pain, and that expression to indicate anguish—I say, the race is so situated and educated that *death* of the body (to the majority of the earth's inhabitants) is equivalent to an annihilation of the personality of the individual. But I would comfort the superficial observer, and I can solemnly assure the inquirer after truth, that, when an individual dies naturally, the spirit experiences no pain; nor, should the material body be dissolved with disease, or crushed by the fearful avalanche, is the individuality of the spirit deformed; or in the least degree obscured.

Could you but turn your natural gaze from the lifeless body, which can no longer answer to your look of love; and could your spiritual eyes be opened, you would behold—standing in your midst—a form, the same, but more beautiful, and living! Hence, there is great cause to rejoice at the *birth* of the spirit from this world into the Inner Sphere of Life—yea, it is far more reasonable and appropriate to weep at the majority of marriages which occur in this world, than to lament when man's immortal spirit escapes from its earthly form, to live and unfold in a higher and better country! You may clothe yourselves with the dark habiliments of woe, when you consign at the altar, a heart to a living grave; or when you chain the soul to breathe in an uncongenial atmosphere; but robe yourselves with garments of light to honour the spirit's birth into a higher life!

The period required to accomplish the entire *charge*, which I saw, was not far from two hours and a half; but this furnishes no rule as to the time required for *every* spirit to elevate and re-organise itself above the head of the outer form. Without changing my position, or spiritual perceptions, I continued to observe the movements of her new-born spirit. As soon as she became accustomed to the new elements which surrounded her, she descended from her elevated position, which was immediately over the body, by an effort of the will-power, and directly passed out of the door of the bedroom, in which she had lain (in the material form) prostrated with disease for several weeks. It being in a summer month, the doors were all open, and her egress from the house was attended with no obstructions. I saw her pass through the adjoining room, out of the door, and step from the house into the atmosphere! I was overwhelmed with delight and astonishment when, for the first time, I realised the universal truth that the Spiritual organisation can tread the atmosphere which, while in the coarser earthly form, we breathe—so much more refined is man's spiritual condition. She walked in the atmosphere as easily, and in the same manner, as we tread the earth, and ascend an eminence. Immediately upon her emergence from the house, *she was joined by [unclear: tso] friendly spirits from the spiritual country*; and, after tenderly recognising and communing with each other, the three, in the most graceful manner, began ascending obliquely through the ethereal envelopment of our globe. They walked so naturally and fraternally together, that I could scarcely realise the fact that they trod the air—they seemed to be walking upon the side of a glorious but familiar mountain! I continued to gaze upon them until the distance shut them from my view; whereupon I returned to my external and ordinary condition.

O, what a contrast! Instead of beholding that beautiful and youthfully unfolded spirit, I now saw, in common with those about me, the lifeless—cold—and shrouded organism of the caterpillar, which the joyous butterfly had so recently abandoned!

Experiences of Death.

DEATH is but the local or final development of a succession of specific changes in the corporeal organism of man. As the death of the *germ* is necessary to the birth or development of the *flower*; so is the *death* of man's physical body an indispensable precedent and indication of his spiritual *birth* or resurrection. That semi-unconscious slumber into which the soul and body mutually and irresistibly glide, when darkness pervades the earth, is typical of death. Sleep is but death undeveloped; or, in other words, sleep is the incipient manifestation of that thorough and delightful *change*, which is the glorious result of our present rudimental existence. Night and sleep correspond to physical death; but the brilliant day, and human wakefulness, correspond to spiritual birth and individual elevation.

There is every reason why man should rest, with regard to life and death, and be happy; for the Laws of Nature are unchangeable and complete in their operations. If we understand these laws, and obey them on the earth, it is positively certain that our *passage* from this sphere, and our *emergence* into the spirit-country, will be like rolling into the blissful depths of natural sleep, and awakening from it, to gaze upon, and to dwell in, a more congenial and harmonious world.

Here I am impressed to introduce a portion of a spiritual communication, which I was in a proper condition of mind to receive, in the city of Boston, on the 29th of May, 1849. The communicant was known, on the earth, as James Victor Wilson; whose name, and intense interest in the book, entitled "Nature's Divine Revelations," are mentioned in a note, which is prefixed to the fourteenth page of the Scribe's introduction to that volume. The circumstances which led to the communication from him, are strictly as follows: For several months previous to Friend Wilson's death, he was in the habit of visiting the room in which I examined and prescribed for the sick; and he was occasionally chosen as a witness to the lectures, which I was also, at that time, engaged in delivering. The profound interest with which the Revelations, and the phenomena which attended their development, inspired him, laid the foundation for a sweet and profitable acquaintance between us. We conversed frequently concerning the nature of death, and concerning that ineffable divinity which pervades the Spirit-Home. He sometimes feared that his identity, or personality, would be lost, at the period of death, by divine absorption—just as the ocean drinks in the drop of water; and frequently he expressed a strong desire to

be thrown into a mental condition, similar to the state in which I gave the above-mentioned lectures, to the end that he might entirely satisfy his own mind of those things which, above all else in the universe, he desired most to comprehend and believe. In reply to these desires of his spirit, I said: "It is well to be patient; for, in the present state of the world's social and intellectual progression, there are but few individuals who can, because of their constitutional qualifications, enter into the superior condition; and even if there were many such individuals, it would be exceedingly difficult to find the right operator—one who possesses within himself the proper physical and mental qualifications—capable of assisting the spirit in its efforts to attain that condition. What we cannot learn by studying the laws of nature, and her universal analogies or correspondences, we had better wait for patiently, either until our spiritual perceptions are *naturally* developed and unclouded, or until we actually become *residents* of the spiritual world."

Thus we walked and conversed together; and it was during one of these conversations that, prompted by his great desire for spiritual enlightenment, he requested me to promise that, should I die first, I would, if possible, subsequent to my death, visit him and communicate to him my experiences; and, with earnestness, he bound himself to do likewise, should he the earliest pass from earth.

A few weeks subsequent to the above interview, during an absence from home, I received a letter, from a friend, announcing his sudden and unexpected death, and stating that "he had been found dead in his bed."

According to our mutual promise, I daily and hourly expected to feel, behold, and converse with his spirit; but weeks and months passed by, and I received no thought or impression which was calculated to keep alive that fraternal intimacy, which had, previous to his death, subsisted between us. I was not to be disappointed, however, in my anticipations of further communion with him, even here; for, toward the last of December, 1847, as I was recovering from a short but severe illness, and while my mind was in a state of interior meditation, I did not see, but I suddenly felt his spiritual presence. He breathed into my spirit the following words: "Thou hast not been of late in that peculiar mental state, which is adapted to spiritual intercourse—thrice have I sought thee, but thy spirit was too much engaged, in the investigation of natural or terrestrial subjects, to have readily perceived, and communed with, me; and, even now, thou hast not sufficient physical strength to record what I would impart. But it is well to be patient; for, when it is *good* and *useful* that I should converse with thee, we shall equally be prepared for the interview."

Weeks and months again rolled between this brief communication and the one I am about to relate, which, I feel impressed, will do much toward illuminating the enslaved intellect, not only of the diseased and the suffering, but also of the unhappy sceptic. And here it would, perhaps, be well to remark, for the satisfaction of the anxious and serious reader, that Friend Wilson's external appearance generally corresponded to his previous earthly exterior personality and amiable deportment—his spiritual form being intensely beautified, and somewhat smaller than the natural body, possessing exquisite symmetry, and harmonious or musical proportions; and his transparent habiliments represented an inter-blending of the character of a student and an instructor. I will now faithfully present to the reader his holy communication, as follows:—

"Truth respondeth to truth—love to love—and soul answereth to soul! I approach thee because thou art approachable—and, I teach thee, because thou didst first teach me.

"I am forced to exclaim: How truthful is Truth—how lovely is Love—how good is Goodness—how omnipotent is Will—how wise is Wisdom—how great is Greatness—how divine is Divinity—how universal is the Universo!

"The innumerable Empires of Worlds about me supply every pure lesire with its proper and complete gratification.

"The elements, which flow between one planet, or world, and another, correspond to the bodies of water which divide, yet unite, countries and hemispheres on your earth.

"These planets are our various countries. On each the inhabitants are different, but only in degrees of growth. Their laws and customs differ; but the difference is always in accordance with their relative position in the infinite system of progressive development.

"There is no antagonism here, only a divine emulation; no absolute discord, only relative degrees of harmony.

"We travel to each other's country or planet, just as you travel to each other's village or city.

"Our Empire is vast—our Government is spiritual—our Law is love—and our obedienco brings wisdom and happiness.

"Those individuals congregate, and journey together, who have similar or parallel attractions.

"Here, every one is conjugally conjoined—is married in spirit and in truth—or, every one *knows* where its proper and eternal associate resides! Out marriages are instantaneous. Behold the sun-beam kiss the flower—or, the sudden blending of kindred dewdrops, or the instantaneous commingling of the elements—and you behold the quickness and beauty of the eclestial marriage. The symbol is perfect in picture, not in magnitude—because, our unions are sweet, pure, beautiful, and eternal!

"Anxiety is effaced from all properly-unfolded spirits. We know the truth, and we are free! It is not the quantity, but the *quality* of truth which makes us free.

"The universe seems *great* or *small* according to our inward growth. If any of us, or any of *you* (by which I mean us) have just as much truth as the spirit can comprehend, feel, and exhibit, in its daily walk and conversation, then its freedom is comparatively perfect.

"If a man has *too little truth* he is anxious—he is seeking; and if truth is all he *desires*, he finds it; but should he seek truth, not for truth's sake, but for the sake of establishing an opinion or hypothesis, then is he discontented and internally unhappy. This perverted motive sometimes actuates the misdirected inhabitants of earth; but it never moves the residents of this celestial empire.

"The universe becomes greater and more sublime as we unfold—Inanity is as many times *more infinite* than you now suppose as there are *moments* in your eternal life.

"The Universe does, not itself become more universal; nor does infinity become more infinite; but the expansion is in the progressed and improved spirit. The spirit of every individual is caused to grow into a higher and wider knowledge of material and spiritual things.

"One widespread and fatal error or misapprehension I behold in all the earth.—It is that man (with but few exceptions) knows not what Truth is; he knows not where to find it—how to estimate it—how to separate it. Thus, facts are locked together; and a *long chain of facts* is estimated as a principle of truth; while, in reality, Facts are only Things, and Truths are Principles.

"To the animalcule, a drop of water is a universe of life and activity. And, to man, the universe is *great, beautiful, divine*, and magnificent; or it is *small, chaotic, and unbeautiful*—just as he is individually organised, educated, and developed.

"Our desire is that ail should tread the same path in the pursuit of truth; just as the child, the youth, the man, tread the same path in journeying toward maturity, neither" manifesting discord, nor giving rise to inconsistencies.

"How beautiful is the way of truth, my brother; and, O, how we—how all are blessed!

"My departure from your earth and society was, to me, sudden and unexpected—but it was fully known and anticipated by my *present* companions.

"While with you I was seeking—finding—exclaiming—writing—speaking—practising—and I was leaving old associations of every description. My spirit expanded under the warmth of your love, and grew enlightened under your revelations. The way to, and the geography of, the spirit-land were deeply impressed upon my understanding; and, on the evening previous to my departure, my soul was lifted up in holy contemplation and admiration of the spirit-home. Thought became too intense and elevated for the body. The sensorium was expanded, with action, to its utmost capacity; the blood rushed to, and from, my head with bewildering rapidity; my thoughts returned to me, and I retired to bed. But my spirit was attracted by an interior power—the attraction overcame me, and I felt the evidences of transformation,

"How thankful was I that my chamber was undisturbed! no excitement, no rush, was there to draw me back—I was thankful for this; for, had it been otherwise—had friends beseeched, and prayed, and wept for me, I should have had but one sensation—not sympathy, but pity! pity!

"I remembered you—held your chart

See discourses on the spiritual spheres—"Nature's Divine Revelations," page 647, et seque.
of the geography of the spirit-home in my memory. You had gone before me—knew the pathway—understood the preparations that were necessary for the journey—I was thus making preparations, and the transition was interesting and delightful.

"My sensorium or cerebrum threw open its ten thousand hearts or cells, and the imprisoned spirit rushed, from the various members, into them,

The spirit escapes the organism by emanating through the anterior portions of the encephalon.
—by *spirit* I mean *myself*.

"Now I was calm—silent—still—sleeping. My bed-chamber, the house, the physical world, all—all receded, and went into nothing.

"My body was on its back,—I was asleep, and yet I was not asleep; I was in the body, and yet it seemed that I was out of the body; I was in the world, and yet it appeared to me I was not in the world.

"Now my sleep deepened, and my consciousness of individuality was melted into an ocean of boundless ether. Joy unutterable came over *me* as I seemed to spread out like the divine breath upon the bosom of infinite life. I expanded in every direction—I was boundless—was infinite—was in being, and yet it seemed that I was nothing.

"Happiness, or rather *tranquillity*, was the last of my earthly recollections. My spirit seemed poured into the fountains of elysium—I felt like the breath of heaven—and the angels seemed to inhale me, and thus I became unconscious.

The [*unclear*: sensations] of blending with the ethereal elements of space were caused by the spirit suspending its consciousness of individuality during the period of [*unclear*: transition.]

"Yea, how we—how all are blest!

"My individuality, thus seemingly purified, was restored. My new being was inhaling what appeared to me like the pure elements of other climes; it was so. My earthly body was beneath me. It was surrounded by friends and medical attendants—it was examined—and turned in various ways to call me back. I was then not more than two feet (according to the natural system of measurement) from them, over the head of the body, yet I was in eternity.

"Nothing which was done affected me. Several radiant beings were near to me—they were my companions to the Spirit-Home.

"When the surrounding elements passed into my lungs, I felt, like an infant, filled with life; when my heart beat, and sent the milk-white ether through my new and perfect organisation, I felt ready to go with my companions!

"We passed from the earth-sphere through the opening at one of the poles; *we met and observed several spirits on our way.*

"My eyes permitted me to see thousands of miles, whereas on earth I could only see inches.

"We arrived where we were attracted, and I knew that we had reached the *Second Spheres*. Thus I recognised your teachings.

"The society of which I am a member is in numbers innumerable. We are mutually fond of travelling through the different societies and portions of the Spirit-Home.

"On earth I was fond of mathematics and kindred studies; my desire for these acquirements is now totally satiated. Spiritual affinities are my studies now; and, ere long, I will disclose what I have learned"

Thus ended our brother's brief but highly interesting revelation. His concluding words refer to some future disclosures of spiritual things, which, when I receive them from him, shall be presented to the World.

I have yet another spiritual communication to record in this place, for the consolation of the mourner, and for the enlightening of the seeker after truth. It was imparted to me by an individual who lived on the earth several hundred years ago. Concerning his personal history and experience, I have derived no knowledge from the reading of books. That which he communicated I will relate as faithfully as I can possibly translate his revelation into the English language; but I can find words for only a fragment of what he breathed into my soul; as nearly as I can phrase the majesty of his thoughts, he thus addressed me:—

"Prayest thou for knowledge concerning that sublime resurrection which mankind has misnamed death? Prayest thou for light upon a *process*, which has been, and is now, on the earth, robed in the darkest horrors and mysteries—bedecked with the funeral pall, and veiled by ignorance? Yea, thou mayest not reply—the earnest and truest desires of thy mind are very distinct, being well defined. Let thy spirit, therefore, withdraw from the various objects and influences of earth; and let it comprehend and faithfully record the sweet and silvery notes, which, through me and thee, may musically instruct the earth's inhabitants concerning life and its diversified phenomena.

"Many centuries have rolled over the earth since I, as one among numerous inhabitants, lived and moved upon its surface. My thoughts and experience, while residing upon that planet, seem to me now like the shadows and outline of some unmeaning dream; my earth-life seems like a brief but an uneasy *night*, when contrasted with the perpetual and peaceful Day, which pervades the interior souls of those who dwell on the higher planes of the neighbouring sphere. Yet my experience, as I neared the termination of my residence on earth, was a perfect history of, and commentary upon, the influence of ignorance and mythology.

"Greece was my Country and my Idol; her inhabitants I loved as my children; and her beautiful institutions seemed to me like monuments of instruction and philosophy. But, as among children, there came discord there; the government of the country was divided into numerous Republics; and the people, looking with favour upon my temperament and attainments, placed me at the summit of their aspirations. Wherefore I became the governor, the instructor, and the lawgiver, of the once-beloved and adored Athens. The laws framed by me for the Athenians were none other than the desires of my inmost understanding; but, instead of orally imparting to the multitude the instinctive promptings and silent meditations of my own spirit, I caused them to be executed upon parchment; and I confidently depended upon the most devoted of my more immediate companions, who were well versed in my laws and reasons, to instruct, and improve, and harmonise the people. But hereby I experienced a truth, which all mankind should forthwith learn, that those who are esteemed as Teachers and Legislators of the land must not be *first* presented with, or taught, new forms or revelations of truth; for such minds, holding a temporary power over the people, will, in order to maintain their power and position, misrepresent and dethrone the medium or person through which the truth is unfolded to the world. Teach the People, not kings and governors; teach children, not strong adults, who feel immovable in their thoughts and philosophy. Had the people *known me*; had they but once contemplated the contents of my living

nature; I would not have been so unexpectedly dethroned, nor banished from those scenes which were enshrined in my misdirected affections. But I was constrained to depart into the interior of my native country—there to deplore the past, and interrogate the future. This change in my life and habits, was the beginning of my uneasiness concerning the issue of that event which is called Death.

"Mythology, though begemmed with unnumbered diamonds of truth, had robed my spirit in darkness. I sought and invoked the gods to preside over me when death frowned upon and claimed me as its victim. Nothing discoursed more forcibly and fearfully concerning the dreadfuraess of my metempsychosis than the long and still nights, which I endeavoured to illuminate and animate with constant wakefulness. Bui the words of the Judean shepherd sounded loud in my soul —Death is an everlasting sleep!' Whether in the forests of the Isle of Salamis; whether consulting the habitations of the gods; or whether contemplating the deep murmuring music of the Grecian gulf—yea, everywhere, I heard the voice of the Judean shepherd saying—'*Dark is the valley of the shadow of death*'—'*Death is an everlasting sleep!*'

"Three years subsequent to my dethronement, I was made aware of approaching dissolution. In view of this final termination to my existence my spirit sank into the depths of melancholy, and was veiled in night. I was imperfectly aroused from this darkness when there streamed to me a recollection of the doctrine which supposed *a resurrection of the [unclear: couls] of the good* that die, to live on some fair and heavenly isle for ever. And this favoured spot of earth—the beautiful retreat I had oft chosen for my meditations—was known as Salamis; out of which was to be born again that fairer Isle, anticipated and named, by Plato, the 'New Atlantis.' At the request of my few but faithful friends, I dictated to be written upon parchment, that my ashes should be scattered upon the sea which so constantly embraced and moaned about the fertile but solitary shores of the Salamis Isle.

"Being prostrated with disease for several week, it was easy to mark the progress of those physical changes to the *final* change which is termed death. This final change came upon me as my spirit was audibly deploring the fate of my dearly-beloved country. The sun had not yet disappeared in the west, when I was prompted to bid my friends farewell; and the change, like slumber, crept over me.

"As my sleep deepened, the room I occupied, together with the objects and persons therein, gradually faded away. The more I strove to maintain a consciousness of things about me, the more unconscious I became; until every avenue, which appeared to connect me with the outer world, was entirely and, as I thought, everlastingly closed. *Fear* and *desire* constituted the last links in the chain of life, lengthened to the end, which seemed about severing for ever. I *feared* lest the waves should not give up my scattered ashes, and waft them to the New Atlantis Isle; and my *desirs* was unto the gods, that their celestial presence should attend my death and revivify *the* divine power which animated *my* bodily frame. Immediately upon analysing these oppressive thoughts, I experienced a sudden rush of all the divine power (which dwelt in the hands and feet) into my encephalon or head. This was accompanied with a soft, tranquillising sensation that pervaded my entire nature, which peaceful calm was speedily followed by a state of total unconsciousness.

"How long I remained thus I could not tell; but I experienced a full return of the consciousness of my personality. This restoration of life was accompanied with many new and sweet influences; and my expanding thoughts caused me suddenly to feel that I could now understand more concerning the gods, and comprehend the nature of the soul's resurrection. A super-consciousness pervaded me; and my spirit was endowed with immortal sensibilities. The instant I realised, or thought I realised, this truth, my breast freely inhaled the soft and silvery air; my heart swelled with emotion, and beat the musical pulsations, which would naturally flow from an harmonious instrument. Inspired with these exalted sensations, and not realising *my* spirit's departure from the body which I had hitherto inhabited, I strove to open my eyes that I might again behold my friends, and relate to them the melody of my soul. I supposed that I should not die, and that I had but passed through a metamorphosis from illness and suffering to a renewed condition of life, which, endowing me with a superior power, would enable me to instruct and legislate for the Athenians.

"Gradually my senses opened, and, lo! instead of seeing the external forms of my friends, *I beheld their interior life, and read their inmost* thoughts—I saw them deploring, in tears, the departure of some dearly-beloved one from their midst; and directing my perceptions to where I saw them gaze, I beheld (in their thoughts) the body which I myself had worn! I Strove to tell them that that deserted tenement was nothing and that I possessed a body, and stood among them; but, instantly, I saw that there could be no communication between us; because they were living in one condition of being, and I in another; they could converse only through the instrumentality of the material senses, and I could discourse only through the pure mediums of thought and desire. But I was too highly inspired with new and comprehensive conceptions, to bestow much desire upon my friends in their attendance beside the lifeless body, which lay before me. I internally knew that it would yet be well with them; and this knowledge made *me* wholly passive concerning their feelings and destiny. Now my interior spiritual senses were soothingly closed; and now my exalted sensibilities gathered themselves into friendly groups throughout my nature. In a few moments I passed into a calm and profound

slumber.

"I was aroused from this serene and partial state of unconsciousness, by experiencing a peculiar breathing sensation upon my face and head, whereupon my eyes opened, and I beheld in the scenes and forms before *me*, more concentrated love and friendship, more grandeur and magnificence, than thou canst understand; thou couldst not comprehend, or record, what I saw Shall I tell thee that I realised the divine resurrection, which the gods had promised the early inhabitants of earth? Shall I tell thee that I stood upon the New Atlantis Isle? Yea, I believed the gods were faithful; and that the glorious *Republic* of immortal duration had arisen from out of the divine Salamis! A pure, serene air constantly entered my breast; my ear was entranced with the most liquid and silvery music, which seemed to float upon the atmosphere; and my eyes contemplated a boundless and magnificent country. Anon, I was inspired or penetrated with a divinity of ineffable sweetness. And a thought came before me, and said:—*Seek thou the things which draw thee most.* And, immediately. I was attracted to a group of friendly persons, whom I beheld conversing near me. What a thrill of unutterable joy ran through my now exalted nature, when among them I discovered and embraced *two of the dearest friends I ever knew in Athens!* This meeting, so unexpected and sweet, imparted to my soul more happiness than I had ever enjoyed on earth; and, from that moment, I began to unfold in love and wisdom. It was only by perpetual development, I learned that the gods did not bring me thither; and that the glorious country, of which I had become an inhabitant, was not, as I had supposed, the new-born republic of the isle of the sea—no; I learned of my higher life, and progressed to understand that I lived in a tenfold more heavenly state than my earthly imaginings had dreamed of—because, each inferior faculty of my nature was drawn up into intimate conjunction with the True, the Good, and the Divine.

"Thou seest now what a simple and ennobling process it is to die; thou seest now that there is no 'valley' of fearful 'shadows' to pass through; and that 'death' *is not* 'an everlasting sleep.' But I must tell thee that *it is only the good who die sweetly; for the troublesome or troubled spirit, is sometimes not quieted*, until after it has been, for a considerable length of time, removed from the earth, and until it has experienced the subduing and disciplining influences which pervade this divine habitation.

"The earth's inhabitants will now see (even though they do not believe it) that to die is to be born again; and that, to die sweetly, they should think, act, and unfold, in harmonious order; for the flower must have blossomed, though in rude places, peacefully and purely, out of whose heart rich fragrance flows to heaven!"

In introducing the foregoing observations, and the several spiritual communications, I desire to be apprehended aright. My motive for presenting them to the reader is identical with that which animated Friend Wilson, and actuated the Athenian lawgiver; is is, to familiarize the human mind with the process of dying, and with the uniform phenomena and consequences which attend the event of death. To the spiritually enlightened, these revealments will possess great weight, and afford much consolation; but to the external intellect, to the materialist, they will appear like the methodical hallucinations of an excited sensorium. To the last-named class I would say, that I depend not upon these spiritual observations and interior communications for a demonstration of the *reality* of an immediate resurrection and ascension of the spiritual body at the period of physical dissolution. I acknowledge and recommend no *authorities* but Nature and Reason. Hence, for proofs of the Immortality of the soul, I involuntarily turn from the unsatisfactory teachings of men and books, to the principles of nature, and to the sanctionings of my highest reason.

It surely is not safe, nor is it reasonable even, to believe, as many minds do, that the human soul is immortal, and that its resurrection from the grave is inevitable, merely because it is asserted that Jesus was seen subsequent to his crucifixion and burial. Nor is it reasonable to base all our hope and faith, in the immortality of the soul, upon the mere speculations and teachings of any form of sectarianism; because the reasoning mind full readily perceives the unsoundness and fallibility of such evidences; and a cold, unhappy, involuntary scepticism will be the certain consequence. Those who believe in the authority of men and books, and base their teachings thereupon, should understand that they cannot satisfy those who believe in the authority of Nature and Reason.

I refer to another portion of the Encyclopedia for an examination of the evidences of the soul's immortality and eternal progression. But, in this connection, I will state three conclusions to which a deep and far-reaching investigation into the USE and universal *tendency* of Nature conducted me. And these conclusions lead legitimately to more sublime and desirable ones, which the reader's own intuition and principle of reason will discover. We are immortal, because—

- I. *Nature was made to develop the human body;*
- II. *The human body was made to develop the human spirit; and*
- III. *Every spirit is developed and organised sufficiently unlike any other spirit, or substance in the universe, to maintain its individuality throughout eternal spheres.*

Each human spirit *possesses within itself eternal affinity of parts and powers;* which affinity there exists nothing sufficiently superior in power and attraction, to disturb, disorganise, and annihilate. These are evidences with which the world is not familiar; but they are plain and demonstrative; and are destined to cause

great happiness and elevation among men.

In [*unclear: eonelnsion*], I desire to impress the reader that there is nothing to fear, but much to love, in a purely natural or non-accidental death. It is the fair stranger which conducts the immortal soul to more glorious scenes and harmonious societies. Let mankind never lament because of the mere departure of an individual from our earth; for the change, though *add* and *cherless* to the material senses, is, to the interior vision, and to the ascending spirit, bathed in auroral splendour! To the enlightened mind "there is no more death;" "nor sorrow, nor crying," to those who live in constant Conjunction with Eternal Truth.

Let tranquillity reign throughout the chambers of the dying; but, when the body is cold, and when the immortal soul is gone, then calmly rejoice and sweetly sing, and be exceeding glad; for, when a body dies on earth, a soul is born in heaven!

You may rest upon the strong foundations of truth; may strive to live peacefully and purely on earth; may enrich and adorn the inner spirit with gems of scientific and philosophic knowledge; may wreath every thought with the sweet flowers of virtue; may robe every impulse with the mantle of contentment; for there is nothing lost by the putting off of mortality, and leaving the material and evanescent things of this world, to pursue life's journey amid immortal beauties in the Spirit-Land!

There are voices from the Spirit-Land which sound, to the inhabitants of earth, like the revelations of fancy; but the time will come—it is dawning on the world—when many men shall hear these voices and comprehend the mighty truths their tones impart. And then, when the hour of death arrives, the chamber of the departed will not resound with sighs and lamentations, but it will echo to the soothing strains of sweet and solemn music; and, there will be, not mournful and wordy prayers, and tearful discourses, but a quiet and holy passover.

The Great Problem Solved; Being Replies to the Question

"What have We got to Rely on, if We cannot Rely on the Bible?"

By the Right Rev. S. Hinds, D.D., Ex-Lord Bishop of Norwich, and Professor F. W. Newman.

With an Introduction by

J.G.S. Grant,

Editor of the "Saturday Review" and Author of "Delphic Oracle" "Ecce Homo," "American Hercules", Etc.

*"Hail! Holy Light,—offspring of Heaven, first-born,
Or of the Eternal co-eternal beam,—
May I express thee unblan'd? since God is light,
And never but in unapproach'd light
Dwelt from Eternity, dwelt then in thee,
Bright effluence of bright [*unclear: cassnce*] increate."*

—MILTON.

Dunedin: Mills, Dick and Co., Printers, -Stafford Street.

Price, One Shilling.

The Great Problem Solved.

*"He from thick films shall purge the visual ray,
And on the sightless cyeballs pout the day."*

LUTHER, in the 16th Century, stirred up Germany and Europe into open revolt against the so-called *infallible teaching* of the Christian Church. The Church—argued the German student—is not the true depository of Religious truth—it is not the true rule of faith and practice—it is not fee refuge from the storm and tempest of God's wrath against the sinful sons of men. But—object his enemies as well as his friends—"what have we got to rely on, if we cannot rely on the Church?" Oh! said Luther, the Bible is the only authority in matters of religion. The world, hitherto, has rested on the Church, but the Church itself rests on the Bible; therefore, to the law and to the testimony, and not to tradition, must we finally appeal. The Reformer put down under his foot one alleged infallible authority and set up, in its place, another standard of infallibility. The Reformer stood on his own manhood and protested against the errors, absurdities and superstitious of the Church, and betook himself to the study of the Bible. This, he argued, is the Word of God, and our duty is to examine it for ourselves. He claimed the right of private judgment; the privilege of a personal interpretation, according to the light of his understanding. To Luther and his Protestant followers, it never occurred that an infallible book, written in a foreign tongue, and in a remote age, required an infallible interpreter. They

assumed that the Bible was the revelation of God's mind and will. They, then, set about the work of interpretation. Luther translated it into the German tongue. Other Protestants followed suit. King James authorised a new version in the English language. Swarms of Commentaries in various languages, successively emanated from the labouring presses of Europe. During the last three Centuries, the right of private judgment has made sad havoc in the Protestant camp. There are now upwards of three hundred sects, distinguished for nothing so much as their mutual hostilities and suspicion. We have a Christian Babel of confusion and endless contradictions and inconsistencies. Meanwhile, a new and revised edition is daily expected. Christendom is drifting away from its old mooring. We are on the eve of a new and greater reformation than that of the 16th Century. As Bishop Hinds says: "We are now entering on a further stage of religious progress. Numbers are so startled at the exposure of some palpable errors, and even questionable rules of morality, in the Bible, that they are beginning to protest against its infallibility, as did a past generation against that of the Church." The Pope—says the Protestant—speaking *ex cathedra*, is not infallible. The Church in Council does not necessarily convey to us the will of God. It is mere human agency. Precisely so. But what is the Bible? Is it an infallible teacher? Is the preacher or the Commentator, or the Sect, any more oracular than the Roman Pontiff and Church? Who wrote the Bible? Certainly not God for no man, as we have often asserted in our writings, ever saw, or conversed with, God. The Apostle Paul says that "No man can approach unto, no man hath seen nor can see," God. The Apostle John says "No man hath seen God at any time." Again, says the beloved Apostle, "Ye have never heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape." Paul says that "God at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the Fathers by the Prophets." Observe, we have only the testimony, at second-hand, of those *prophets and fathers*, who alleged that they had "received the law by the disposition of angels," or messengers. We have simply their assertion for the proof that they were inspired by God, and received communications from the spirit world, through the medium of Angelic revelators. Now, this is precisely what the Modern Spiritualists daily assert. But who can credit such witnesses, or believe their alleged revelations? The Deity never "spake to the Fathers, save through faculties of mind.." We are told that the Bible is inspired. In other words that the writers are said to have written or spoken as the Spirit moved them. But we have only human testimony for that. To us there is absolutely no eternal *vox ex adydis*. The oracle of Delphi, or of Jerusalem, was believed to emanate, through human agency, direct from Apollo or Jehovah. Beyond one's own bosom a divine *afflatus* is absolutely impossible, mid is *always impreceptible*. An appeal is now being made, faintly and slowly, but surely, from the Bible to the human reason. The dogmas of Protestant Churches are quite as offensive to the reason, as were those of Rome. Indeed, the Roman Church in many respects, is more consistent in its line of procedure, than any of her Protestant daughters. She demands unyielding submission. They pretend to grant a show of reason, but ostracise it when it puts ugly and awkward questions. In our last issue of the SATURDAY REVIEW, we concisely summed up the cardinal elements of true religion, in one noetic verse. God, we wrote, hath shown clearly to us what is true religion. Here it is *in nuce*:

*"They deeds let sacred justice rule;
Thy heart let mercy fill;
And walking humbly with thy God,
To him resign thy will"*

Not what is written in a book, or preached from pulpits or altars, or enunciated from councils or shrines; but what is sanctioned by reason, which is a developed conscience, that is to us the only word of God.

"The primal virtues shine aloft as stars,
The charities that soothe and heal and bless."

Not the Church, nor the Bible, but reason is the foundation of religion. Not tenets of religion, but purity of heart can save the soul from corruption, and secure to man the favor and blessing of God. Reason is the revelation of the will of God, legibly written on the heart of man, and on the eternal Scriptures of the earth—the sea and the sky. "Religion" says Professor F. W. Newman, "is a life, not a mere theory."

Nature and the conscience—apart from a Bible—reveal the existence and character of God. As Newman says, "a belief in a holy God is necessarily prior to any rational belief in a Bible."

Natural religion has been choked up with the briars, thorns, thistles, and nettles of biblical dogmas and superstitions. Our business is to do justly, act mercifully, and to adore God humbly, but fervently; and leave the issue in his hands. Plato and Cicero did not dogmatise on the question of immortality; neither does Newman. They did not attain to a certainty, and certainly were not good from the selfish hope of reward; but they

practised virtue—just as they pursued knowledge—because of its intrinsic excellence. Let us—

"Hope humbly, then, with trembling pinions soar,
Wait the great teacher Death, and God adore"

As the Reformers of the 16th century threw away the authority of the Church, so the greater Reformers of the 19th century will have to cast aside the supernatural authority of the Hebrew leaves, and on reason and conscience build up true religion and a manly resolve. We must exercise the faculties given us by God. Human authority has paralysed the reason of man in religious matters. Hence "the mental emaciation which false teaching" has superinduced. Through the perversity and ignorance of preachers, who elaborately inculcate "the disuse of our religious faculties," the Protestant, no less than the Catholic, has well high lost his personal confidence in a personal God. Hence the prevalence of Atheism Pantheism, and practical irreligion. We have often, indirectly, called in question the orthodox religious notions of the day, and have been frequently taunted with the question—"What have we got to rely on, if we cannot rely on the Bible?" Our invariable reply was, Trust your own reason and conscience. Do not hang out your Hebrew lamp in the meridian splendor of the sun to light your path. Our views may be far a-head of the age; but, it appears from two small pamphlets published in England, the one by Professor F. W. Newman—*brother* of the Rev. John Newman, who left the Anglican for the Roman communion—and the other By the Lord Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Hinds, who resigned his office in 1857, that this view of ours is the goal "towards which numbers in all Protestant countries are now progressing." There is a new and glorious religious reformation just dawning—compared to which the Protestantism of the last reformation was only the lispings of babes in swaddling clothes. Men are now earnestly asking to be delivered from the thralldom of Protestant superstition, and appealing to conscience and reason as the ultimate authority on things pertaining to God, religion, and the salvation of the soul from error, sin, and every sort of defilement. The soul of humanity is opening its eyes from the lethal sleep of ages.

Professor Newman and the English Bishop had been importuned by the publisher of these two pamphlets to reply to the question—"What have we got to rely on, if we cannot rely on the Bible?" We hereby publish their answers. We may remark that the Bishop's reply is even more satisfactory to us than that of the Professor. It is gratifying to find that men are slowly but surely feeling their way out of darkness into the light—out of the Cimmeria of bigotry and superstition into the glorious religion of light and liberty. Our own views—albeit in advance of this illiterate age—receive fresh confirmation of their philosophical soundness from the evident tendencies of modern thought, and specially from such cheering approximations of religious ideas as are to be found in the two following sixpenny pamphlets, which we publish at the English price, albeit our market is very limited, and the cost of printing four-fold dearer than it would be at home: besides, we throw a third pamphlet in the form of an introduction into the bargain. May this little book, under Divine Providence, open the eyes of the blind, and purge the souls of the ignorant from the dross of error, falsehood, and superstition. May the reader rise from its perusal intellectually illuminated, morally refreshed, and religiously regenerated.

Reply No. 1., By Professor F. W. Newman.

My Dear Scott,—

You write to me a pressing letter, begging me to reply (since your own replies, somehow or other, do not bring satisfaction,) to those who ask, "What have we got to rely on, if we cannot rely on the Bible?"

I have written two books which expressly treat this question at largo. The one is called "The Soul the other, which is the more mature and comprehensive work, is called 'Theism,' that is, the doctrine of God; and aims to develop the religion which is common to Judaism, Christianity, and Moham-medism. I have very little confidence that I can treat so great a subject concisely, with much chance of giving satisfaction. A short reply can easily *confute the* questioner, if he is a more objector; but it cannot possibly give him peace and rest of soul, if he is sincerely uneasy;—for two reasons; first, because the mind of the questioner is clearly unexercised; next, because *religion is a life*, not a mere theory; and it is only by the life of religion that faith in God can grow up into active force.

I. I have already move than once printed what, I think, is a sufficient *confutation* of those who fancy that the Bible can ever be the ultimate restingplace of legitimate and wanly faith.

If we be ever so sure that the Bible is dictated by a superhuman Mind, this cannot be to us any guarantee of

truth, while that mind is unknown to us. We cannot talk of the book's being *guaranteed* to us by God, unless we first know both that there *is* a God, and what *sort* of God he is; that he attends to our conduct; approves of our virtue, and of our justice; disapproves of our vice and injustice; is likely to send us a book to teach us; is himself Holy and good. Until we know all this, the Bible cannot have authority, if it be ever so much a book from him. A book written by a Fairy or a Devil would not have the more authority, though the Fairy were to say, "I am not capricious; or the Devil, "I am not malignant." We need to know the moral character of the Spirit who dictates the book, *independently* of what that Spirit says of himself in the book. A lying Spirit will tell lies his word is absolutely' worthless. We must know that the inspirer of the book is truthful, wise, and good, by some *surer* mode than by his own word. His self-laudation goes for nothing, unless we first know his character. Hence, until we have something surer than God's *word*, God's *word* is invalid as an authority.

I have here laboriously said in many lines what will go into few, because I find people to be upon this matter wonderfully dull and puzzle-headed. No one believes a man to be truthful upon his own testimony. It is equally irrational to believe an *unknown* Spirit to be truthful upon his own testimony. We need to believe God to be truthful and good *because we see it ourselves*, and not because he tells us. Until then, we have no foundation for religion in any imaginable Bible.

Now if, prior to and independent of book-authority, we know that God exists, and is truthful and good (which is the highest and most important of all truths), surely it is absurd to say that Man, without an authoritative Bible, has no religious foundation; or to undervalue that revelation which God has given us of himself, in the universe and in the human heart. And to undervalue it, is nothing but a modern, a contemptible, and, I may add, a detestable heresy. It is not found in the Old Testament, nor yet in the New, nor in the ancient Christian Fathers, nor even in the Catholic Church. It is nothing but the error of a very narrow Protestantism, which insists on looking into a book for what cannot be found there. And this evidently bréala down of itself, the moment a missionary attempts to preach the gospel to the heathen. Not one was ever so unwise as to go to a barbarian and say, "Believe that there is a God, *because* this Book says that there is a God; moreover that he is Holy, Just, Loving, and True." This could only [*unclear: esiest*] the reply, "What is the Book to me? What do I know about it, that I should believe it?" But the preacher says boldly: "The God who made Heaven and Earth, the God who abhors wickedness and loves righteousness, commands you to repent of your sins, calls you to do justice, to love mercy, and adore God humbly." And, if he can get the intelligence of the hearers, as he generally can, to accept this statement, as verified by the world around and by the conscience within, he further proceeds to set before the hearer the great gravity of *Sim*—presses on him that he needs some mode of acquittal from Guilt and Punishment, and urges him to flee from the Wrath to come. (Such, at least, is the ordinary process.) If he can gain this second step, he takes a third, and propounds a salvation from heaven and a Saviour. Of course, if the hearer asks how *this* is known, the preacher at last brings in the Bible and the Apostles and the other Christian apparatus. Such is the outline of what not only the first preachers did, but what all reasonable missionaries do,—all whom a Protestant will endure; for to act upon barbarians by carrying about pictures and flags and such like sensuous demonstrations, does not approve itself to us. It is therefore really too late, and too absurd, for Protestant Christians to deny or doubt that the belief in a holy God is necessarily prior to any rational belief in a Bible. The Bible may perhaps build something *more* upon the foundation, but cannot lay the foundation. If it cannot be laid independently of the Bible, it can never be laid at all. And nothing that a Bible can build upon Natural Religion (so called) can ever be half so valuable as that which pre-existed—the belief in God, Holy and Good. To undervalue this belief is the weakest form of Scepticism, the direct token of religious rottenness.

II. What has made so many Protestants thus weak? What has sapped the energy of their faith in God? Principally the perversity and ignorance of preachers, who elaborately inculcate the disuse of our religious faculties. If any one were to dandle a child it: arms long after he ought to run about, Were to have him drawn in a Bath chair or carried in a Utter, and never allow his foot to touch the ground, the boy's muscles would never grow, his legs would be spindles; and if, some day, his vehicles were suddenly withdrawn, he would wallow on the ground miserably, and groan out that God had never made man to walk. This is a close representation of the *mental emaciation* which false teaching induces. The hearer is made simply receptive of notions authoritatively poured in. All independent thought is repressed and crippled, through alarm lest it reject something in the authoritative Bible; lest it distinguish some things in the Bible, as not only certainly true, but as prior certainties, and thereby become conscious of power to sit in judgment on the book itself. When a great body of preachers in a succession of generations dread lest the human mind become conscious of power, their hearers collectively cannot but be dwarfed in religious intelligence. Such is the state of a very great mass of English devotees. When these discover that their basis is unsound—that the book which they had assumed to be infallible, is no more so than the infallible Church or Pope, they must not expect all at once to recover normal robustness of mind. They have been taught systematically to distrust the human faculties and to abstain from fundamental thought; and then they almost reproach such as you, because you cannot give them, that faith in

Man, which is but a part of faith in Man's Creator. *the faith* is simply this,—that to Man collectively, to normal Man, God has given all that God sees needful "for life and godliness;" hence, so long as sure knowledge is strictly unattainable, neither is it necessary for that measure of perfection for which God designs us, which also he claims of us. *Natural talents*, which are diligently cultivated, increase immensely in force; but if they are not cultivated, dwindle. Still, while vitality is strong, even late in life much may be done to retrieve past neglect: and in this ease it is, in general, only one side or corner of the mind which has been neglected. The man who in religion has been merely receptive and credulous, may have been active-minded and bold in other studies or occupations: hence with time and exercise, even when the crutches are pulled from under him, his limbs may gradually recover normal strength.—Yet not all at once; he must have time.

However, I believe that such questions as you say are put to you, are oftenest *not* put by persons who here really ceased to rely on the Bible; they are meant merely as arguments to shut your mouth. To such, the proper reply is that of my first head. They are alarmed for *others*, not uneasy *themselves*. Because they cannot swim they fancy that others cannot; and do not believe that they could ever themselves learn. If they will never go into the water—probably not. If they will not accept a proved truth, because they do not yet foresee all the consequences to which it may lead, they have very little love of truth, and they are never likely to learn much. They deserve no sympathy, for they are not suffering. Why distress yourself about them?

III. But, next, the religion of which we speak is not, what a Greek philosopher or Herbert Spencer would make it, a part of Physics, an effort to solve the problem of Cosmogony; it is an opening of the human heart to the consciousness of a present living, ruling God. All Christians revere the saying: "Blessed the pure in heart for they shall see God." They believe it (I hope), not *only* because they find it written in a book, but *also* because they see it true and find it true. If so, they will not cease to believe it, when they cease to trust the book as authoritative. But some one has said, "Selfishness is Hell, and Love is Heaven." Those who, with Paul, study whatever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report, whatever is virtuous and praiseworthy; who with James wait for the wisdom from above, pure, peaceable, full of mercy, and good fruits;—are certainly not far from the consciousness of Heaven and of God's presence. The love of man ordinarily leads, by a pretty short cut, both to the knowledge of God and to the love of God: and how else did [*unclear*: Apostles] get it? Let none imagine that outward sights or miracles avail. What signifies it to see a bright light or hear a voice? To fling away selfishness, to live for others, to form noble aims, to mortify, mean and base desires, to limit our personal needs and personal indulgences, that we may the better support the weak,—all such moral inward development is to become nobler and *calmer*, and will, if anything can, quell religious agitations at the loss of a favorite old error. If any one has dropt belief in God entirely, with his belief that the Bible is immaculate, his paralysis is gone very far, if I may speak thus dogmatically; but if, while thus losing his belief, he is distressed at the loss, my full persuasion is, that by cultivating all noble and loving sentiment he will win back a creed wiser and happier [*unclear*: than] the old. But this is no task for mere logic. The weapons of the warfare are spiritual.

But here, you tell me, that when you speak to this effect, people reply,—"It is all true, but they *cannot* be good." Christians and Jews may with reason say this as well as others. Pure perfect goodness cannot be in finite beings; we do but make approaches, each in his own measure, struggling up, day by day, to something higher. Have you really met with so much as one person, who seriously says to you: "While I believed the Bible to be an infallible book, I was conscious of inward power from God to be good (in my measure): his grace supported me in right doing, But, alas! since I have lost my belief in the Bible, I have lost all inward power to be good, in the sense and measure in which I *was* good before." I never knew such a case. I can only conceive of it in one who has been taught morality *on false dogmatic foundations*; and when he finds these to be rotten, is carried into immorality by the force of temptation. This is a lamentable possibility, and the recovery may be slow. But then, it is not you whom he must blame, but the dogmatic system. By this, I do not mean the Bible, but the modern narrowing down of everything to the Bible. At the same time, here also I suspect that your complainant, who says, "I *cannot* be good," is not speaking for his actual, but for his theoretical self; and means only to say, "I *think* I *should* lose moral power, if I were to lose my faith in live Bible." A sufficient reply is, "Perhaps so, if your morality is puerile and ill-founded; if not, not."

IV. But, after all, I may be told that I quite misstate the case. Your complainant believes in all Natural Religion, but is sad to lose confidence in those things which the Bible has *superadded* to Natural Religion; and his question was, "What have we got to rely on *concerning Immortality or a Futnre State.*, if we cannot rely on the Bible?" or, "What assurance can I have *concerning my own Salvation*, if, &c.?" I conjecturally insert such words. At this one must ask, Is it a selfish fear that distresses you? Where did you learn to be afraid that God would be hard upon you? If past guilt, in which you have injured *other*, *lies* on you conscience, and you did not make restitution to the utmost of your power while you were a Biblist, such peace as you then had was false and rotten. Let us hope better things. But if nothing of guilt remains, but sin against yourself and God, do you suppose your personality no mighty that God is a sufferer by you? Can you imagine that he desires anything

else but your goodness? If you fear his *vengeance*, whence did you learn to fear? These fears are mere indications that you have not yet duly unlearned the errors of your old creed. His only "vengeance" is felt in the natural consequences of sin and crime, which he is too wise to repeal.

But if the complainant's selfishness take this form, "Alas! I thought I was going to have immortal glory, to sit on a throne with the Almighty Judge, to wear a crown, and to judge the nations with Him, but you, Mr. Scott! have cruelly robbed me of my delicious dream: *what do you give me back for it?*" I think you may safely reply, "The chance of learning to be less selfish." The *true Heaven* does not consist in aspirations quite ridiculous in puny man, but rather in self-forgetfulness; in that faith which says, "Let me do the will of God, and be swallowed up in his work. Conscious that his goodness is perfect, let me spend not a thought *on* the contingencies of my future, which he will provide as his wisdom sees good."

So much for self. But I am gravely sensible that these is another view of *Immortality* in which self is quite forgotten; in which the enlargement of man's destiny beyond the grave is viewed as ennobling our nature, and assuaging the grief with which we see human afflictions end in dark moral degradation. Such a doctrine of Immortality is incumbered with severe logical difficulties to a Theist, but with *fewer* (I think) *than those which meet a Biblical Christian*. To speak egotistically;—in my book on the 'Soul,' I expressed little but negations concerning the doctrine of Immortality: in my book called Theism, I have elaborately developed all the arguments which commend themselves to me. When I read them, I find them very powerful. Some of them are even short enough, if sound, to generate vivid electric faith. The discomfort to me is, that they do not wholly refute, they rather outweigh, arguments on the other side; and where you deal with a balanced argument, you strike the balance differently, I believe, in different frames of mind, Perhaps when I am too much pre-engaged by sense, and too little devout, the spiritual arguments for Immortality lose force with me. Whether that is the explanation, I cannot tell: but I frankly confess, that what at one time I think to bring full conviction, at another time seems overbalanced by objections. I do not at all imagine (hat I have solved the problem. I sometime think that the half-faith which I sustain may be precisely the thing most wholesome to man: and indeed, is it not unreasonable to expect to see clearly through such a veil as Death? Yet there are Theists, as Theodore Parker, and Muzzini, and earlier, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, with whom Immortality was an axiom. When many minds cultivate hoi [*unclear: less*] and piety independently, will not their co-operation gradually develop higher and surer truths than we have yet attained? Let your complainant exercise the grace of waiting for light, and of hoping that more light may dawn on our successors than God has yet granted to us.

Reply No. 2, By S. Hinds.

My Dear Sir,—

You tell me that you are pressed with the question, "If we cannot rely en the Bible, what have we to rely on?" It is prompted, I presume, by a feeling akin to that which caused our Lord's Apostles to exclaim, on one occasion, "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life." (John vi. 68) It is a question which you cannot but respect, and even sympathise with, although you may not be under its disquieting influence. But he who is, may be reminded that, in these latter days of Christianity, a question of the like import, and prompted by the like feeling, has once already disquieted the minds of Christians, and has nevertheless been answered to the satisfaction of, at all events, numbers in their successive generations. When the errors and malpractices of the Roman Catholic Church were impelling multitudes to protest against it and quit it, the question was, "If we cannot rely on the Church, what have we to rely on?" There is a natural craving after some *infallible leaching*, in matters of Religion, which was thought too reasonable to be denied, and the Bible was proposed and accepted as the substitute, in this respect, for the Church; *that*, though not the Church, was pronounced to be infallible. We are now entering on a *farther stage* of religious progress. Numbers are so startled at the exposure of some palpable errors, and even questionable rules of morality, in the Bible, that they are beginning to pretest against its infallibility, as did a past generation against that of the Church, and thus the question is revived, "If we cannot rely on the Bible, what have we to rely on?"

A scoffer might be disposed to say, "This reminds one of the Eastern theory of the earth's resting-place. It was supported *on* an elephant. But what supports the elephant? A tortoise. And what supports the tortoise? No answer. Even so, it may be suggested, the Church was made the first resting-prop for the Christian world. When driven to find one on which to rest the Church, it was the Bible. Now, objections being urged against that, what underlies it? Nothing." That such, however, is not the ease, may, I think, be shown satisfactorily, and without drawing on the unreasoning credulity of any. Let me preface what I have to say for this purpose by observing

that the protest against the Church formerly, and that which is now gathering strength against the Bible, have not been protests against either Church or Bible in respect of their legitimate character and use; but against each and both as *infallible teachers* of religious truth. And now for the question which you are called on to answer.

I. Firstly, to assume, by *à priori* reasoning, that God must have provided an infallible teaching of religious truth, is more than we have any reasonable right to do. It may seem to us to be requisite and indispensable; but we are not competent judges of this. The rational, and humble, and pious course unquestionably is, to ascertain, in the first instance, what is actually the religious provision made for us by our Creator, and to accept this, and endeavour to regulate our life and faith by it, whether or not it corresponds to anticipations founded on *à priori* reasoning.

II. Secondly, in the instances of infallible teaching, or rather, in those which have been successively recognised as such, all that has been apparent has been human agency, the divine agency having been always imperceptible. The Roman Catholic Church represents itself to be the working of the divine mind within a human exterior; but whatever its members may believe of this assumption, all that they are actually conversant with, the entire of its teaching, comes to them from priests and councils, through words spoken or written by men of the like passions with themselves. There is no *vox ex adylis*, no sign or sound divine. Protestants, whatever degree of sanctity they may ascribe to the scriptures, whatever extent of inspiration they may assert for their authorship, *derive all their religious instruction from human teaching*. What they see is a book, confessedly the work of man's hand, the *interpretation of which is* their instruction, and this interpretation is, and ever must be, human, whether embodied in Church formularies, derived from the lips of a pastor or other trusted individual, or acquired through the exercise of their own human faculties on the contents of the book. Place the divine infallibility where you will, the human fallibility must come between you and it. The book itself is man's report of God's Word, and of all that is asserted to be divine in and concerning his record of it. Reliance on the Bible, therefore, does not mean reliance of the same kind as when we speak of relying on God, or on a fellow-creature, or on any fact; such, *e.g.*, as the continuance of the course of nature. It is, if I may be allowed the expression, a compound reliance,—a reliance on an aggregate of what is divine and what is human. Why should it shock and bewilder your questioner to have it pointed out to him, that that which is human is necessarily fallible, and that this fallibility affects the aggregate. He could never, if he has duly reflected on the matter, have imagined that he could rely either on the interpretation of Scripture or on Scripture itself, independently of the exercise on both of those natural faculties which God has bestowed on us, and as possessing which God addresses us when His gracious purpose is to make us wise unto salvation. It is this joint working that St. Paul impressed on the Christians of Philippi when he told them (Philippi ii. 12, 13), "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure,"—worketh with us, not without us, and not only in doing His will, but in acquiring that knowledge of Him, which it is His will and good pleasure to reveal to us.

III. Thirdly, whilst the attention of the religious world has been absorbed in contemplating *the shift* from one infallible teacher, or supposed infallible teacher, to the other, a change, not less important and more permanent, has been simultaneously going on in the fuller and still fuller recognition of an *appeal to human reason* on all questions concerning divine revelation. The first bold step in this direction was taken in respect of Church infallibility. It was canvassed, it was brought to the test of human reasoning, it was roughly handled, and overthrown—overthrown, perhaps, is too strong a word—but, at all events, amongst a large section of Christendom it was undoubtedly denuded of its most extravagant pretensions. An advance from this to an examination of the claim for the Bible to be recognised as the infallible teacher was inevitable. To some extent it was entered on even in the first stages of Protestantism, but tenderly and timidly. Certain portions of the Bible were rejected from the infallible document. What was left, however, was not as yet thought to be questionable. The free exercise of man's reasoning powers found employment in the interpretation of the sacred volume. All agreed that the Scriptures were infallible; but this infallibility was no infallible teaching unless those who interpreted the Bible interpreted it rightly. Where resided the infallible interpreter? For any Protestant Church to have asserted this qualification would have been to revive the pretensions of the Church from which all had separated, and on the decisions of which all had freely exercised their reasoning powers. Was human reason, then, to be supreme even in religious matters? The admission of this principle was unavoidable; its full establishment might be slow and gradual, but eventually it was certain. In the meantime, even in its first development, it gave rise to a *new feature* in the Christian world—at least, in Western Christendom—the formation of sundry churches with no positive bond of union between them; only the negative bond of dissent from Rome. I do not mean that they had nothing positive in common; but that the only common ground on which they could combine for any joint action, was the negative one of being anti-Romanist. Subsiding into this condition, Protestant Christendom has gone on ever since, admitting an exercise of human reasoning in the interpretation of the Bible, but struggling, with more or less of conscious inconsistency, both against the actual fallibility of interpretation as authoritatively set forth in its formularies, and also against the further exercise of

that reasoning faculty—which once released from its shackles, was sure to extend its [*unclear: flod*] of operation,—on the authority of the Scriptural document, on the limits of its infallibility, on its claim, either wholly or partially, to infallibility. This is the stage which we cannot be said to have reached, but towards which numbers in all Protestant countries are now progressing. Amongst these are many, no doubt, who, like your questioner, are slow to admit the *sufficiency of those reasoning powers*, the exercise of which has led them thus far. Considerations such as I have ventured to suggest may help to assure them, that it is appointed to man thus to seek and attain the knowledge that is from above, as well as that which is of the earth.

Permit me to say a word or two more on one feature in this direction of progressive thought, which has hitherto marked its course, and is now as prominent as ever. It is the paramount importance which is given to religious knowledge. It would seem to be taken as an indisputable principle, as indeed it has been from a *very* early period in the history of Christianity, that our chief religious care should be to determine all that we can concerning God and our unseen and future condition. Now this comprises topics concerning which, once sanctioned the exercise of reasoning, there must ever be a widespread disagreement. The affixing of a creed to a church, embodying all that has been determined by its founders or rulers, is a signal of dissent from, if not of actual hostility to, other churches; and, in no long time, a source of division and discord within each separate community; in the Church of England, at present, carried to an excess which makes it difficult for the different parties to be comprehended in it, notwithstanding the latitude permitted; to say nothing of the large dissenting bodies who find it impassible to remain in it. Is not this, which is confessedly an unchristian condition, enough to suggest a doubt, whether we are not making too much of religious knowledge or belief, in short of the Christian creed. Notwithstanding all the force which may belong to the argument for it from the unbroken tradition of many centuries, when we reflect on all that doctrinal tests have given rise to, the atrocities committed by Christians on Christians, the individual and wholesale persecutions, the bloody wars, is there not enough to make it questionable whether Christians are right in presuming that it is a creed which is required of them above all things? Of two revelations from God to us, whether you include in the sources of them Scripture, or not, He has given us something like infallible teaching for the one, and has [*unclear: denied*] it, practically denied it to us, for the other. Religious life, the observance of justice, charity, and other moral requirements, of faith, too, in God, and a recognition of responsibility for all matters wherein He has given us free-will to do or not to do, in all this the will of God is so revealed to us that every one, without doubt, can comprehend and conform to it. The religious creed, on the other hand, the knowledge of and belief in the doctrines of a Trinity, an Atonement, an Incarnation, the Personality of the Holy Ghost, Justification, Sanctification are matters which do not admit of the same ready and universal acceptance, and which have been the occasion of much unchristian strife and cruelty, of much which is condemned by that oilier revelation of the divine will, which is alone capable of being made a universal symbol of God's people. It is not the holding of these doctrines of which I am speaking, but the requiring from those who unite in one religious body that they shall hold them, one and all; that their symbol of fellowship must be, not the living principle which is evidenced by a Christian life, but the assent to certain formularies embodying these points of knowledge and belief. Men who lead religious lives may surely be still of one religious society, although they may not agree in thinking alike on such topics. Men may surely worship God, side by side, if that worship consists of simple prayer and praise not stamped with professions of doctrine. Agree to differ, and the very differences are likely to be diminished when they are no longer the battlefield for controversy. Tenets are the appropriate bond and symbol of philosophical and political associations, because tenets express the object for which the members unite; but the ultimate object of religious union consists, not in aught which is set forth in the tenets of religion, however high and holy that may be, but in holy living, in obedience to a law that is written within as well as without us, in that purity of heart without which no man shall see God.

When, therefore, you are asked, "If we cannot rely on the Bible, what have we to rely on?" you may reply, Will you be left comfortless, without infallible guidance and teaching, as to one great section of divine revelation,—God's will respecting man's life? But the questioner is not satisfied. He asks for a corresponding certainty in what he is to think and believe concerning the nature of the divine Being, the mode of His intercourse with us, the whole scheme of His appointments for man, now and hereafter. Habituated to clothe his piety in the rich garb of an elaborate creed, what is to become of me, he exclaims, if the materials out of which this precious inheritance has been fabricated are not as surely and as essentially my religion as justice and mercy, simple faith and childlike devotion? Say to such an one, in the words of an Apostle, "Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God; shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?" (Romans ix, 20.) On whom ought you to charge your disquietude—on God, if it appears that He has not provided the like plain evidence for your creed, or on man who has assumed that He ought and must have done so, and has built up this system, and, not only so, but has caused it to take precedence of, if not to supersede altogether, that portion of His Revelation which He has made as dear to us as if he had written it on the sky; which needs no learned interpretation, for it is not a matter of learning; which is fitted to bind His people

together without the possibility of their union being dissolved through dissent about it; which is, after all, the Revelation to which we instinctively turn, when appeal is made from any portion of a creed which is thought to be inconsistent with a divine revelation? Say to such an one, that his misgiving savours of mistrust in God, who has made us as it seemed best to him, and, as it seemed best to him, has placed us in circumstances which call for the exercise of the faculties with which he has endowed us, and has so ordered it, that in the exercise of those faculties alone He is revealed to us, whether they be exercised on His volume of nature, or on Scripture. The source of revelation may be either; but the revealer is man himself. Bid him, moreover, be on his guard against substituting a vain and presumptuous prying into the hidden things of the Lord, for the desire to know Him by seeking to conform to his will. The tree of knowledge in the garden of Eden, the craving after which caused Adam and Eve to be banished from the tree of life, may serve as an emblem to us. We, too, in our eager pursuit after forbidden knowledge, may find ourselves wandering far away from the life which is destined otherwise to nourish and prepare us for Heaven.

Dunedin:

Mills, Dick and Co., Printers, Stafford Street.

MDCCCLXXI.