Birla Central Library
PILANI (Rajasthan)
Class No :- 808.8
Book No :- I53T V3
Accession No :- 39605

PATRICK HENRY DELIVERING HIS SPEECH OF 1765.

PHOTOGRAVURE AFTER THE PAINTING
BY P. F. ROTHERMEL.

THE artist represents the tumultuous and conflicting passions aroused by the famous peroration of Patrick Henry's speech to the Virginia House of Burgesses. This great radical leader of the anti-British party pleads for the immediate arming of the Virginian militia, declares that war is inevitable, and concludes "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"

Text Matter

INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY Reading Course

A DISTINCTIVE AND INDEPENDENT LIBRARY OF REFERENCE

SPECIAL INTRODUCTIONS BY
RT. HON. AUGUSTINE BIRRELL, K.C.
SIR GILBERT PARKER, K.T., D.C.L.

International University Society
OFFICES : I.U.S. HOUSE, ARBORETUM STREET, NOTTINGHAM ; AND AT
LONDON GLASGOW BELFAST TORONTO SYDNEY NEW ZEALAND

COPYRIGHT
BY
INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
SOCIETY

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
FOR INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY SOCIETY
BY WALTER BLACK & CO., LTD., NOTTINGHAM & LONDON

M

International University
Reading Course

Reference must be made to
Question Brochures issued by the Society to its Members
for Direction by Specialists in each Subject

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION III.

	LIVED	PAGE
INTRODUCTION " Of Studies." FRANCIS BACON.		1
ATTERBURY, FRANCIS Under which King ?	1662-1732	3
BURKE, EDMUND The Impeachment of Warren Hastings.	1729-1797	10
CARDUCCI, GIOSUÈ The Work of Dante.	1836-1907	68
CATO, MARCUS (THE ELDER) Woman's Rights.	234-149 B.C.	74
CHATHAM, LORD The English Constitution.	1708-1778	76
CHESTERTON, GILBERT K. The Superstitions of the Sceptic.	1874-	84
CLARENDON, EARL OF (EDWARD HYDE) In John Hampden's Case.	1608-1674	91
COBBETT, WILLIAM The Man on the Tower. On Reform and Reformers.	1762-1835	93
COBDEN, RICHARD Free Trade with all Nations. Small States and Great Achievements.	1804-1865	101

	LIVED	PAGE
COLERIDGE, JOHN DUKE Is Marriage a Sacrament ?	1820-1894	114
COUSIN, VICTOR Liberty an Inalienable Right. The Foundations of Law.	1792-1867	120
CULPEPER, SIR JOHN Against Monopolies.	? -1660	126
CURRAN, JOHN PHILPOT For Free Speech. Against Pensions. England and English Liberties. Farewell to the Irish Parliament.	1750-1817	130
DILKE, SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH America in the Crucible. Omphalism.	1843-1911	143
ELIOT, SIR JOHN On the Petition of Right.	1592-1632	153
FALCONER, SIR ROBERT A. Reactions on Canadian Nationalism.	1867-	160
FALKLAND, LORD Ship Money—Impeaching Lord Keeper Finch.	1610-1643	163
GEORGE, D. LLOYD Citadel of Peace and Liberty.	1863-	168
HAMPDEN, JOHN A Patriot's Duty Defined.	1594-1643	171
HENRY VIII. Last Speech in Parliament.	1491-1547	175
HOLBORNE, SIR ROBERT In Defence of John Hampden.	c. 1594-1647	178

	LIVED	PAGE
HUME, DAVID	1711-1776	183
The Sceptical Philosophy.		
JUNG, C. G.	1875-	191
The Psychological Foundations of Belief in Spirits.		
KNOX, JOHN	1505-1572	199
Against Tyrants.		
LAMARTINE, ALPHONSE MARIE LOUIS	1790-1869	206
The Revolution of 1848.		
MACAULAY, THOMAS BABINGTON	1800-1859	213
A Tribute to the Jews. Consent or Force in Government. The Gates of Somnauth.		
MACDONALD, J. RAMSAY	1866-	232
The Social Implications of Christianity.		
MACPHERSON, HECTOR C.	1888-	237
The Universe as Revealed by Modern Astronomy.		
MANSFIELD, CHIEF-JUSTICE	1705-1793	248
In the Case of John Wilkes.		
PANKHURST, MRS. EMMELINE	—— ——	251
The Importance of the Woman's Vote.		
PARKER, THEODORE	1810-1860	263
Daniel Webster.		
PENN, WILLIAM	1644-1718	267
Principles of Magna Charta.		
PLATO	427-347 B.C.	272
The Character of the Philosopher. The Allegory of the Cave. A Myth concerning the Soul.		

	LIVED	PAGE
PULTENEY, WILLIAM Against Standing Armies.	1684-1764	287
ROOSEVELT, T. Pioneers.	1858-1919	293
RUSKIN, JOHN War.	1819-1900	299
SALEEBY, CALEB W. Biology and History. The Psychology of Parenthood. Sunlight and Disease.	1875-	322
SCHOPENHAUER, ARTHUR Style.	1788-1860	350
TALFOURD, SIR THOMAS NOON The Queen against Moxon.—Shelley as a Blasphemer.	1795-1854	359
WALLER, EDMUND The Tyrant's Plea, Necessity.	1605-1687	376
WALPOLE, SIR ROBERT AND HORACE The Debate with Pitt in 1741. On Patriots. On the Peerage Bill.	1676-1745 1717-1797	382
WILBERFORCE, WILLIAM Horrors of the British Slave Trade in the Eighteenth Century.	1759-1833	396

INTRODUCTION

OF STUDIES

FRANCIS BACON

STUDIES serve for delight, for ornament, and for ability. Their chief use for delight is in privateness and retiring ; for ornament, is in discourse ; and for ability, is in the judgment and disposition of business. For expert men can execute, and perhaps judge of particulars, one by one ; but the general counsels, and the plots and marshalling of affairs, come best from those that are learned. To spend too much time in studies is sloth ; to use them too much for ornament is affectation ; to make judgment wholly by their rules is the humour of a scholar. They perfect nature, and are perfected by experience ; for natural abilities are like natural plants, that need pruning by study ; and studies themselves do give forth directions too much at large, except they be bounded in by experience. Crafty men contemn studies ; simple men admire them, and wise men use them : for they teach not their own use ; but that is a wisdom without them and above them, won by observation. Read not to contradict and confute ; nor to believe and take for granted ; nor to find talk and discourse ; but to weigh and consider. Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested : that is, some books are to be read only in parts ; others to be read, but not curiously ; and some few to be read wholly, and with diligence and attention. Some books also may be read by deputy, and extracts made of them by others ; but that would be only in the less important arguments, and the meaner sort of books ; else distilled books are like common distilled waters—flashy things. Reading maketh a full man ; conference a ready man ; and writing an exact man. And therefore, if a man write little, he had need have a great memory ; if he confer little, he had need have a present wit ; and if he read little, he had need have much cunning, to seem to know that he doth not. Histories make men wise ; poets witty ; the mathematics subtile ; natural philosophy deep ; morals grave ; logic and rhetoric able to contend. *Abeunt studia in mores.* (Studies pass into character). Nay, there is no stond or impediment in the wit but may be wrought out by fit studies : like as diseases of the body may have appropriate exercises. Bowling is good for the stone and veins; shooting for the lungs and breast; gentle walking for the stomach; riding for the head; and the like. So if a man's wit be wandering, let him study the mathematics; for in demonstrations, if his wit be called away never so little, he must begin again: if his wit be not apt to distinguish or find differences, let him study the schoolmen; for they are *cymini sectores*: if he be not apt to beat over matters, and to call up one thing to prove and illustrate another, let him study the lawyers' cases: so every defect of the mind may have a special receipt.

FRANCIS ATTERBURY

(1662-1732).

FRANCIS ATTERBURY was born at Milton in Buckinghamshire, where his father was Rector of the parish. He was sent to Westminster School, under the rule of the famous Dr. Busby. From here he proceeded to Christ Church College, Oxford, being elected in 1680. After graduating he continued at the University, taking part in the tutorial work. Whilst engaged in this work he wrote the celebrated pamphlet against the attempt of James II. to force his creed upon the University. This was entitled "The Origin of the Reformation," and it made Atterbury famous as a defender of the Church of England.

In 1691 he was appointed Lecturer of St. Brides by the Bishop of London, and soon after left Oxford for London. Atterbury, though still a strong advocate for the rights of the clergy, rapidly became a favourite Court preacher; and when Anne succeeded to the Throne, she made him Dean of Carlisle (1704).

A strong Tory and High Church reaction had set in towards the end of Anne's reign, and this brought Atterbury into still greater prominence. In 1713 he was made Bishop of Rochester and Dean of Westminster, two appointments which in those days always went together. "Thus," says Bishop Burnet, "he was promoted and rewarded for lighting a flame in our Church."

During the lifetime of Queen Anne, Atterbury had not concealed his strong Jacobite leanings, and the story goes that he offered, on her death, to proclaim the Stuart James III., as the rightful King of England. However this may have been, he was present at the Coronation of George I. in his official capacity as Bishop of Rochester; but there is little doubt that he was, even then, secretly holding communication with the Pretender.

The climax was reached in 1720 when a son was born to the exiled King. This, together with the wide-spread ruin that followed the bursting of the South Sea bubble, increased the disaffection towards George I., and appeared a favourable time for a national rising to restore the Stuarts.

Atterbury was deeply involved in this conspiracy, and in 1722 was arrested and thrown into the Tower, where he was confined for seven months prior to his arraignment before the Peers on a charge of high treason.

It was during this historic trial that Atterbury made his famous speech whereby he attempted to extenuate his parleyings with the exiled Stuarts. But the offence was grave and he fought against stubborn facts. The trial ended in a heavy sentence—banishment for life and the deprivation of all his ecclesiastical dignities and revenues.

He sailed for France in 1723, where, after nine years of exile, he died. (Paris, February, 1732). His body was secretly smuggled over to England and privately buried in Westminster Abbey.—C.E.H.

UNDER WHICH KING?

(Delivered in the House of Lords, May 11th, 1722).

LET me speak, my Lords (alway, I hope, with that modesty which becomes an accused person, but yet) with the freedom of an Englishman. Had nothing been opened to you concerning this man's character and secret transaction, could you possibly have believed the romantic tales he has told? Could this pretender to secrets have had, or shall he still have, any weight with your Lordships, who threw away his life rather than venture to stand to the truth of what he had said? Shall this man do more mischief by his death than he could have done if living? for then he could have been confronted, puzzled, and confounded; shame and consciousness might have made him unsay what he had said. But a dead man can retract nothing. What he has written he has written; the accusation must stand just as it is; and we are deprived of the advantages of those confessions, which truth and remorse had once extorted, and would again have extorted from him.

However, I should have been glad to have all that even this witness said, and would have hoped that, by a comparison of the several parts of the story he at several times told, some light might have been gained that is now wanting, particularly by the knowledge of what he said freely and voluntarily, and in good humour, before his rough usage upon his return from Deal had frightened him into new confession. But I think we have the evidence only of a few of the last days of his life. All the preceding time, when he was most in favour and confidence with a great man, is a blank; we have no account of it, and yet, it is said, he underwent frequent examinations during that time. But they were not, it seems, so maturely weighed and digested as to be thought worth being committed to writing.

But he is gone to his place, and has answered for what he has said at another tribunal. I desire not to blemish his character any further than is absolutely necessary to my own just defence.

Our law has taken care that there should be a more clear and full proof of treason than of any other crime whatsoever. And reasonable it is, that a crime, attended with the highest penalties, should be made out by the clearest and fullest evidence. And yet here is a charge of high treason brought against me, not only without full evidence, but without any evidence at all, *i.e.*, any such evidence as the law of the land knows and allows. And what is not evidence at law (pardon me for what I am going to say) can never be made such, in order to punish what is past, but by a violation of the law. For the law, which prescribes the nature of the proof required, is as much the law of the land as that which declares the crime; and both must join to convict a man of guilt. And it seems equally unjust to declare any sort of proof legal, which was not so before a prosecution commenced for any act done, as it would be to declare the act itself *ex post facto* to be criminal.

Now there never was a charge of so high a nature so strongly pressed, and so weakly supported—supported, not by any living or dead witness, speaking from his own knowledge, but by mere hearsays and reports from others, contradicted by the very persons from whom they are said to be derived—supported not by any one criminal deed proved to have been done, not by any one criminal line proved to have been either written or received, not even by any one criminal word proved to have been spoken by me; but by intercepted letters in a correspondence, to which it appears not that I was, and to which it is certain that I was not privy; some of these letters shown to have been contrived with a design of fastening them upon me, as a foundation of the scheme which was to follow; others, written with the same view, employing the same fictitious names, and throwing out dark and suspicious hints, concerning the persons meant by those names, and endeavouring by little facts and circumstances, sometimes true, sometimes doubtful, and often false, to point out that person to such as should intercept those letters, who continues all this time a stranger to the whole transaction, and never makes the discovery till he feels it, and finds it advanced into a solemn accusation; till the pestilence that walked in darkness, becomes the arrow that flieth by noonday. . . . My Lords, this is my case; I have showed it so to be; though I had the hard task upon me of proving a negative, and had no other lights to guide me but those the report affords. And shall I stand convicted before your Lordships upon such an evidence as this? by the hearsay of an hearsay (for this often is the case), and that denied by the very person into whose testimony all must be resolved; by strained reasonings and inferences, from obscure passages and fictitious names in letters, the contents of which were entirely a secret to me till I saw them in print, by the conjecturers of deciphers, without any opportunity given me (though I humbly asked it) to examine into the truth of their explications. . . .

Shall I, my Lords, be deprived of all that is valuable to an Englishman (for in the circumstances to which I am to be reduced, life itself is scarce valuable) by such an evidence as this—such an evidence as would not be admitted in any other cause, in any other court; nor allowed, I verily believe, to condemn a Jew in the Inquisitions of Spain or Portugal; shall it be received against me, a bishop of this Church, and a member of this House, in a charge of high treason brought in the High Court of Parliament? God forbid.

Suffer me, my Lords (I know you will suffer me) to put you all (and particularly my right reverend brethren) in mind of a text of Holy Writ: "Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses." It is not said, condemn him not upon an unsupported accusation; but, receive it not, give it no countenance or encouragement. And I am somewhat more than an elder as the word there imports. Shall an accusation be received against me, without any one witness to maintain it? My Lords, this is not a direction merely for ecclesiastical judicatories; it was taken by St. Paul from the civil and judicial part of the law of Moses, for there we read: "One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or any sin that he sinneth; at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter be established." And as this rule was transplanted from the State into the Church by an inspired authority, so would it be no blemish to any Christian state, if they always thought fit to follow it in such cases as this now before your Lordships. The laws of this Christian state have actually followed it, and made two witnesses necessary in accusations of treason. Shall I be the first bishop of this Church prosecuted and condemned upon two or three hearsays, two or three conjectures about names, and obscure passages in letters, instead of two or three witnesses? And will they who are most concerned to resist this precedent, contribute to make it, and to derive the sad influence of it to all succeeding times; and even concur in such an act, on such an evidence, to render me incapable of using or exercising any office, function, authority, or power, ecclesiastical or spiritual whatsoever? Is this either good divinity or good policy? I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.

Doubtless the Legislature is without bounds. It may do what it pleases; and whatever it does is binding. Nay, in some respects it has greater power (with reverence be it spoken) than the Sovereign Legislator of the universe; for He can do nothing unjustly. But though no limits can be set to parliaments, yet they have generally thought fit to prescribe limits to themselves, and so to guide even their proceedings by bill in criminal cases, as to depart as little as is possible from the known laws and usages of the realm. The parliament may, if it pleases, by a particular act, order a criminal to be tortured who will not confess; for who shall gainsay them? But they never did it, nor, I presume, ever will; because torture, though practised in other countries, is unknown in ours, and repugnant to the temper and genius of our mild and free government; and yet, my Lords, it looks, methinks, somewhat like torture, to inflict grievous pains and penalties on a person only suspected of guilt, but not legally proved guilty in order to extort some confession or discovery from him. This, in other countries, is called putting to the question; and it matters not much by what engines or methods such an experiment is made.

The Parliament may, if it pleases, by an express law, adjudge a man to absolute perpetual imprisonment, as well as to perpetual exile, without reserving to the Crown any power of determining such imprisonment. They have enacted the one; I find not they ever enacted the other. And the reason seems to have been because our law, which above all others provides for the liberty of the subject's person, knows nothing of such absolute perpetual imprisonment.

The Parliament may in like manner condemn a man upon a charge of accumulative and constructive treason. They did so once, in the case of the Earl of Strafford; but they repented of it afterwards, and ordered all the records and proceedings of Parliament relating thereto to be wholly cancelled, defaced, and obliterated, to the intent the same might not be visible in after-ages, or brought into example to the prejudice of any person whatsoever. My Lords, it was the fate of that great person thus to fall by accumulative and constructive treason. A much less now stands before you, who is attacked by accumulative and constructive proofs of his guilt; that is, by such proofs as in themselves, and when taken singly and apart, are allowed to prove nothing; but when taken together, and well interpreted and explained, are said to give mutual light and strength to each other, and by the help of certain inferences and deduction, to have the force though not the formality of legal evidence. Will such proofs be ever admitted by your Lordships, in order to deprive a fellow-subject of his fortunes, his fame, his friends, and his country, and send him in his old age, without language, without limbs, without health, and without a provision for the necessaries of life, to live, or rather starve, amongst foreigners? I say again, God forbid!

My ruin is not of that moment to any man, or any number of men, as to make it worth their while to violate (or even seem to violate) the constitution in any degree to procure it. In preserving and guarding that against all attempts, the safety and the happiness of every Englishman lies. But when once by such extraordinary steps as these we depart from the fixed rules and forms of justice, and try untrodden paths, no man knows whither they will lead him, or where he shall be able to stop, when pressed by the crowd that follow him.

Though I am worthy of no regard; though whatever is done to me may be looked upon as just, yet your Lordships will have some regard to your own lasting interests, and those of the State, and not introduce into criminal cases a sort of evidence with which our constitution is not acquainted, and which, under the appearance of supporting it at first, may be afterwards made use of (I speak my honest fears) gradually to undermine and destroy it.

For God's sake, my Lords, lay aside these extraordinary proceedings! Set not these new and dangerous precedents! And I for my part will voluntarily and cheerfully go into perpetual exile, and please myself with the thought that I have in some measure preserved the constitution by quitting my country; and I will live, wherever I am, praying for its prosperity, and die with the word of Father Paul in my mouth, which he used of the Republic of Venice, *Esto perpetua!* The way to perpetuate it is, not to depart from it. Let me depart, but let that continue fixed on the immovable foundations of law and justice, and stand for ever. . . .

Had indeed the charge been as fully proved as it is strongly asserted, it had been in vain to think of encountering well-attested facts by protestations to the contrary, though never so solemnly made. But, as that charge is enforced by slights and probabilities, and cannot be disproved in many circumstances without proving a negative, your Lordships will, in such a case, allow the solemn asseverations of a man, in behalf of his own innocence, to have their due weight. And I ask no more of God than to grant them as much influence with you as they have truth in themselves.

If, after all, it shall be still thought by your Lordships that there is any seeming strength in any of the proofs produced against me; if by private persuasions of my guilt, founded on unseen, unknown motives, which ought not certainly to influence public judgments; if by any reasons and necessities of state (of the expedience, wisdom, and justice of which I am no competent judge) your Lordships shall be induced to proceed on this bill, and to pass it in any shape, I shall dispose myself quietly and patiently to submit to what is determined. God's will be done!

EDMUND BURKE

(1729-1797).

EDMUND BURKE has been called the Shakespeare of English orators and certainly no one else so well deserves the title. His mind never acknowledges limitation. His thoughts are multitudinous, succeeding each other, flowing into each other, impelling each other with that ever-changing unity which, when seen in the waves of the sea, with the sun shining upon it, at once delights and dazzles.

" Possessed," says Brougham, " of most extensive knowledge and of learning of the most various description ; acquainted alike with what different classes of men knew, each in his own province, and with much that hardly any one else ever thought of learning, he could either bring his masses of information to bear directly upon the subjects to which they severally belonged, or he could avail himself of them generally to strengthen his faculties and enlarge his views, or he could turn any portion of them to account for the purpose of enlarging his theme and enriching his diction. Hence, when he is handling any one matter, we perceive that we are conversing with a reasoner or a teacher to whom almost every other branch of knowledge is familiar. His views range over all cognate subjects ; his reasonings are derived from principles applicable to other matters, as well as to the one in hand ; arguments pour in from all sides, as well as those which start up under our feet, the natural growth of the path he is leading us ; while to throw light round our steps and either explore its darker places or serve for our recreation, illustrations are fetched from a thousand quarters ; and an imagination marvellously quick to descry unthought-of resemblances pours forth the stores which a lore yet more marvellous has gathered from all ages and nations and arts and tongues."

That this tribute of one great orator to the powers of a greater is not exaggerated, we know from the effects often produced by Burke upon his audiences. " In the Hastings trial," writes Doctor Matthews, " it is said that when Burke, with an imagination almost as Oriental as the scenes he depicted, described, in words that will live as long as the English language, the cruelties inflicted upon the natives of India by Debi Sing, one of Hastings's agents, a convulsive shudder ran through the whole assembly; indignation and rage filled the breasts of his hearers; some of the ladies 'swooned away'; and Hastings himself, though he had protested his innocence, was utterly overwhelmed. 'For half an hour,' he said afterwards, in describing the scene, 'I looked on the orator in a reverie of wonder, and actually thought myself the most culpable man on earth.'"

That the ability to produce this profound impression on others was not merely intellectual but constitutional with Burke, we know from his defence of himself when his 'Reflections on the French Revolution' alienated many who had been his friends,—among them Philip Francis, who, seeing the proof sheets of the work, tried to dissuade Burke from publishing it.

Speaking of Marie Antoinette, Burke had written the memorable comparison: "And surely never lighted on this orb, which she hardly seemed to touch, a more delightful vision. I saw her just above the horizon, decorating and cheering the elevated sphere she had just begun to move in, glittering like the morning star, full of life and splendour and joy."

When Francis called this a piece of foppery, asking Burke if Marie Antoinette were not a jade, a mere Messalina, Burke replied indignantly: "I know nothing of your Messalinas. Am I obliged to prove judicially the virtues of those I see suffering every kind of wrong? . . . I tell you again that the recollection of the manner in which I saw the Queen of France in 1774 and the contrast between that brilliancy, splendour, and beauty, with the prostrate homage of a nation to her, and the abominable scene of 1789, which I was describing, did draw tears from me and wetted the paper. Those tears came again into my eyes almost as often as I looked at the description. They may again. You do not believe this fact nor that these are my real feelings, but that the whole is affected or, as you express it, 'downright foppery.' My friend, I tell you it is truth and that it is true and will be true when you and I are no more, and will exist as long as men with their natural feelings shall exist."

Undoubtedly it was this deep emotional earnestness which gave Burke's magnificent intellect its effectiveness. We can see what this effectiveness means and how completely it depends on his sympathies when we undertake to read those speeches where, without being "keyed up" to his highest nervous possibilities, he is using his intellect merely. Such passages are frequent in his speeches; often when he is reasoning well and consecutively, they are prosy; and sometimes when he is relaxed after the strain of intellectual and emotional exaltation, they are dull.

Reading them and searching for the secret of the power which has gone out from them and left them thus lifeless, we see that it is the same which controlled Burke when he wetted his paper with tears for Marie Antoinette. No man who attains the sublime as often as he did can keep his position of costly eminence, and in his reactions he must pay the price for it. Burke paid in acquiring habits through which he won the ability to make the most wonderful speeches ever made in England, and joined with it a more extraordinary faculty for emptying benches under the sound of his voice than any other great orator had ever demonstrated. This seems largely due to his very greatness. His own intellectual strength made him forget the intellectual weaknesses of others. Standing unwearied before people of ordinary minds, pouring out not one oration, a perfect whole, but one after another, each dealing with some thought which, for the time, mastered him,—each with its own perfection of art, its own rapid development of thought,—he could not carry his audience with him, because he alone had the intellectual strength to keep the thread of the argument so as to be able to join the splendid parts into an intelligible and concordant whole. His speeches at the trial of Hastings are as Homeric in quantity as in quality. Few will even attempt to keep the connection from their beginning to the end. But no one could be so obtuse as to miss the point of the fiery periods in which his immortal indignation blazed out against Hastings and conquest as a commercial method, when he came to describe the atrocities of Debi Sing.

Burke was born in Dublin, January 12th, 1729 N. S.,—the second of the fifteen children of an Irish attorney, most of whom were delicate and died young. Burke himself was never strong, and the great results he achieved were in spite of physical weakness. His education which received its greatest impetus at Trinity College, Dublin, never ceased during his lifetime. He seems to have had one of those peculiar minds which retain in mature life the childish ability to learn easily,—the puerile habit, so soon lost and with most never regained, of welcoming information regardless of the quarter it comes from.

Burke's biography is the history of the most important period in modern politics. It would be presumption to attempt it here. It is enough to add that when he died, July 9th, 1797, he left a world which his genius and his sympathy for the suffering he saw everywhere around him had made more fit for his successor, when he comes to pay with his own emotion the price of the sympathy every great mind feels as the secret of its ability to champion the weak and to win the battles of helplessness against power. But his successor has not yet come nor do those who would welcome him most expect him soon. W.V.B.

THE IMPEACHMENT OF WARREN HASTINGS

(February 18th and 19th, 1788).

THE gentlemen who are appointed by the Commons to manage this prosecution have directed me to inform your lordships that they have very carefully and attentively weighed the magnitude of the subject, which they bring before you, with the time which the nature and circumstances of affairs allow for their conducting it.

My lords, on that comparison they are very apprehensive, that, if I should go very largely into a preliminary explanation of the several matters in charge, it might be to the prejudice of an early trial of the substantial merits of each article. We have weighed and considered this maturely. We have compared exactly the time with the matter, and we have found that we are obliged to do, as all men must do who would manage their affairs practicably, to make our opinion of what might be most advantageous to the business conform to the time that is left to perform it in. We must, as all men must, submit affairs to time, and not think of making time conform to our wishes; and therefore, my lords, I very willingly fall in with the inclinations of the gentlemen, with whom I have the honour to act, to come as soon as possible to close fighting, and to grapple immediately and directly with the corruptions of India; to bring before your lordships the direct articles; to apply the evidence to the articles, and to bring the matter forward for your lordships' decision in that manner which the confidence we have in the justice of our cause demands from the Commons of Great Britain.

My lords, these are the opinions of those with whom I have the honour to act, and in their opinions I readily acquiesce. For I am far from wishing to waste any of your lordships' time upon any matter merely through any opinion I have of the nature of the business, when at the same time I find that in the opinion of others it might militate against the production of its full, proper, and, if I may so say, its immediate effect.

It was my design to class the crimes of the late governor of Bengal—to show their mutual bearings—how they were mutually aided, and grew and were formed out of each other. I proposed first of all to show your lordships that they have their root in that, which is the origin of all evil, avarice, and rapacity; to show how that led to prodigality of the public money, and how prodigality of the public money, by wasting the treasures of the East India Company, furnished an excuse to the governor-general to break its faith, to violate all its most solemn engagements, and to fall with a hand of stern, ferocious, and unrelenting rapacity upon all the allies and dependencies of the company. But I shall be obliged in some measure to abridge this plan; and as your lordships already possess, from what I had the honour to state on Saturday, a general view of this matter, you will be in a condition to pursue it when the several articles are presented.

My lords, I have to state to-day the root of all these misdemeanours; namely, the pecuniary corruption and avarice which gave rise and primary motion to all the rest of the delinquencies charged to be committed by the governor-general.

My lords, pecuniary corruption forms not only, as your lordships will observe in the charges before you, an article of charge by itself, but likewise so intermixes with the whole, that it is necessary to give, in the best manner I am able, a history of that corrupt system, which brought on all the subsequent acts of corruption. I will venture to say, there is no one act, in which tyranny, malice, cruelty, and oppression can be charged, that does not at the same time carry evident marks of pecuniary corruption.

I stated to your lordships, on Saturday last, the principles upon which Mr. Hastings governed his conduct in India, and upon which he grounds his defence. These may all be reduced to one short word, *arbitrary power*. My lords, if Mr. Hastings had contended as other men have often done, that the system of government which he patronizes, and on which he acted, was a system tending on the whole to the blessing and benefit of mankind, possibly something might be said for him for setting up so wild, absurd, irrational, and wicked a system. Something might be said to qualify the act from the intention; but it is singular in this man, that, at the time he tells you he acted on the principles of arbitrary power, he takes care to inform you that he was not blind to the consequences. Mr. Hastings foresaw that the consequence of this system was corruption. An arbitrary system, indeed, must always be a corrupt one. My lords, there never was a man who thought he had no law but his own will, who did not soon find that he had no end but his own profit. Corruption and arbitrary power are of natural unequivocal generation, necessarily producing one another. Mr. Hastings foresees the abusive and corrupt consequences, and then he justifies his conduct upon the necessities of that system. These are things which are new in the world: for there never was a man, I believe, who contended for arbitrary power,—and there have been persons wicked and foolish enough to contend for it,—who did not pretend, either that the system was good in itself, or that by his conduct he had mitigated or had purified it, and that the poison by passing through his constitution had acquired salutary properties. But if you look at his defence before the House of Commons, you will see that that very system upon which he governed, and under which he now justifies his actions, did appear to himself a system pregnant with a thousand evils and a thousand mischiefs.

The next thing that is remarkable and singular in the principles upon which the governor-general acted is that when he is engaged in a vicious system which clearly leads to evil consequences, he thinks himself bound to realize all the evil consequences involved in that system. All other men have taken a directly contrary course; they have said, I have been engaged in an evil system, that led, indeed, to mischievous consequences, but I have taken care by my own virtues to prevent the evils of the system under which I acted.

We say, then, not only that he governed arbitrarily, but corruptly; that is to say, that he was a giver and receiver of bribes, and formed a system for the purpose of giving and receiving them. We wish your lordships distinctly to consider, that he did not only give and receive bribes accidently, as it happened, without any system and design, merely as the opportunity or momentary temptation of profit urged him to it, but that he has formed plans and systems of government for the very purpose of accumulating bribes and presents to himself. This system of Mr. Hastings's government is such a one, I believe, as the British nation in particular will disown, for I will venture to say, that, if there is any one thing which distinguishes this nation eminently above another, it is, that in its offices at home, both judicial and in the State, there is less suspicion of pecuniary corruption attaching to them than to any similar offices in any part of the globe, or that have existed at any time; so that he, who would set up a system of corruption, and attempt to justify it upon the principle of utility, that man is staining not only the nature and character of office, but that which is the peculiar glory of the official and judicial character of this country; and therefore in this house, which is eminently the guardian of the purity of all the offices of this kingdom, he ought to be called eminently and peculiarly to account. There are many things, undoubtedly, in crimes, which make them frightful and odious; but bribery, filthy hands, a chief governor of a great empire receiving bribes from poor, miserable indigent people, this is what makes government itself base, contemptible, and odious in the eyes of mankind.

My lords, it is certain that even tyranny itself may find some specious colour, and appear as a more severe and rigid execution of justice. Religious persecution may shield itself under the guise of a mistaken and over-zealous piety. Conquest may cover its baldness with its own laurels, and the ambition of the conqueror may be hid in the secrets of his own heart under a veil of benevolence, and make him imagine he is bringing temporary desolation upon a country only to promote its ultimate advantage and his own glory. But in the principles of that governor, who makes nothing but money his object, there can be nothing of this. There are here none of those specious delusions that look like virtues, to veil either the governed or the governor. If you look at Mr. Hastings's merits, as he calls them, what are they? Did he improve the internal state of the government by great reforms? No such thing. Or by a wise and incorrupt administration of justice? No. Has he enlarged the boundary of our government? No; there are but too strong proofs of his lessening it. But his pretensions to merit are, that he squeezed more money out of the inhabitants of the country than other persons could have done,—money got by oppression, violence, extortion from the poor, or the heavy hand of power upon the rich and great.

These are his merits. What we charge as his demerits are all of the same nature; for though there is undoubtedly oppression, breach of faith, cruelty, perfidy, charged upon him, yet the great ruling principle of the whole, and that from which you can never have an act free, is money. It is the vice of base avarice, which never is, nor ever appears even to the prejudices of mankind to be anything like a virtue. Our desire of acquiring sovereignty in India undoubtedly originated first in ideas of safety and necessity; its next step was a step of ambition. That ambition, as generally happens in conquest, was followed by gains of money; but afterwards there was no mixture at all; it was, during Mr. Hastings's time, altogether a business of money. If he has extirpated a nation, I will not say whether properly or improperly, it is because, says he, you have all the benefit of conquest without expense, you have got a large sum of money from the people, and you may leave them to be governed by whom, and as they will. This is directly contrary to the principles of conquerors. If he has at any time taken any money from the dependencies of the company, he does not pretend that it was obtained from their zeal and affection to our cause, or that it made their submission more complete; very far from it. He says they ought to be independent, and all that you have to do is to squeeze money from them. In short, money is the beginning, the middle, and the end of every kind of act done by Mr. Hastings,—pretendedly for the company, but really for himself.

Having said so much about the origin, the first principle both of that which he makes his merit, and which we charge as his demerit, the next step is, that I should lay open to your lordships, as clearly as I can, what the sense of his employers, the East India Company, and what the sense of the legislature itself has been upon those merits and demerits of money.

My lords, the company, knowing that these money transactions were likely to subvert that empire which was first established upon them, did, in the year 1765, send out a body of the strongest and most solemn covenants to their servants, that they should take no presents from the country powers under any name or description, except those things which were publicly and openly taken for the use of the company, namely, territories or sums of money, which might be obtained by treaty. They distinguished such presents as were taken from any persons privately and unknown to them, and without their authority, from subsidies; and that this is the true nature and construction of their order, I shall contend and explain afterwards to your lordships. They have said nothing shall be taken for their private use; for though in that and in every State there may be subsidiary treaties by which sums of money may be received, yet they forbid their servants, their governors,—whatever application they might pretend to make of them,—to receive, under any other name or pretence, more than a certain marked simple sum of money, and this not without the consent and permission of the presidency to which they belong. This is the substance, the principle, and the spirit of the covenants, and will show your lordships how radicated an evil this of bribery and presents was judged to be.

When these covenants arrived in India, the servants refused at first to execute them, and suspended the execution of them till they had enriched themselves with presents. Eleven months elapsed, and it was not till Lord Clive reached the place of his destination, that the covenants were executed; and they were not executed then without some degree of force. Soon afterwards the treaty was made with the country powers, by which Shuja ul Dowla was re-established in the province of Oude, and paid a sum of £500,000 to the company for it. It was a public payment, and there was not a suspicion that a single shilling of private emolument attended it. But whether Mr. Hastings had the example of others or not, their example could not justify his briberies. He was sent there to put an end to all those examples. The company did expressly vest him with that power. They declared at that time, that the whole of their service was totally corrupted by bribes and presents, and by extravagance and luxury, which partly gave rise to them; and these in their turn enabled them to pursue those excesses. They not only reposed trust in the integrity of Mr. Hastings, but reposed trust in his remarkable frugality and order in his affairs, which they considered as things that distinguished his character. But in his defence we have him in quite another character, no longer the frugal, attentive servant bred to business, bred to bookkeeping, as all the company's servants are; he now knows nothing of his own affairs, knows not whether he is rich or poor, knows not what he has in the world. Nay, people are brought forward to say that they know better than he does what his affairs are. He is not like a careful man bred in a countinghouse, and by the directors put into an office of the highest trust on account of the regularity of his affairs; he is like one buried in the contemplation of the stars, and knows nothing of the things in this world. It was then on account of an idea of his great integrity that the company put him into this situation. Since that he has thought proper to justify himself, not by clearing himself of receiving bribes, but by saying that no bad consequences resulted from it, and that, if any such evil consequences did arise from it, they arose rather from his inattention to money than from his desire of acquiring it.

I have stated to your lordships the nature of the covenants which the East India Company sent out. Afterwards, when they found their servants had refused to execute these covenants, they not only very severely reprehended even a moment's delay in their execution, and threatened the exacting and the most strict and rigorous performance of them, but they sent a commission to enforce the observance of them more strongly; and that commission had it specially in charge never to receive presents. They never sent out a person to India without recognizing the grievance, and without ordering that presents should not be received, as the main fundamental part of their duty, and upon which all the rest depended, as it certainly must; for persons at the head of government should not encourage that by example, which they ought by precept, authority, and force, to restrain in all below them. That commission failing, another commission was preparing to be sent out with the same instructions, when an act of Parliament took it up; and that act, which gave Mr. Hastings power, did mould in the very first stamina of his power this principle, in words the most clear and forcible that an act of Parliament could possibly devise upon the subject. And that act was made not only upon a general knowledge of the grievance, but your lordships will see in the reports of that time that Parliament had directly in view before them the whole of that monstrous head of corruption under the name of presents, and all the monstrous consequences that followed it.

Now, my lords, every office of trust, in its very nature, forbids the receipt of bribes. But Mr. Hastings was forbidden it, first, by his official situation; next by covenant; and, lastly, by act of Parliament; that is to say, by all the things that bind mankind, or that can bind them,—first, moral obligation inherent in the duty of their office; next, the positive injunctions of the legislature of the country; and, lastly, a man's own private, particular, voluntary act and covenant. These three, the great and only obligations that bind mankind, all united in the focus of this single point—that they should take no presents.

I am to mark to your lordships, that this law and this covenant did consider indirect ways of taking presents—taking them by others, and such like—directly in the very same light as they considered taking them by themselves. It is perhaps a much more dangerous way, because it adds to the crime a false prevaricating mode of concealing it, and makes it much more mischievous by admitting others into the participation of it. Mr. Hastings has said, and it is one of the general complaints of Mr. Hastings, that he is made answerable for the acts of other men. It is a thing inherent in the nature of his situation. All those who enjoy a great superintending trust, which is to regulate the whole affairs of an empire, are responsible for the acts and conduct of other men, so far as they had anything to do with appointing them, or holding them in their places, or having any sort of inspection into their conduct.

But when a governor presumes to remove from their situations those persons whom the public authority and sanction of the company have appointed, and obtrudes upon them by violence other persons, superseding the orders of his masters, he becomes doubly responsible for their conduct. If the persons he names should be of notorious evil character and evil principles, and if this should be perfectly known to himself and of public notoriety to the rest of the world, then another strong responsibility attaches to him for the acts of those persons.

Governors, we know very well, cannot, with their own hands, be continually receiving bribes; for then they must have as many hands as one of the idols in an Indian temple in order to receive all the bribes which a governor-general may receive; but they have them vicariously. As there are many offices, so he has had various officers for receiving and distributing his bribes; he has had a great many, some white and some black agents. The white men are loose and licentious; they are apt to have resentments, and to be bold in revenging them. The black men are very secret and mysterious; they are not apt to have very quick resentments; they have not the same liberty and boldness of language which characterize Europeans; and they have fears, too, for themselves, which make it more likely that they will conceal anything committed to them by Europeans. Therefore, Mr. Hastings had his black agents, not one, two, three, but many disseminated through the country; no two of them hardly appear to be in the secret of any one bribe. He has had likewise his white agents,—they were necessary,—a Mr. Larkins and a Mr. Crofts. Mr. Crofts was sub-treasurer, and Mr. Larkins accountant-general. These were the last persons of all others, that should have had anything to do with bribes; yet these were some of his agents in bribery. There are few instances in comparison of the whole number of bribes, but there are some, where two men are in the secret of the same bribe. Nay, it appears that there was one bribe divided into different payments at different times,—that one part was committed to one black secretary, another part to another black secretary. So that it is almost impossible to make up a complete body of all his bribery; you may find the scattered limbs, some here, and others there, and while you are employed in picking them up, he may escape entirely in a prosecution for the whole.

The first act of his government in Bengal was the most bold and extraordinary that I believe ever entered into the head of any man,—I will say, of any tyrant. It was no more or less than a general, almost exceptionless, confiscation, in time of profound peace, of all the landed property in Bengal, upon most extraordinary pretences. Strange as this may appear, he did so confiscate it; he put it up to a pretended public, in reality to a private, corrupt auction, and such favoured landowners as came to it were obliged to consider themselves as not any longer proprietors of the estates, but to recognize themselves as farmers under government; and even those few that were permitted to remain on their estates had their payments raised at his arbitrary discretion, and the rest of the lands were given to farmers-general, appointed by him and his committee, at a price fixed by the same arbitrary discretion.

It is necessary to inform your lordships that the revenues of Bengal are, for the most part, territorial revenues, great quitrents issuing out of lands. I shall say nothing either of the nature of this property, of the rights of the people to it, or of the mode of exacting the rents, till that great question of revenues, one of the greatest which we shall have to lay before you, shall be brought before your lordships particularly and specially as an article of charge. I only mention it now as an exemplification of the great principle of corruption which guided Mr. Hastings's conduct.

When the ancient nobility, the great princes,—for such I may call them,—a nobility, perhaps, as ancient as that of your lordships, and a more truly noble body never existed in that character; my lords, when all the nobility, some of whom have borne the rank and port of princes, all the gentry, all the freeholders of the country, had their estates in that manner confiscated, that is, either given to themselves to hold on the footing of farmers, or totally confiscated; when such an act of tyranny was done, no doubt some good was pretended. This confiscation was made by Mr. Hastings, and the lands let to these farmers for five years, upon an idea, which always accompanies his acts of oppression,—the idea of moneyed merit. He adopted this mode of confiscating the estates, and letting them to farmers, for the avowed purpose of seeing how much it was possible to take out of them. Accordingly, he set them up to this wild and wicked auction, as it would have been, if it had been a real one,—corrupt and treacherous, as it was. He set these lands up for the purpose of making that discovery, and pretended that the discovery would yield a most amazing increase of rent. And for some time it appeared so to do, till it came to the touchstone of experience; and then it was found that there was a defalcation from these monstrous raised revenues, which were to cancel in the minds of the directors the wickedness of so atrocious, flagitious, and horrid an act of treachery. At the end of five years, what do you think was the failure?—No less than £2,050,000. Then a new source of corruption was opened, that is, how to deal with the balances, for every man who had engaged in these transactions was a debtor to government, and the remission of that debt depended upon the discretion of the governor-general. Then the persons, who were to settle the composition of that immense debt, who were to see how much was recoverable, and how much not, were able to favour, or to exact to the last shilling; and there never existed a doubt but that, not only upon the original, cruel exaction, but upon the remission afterwards, immense gains were derived. This will account for the manner in which those stupendous fortunes, which astonish the world, have been made. They have been made, first, by a tyrannous exaction from the people, who were suffered to remain in possession of their own land as farmers, then by selling the rest to farmers at rents and under hopes which could never be realized, and then getting money for the relaxation of their debts. But whatever excuse, and however wicked, there might have been for this wicked act, namely, that it carried upon the face of it some sort of appearance of public good, that is to say, that sort of public good which Mr. Hastings so often professed, of ruining the country for the benefit of the company, yet, in fact, this business of balances is that *nidus* in which have been nestled and bred and born all the corruption of India,—first, by making extravagant demands, and afterwards by making corrupt relaxations of them.

Besides this monstrous failure in consequence of a miserable exaction, by which more was attempted to be forced from the country than it was capable of yielding, and this by way of experiment, when your lordships come to inquire who the farmers-general of the revenue were, you would naturally expect to find them to be the men in the several countries, who had the most interest, the greatest wealth, the best knowledge of the revenue and resources of the country in which they lived. These would be thought the natural proper farmers-general of each district. No such thing, my lords. They are found in the body of people, whom I have mentioned to your lordships. They were almost all let to Calcutta banyans. Calcutta banyans were the farmers of almost the whole. They sub-delegated to others, who sometimes had sub-delegates under them *ad infinitum*. The whole formed a system together through the succession of black tyrants scattered through the country, in which you at last find the European at the end, sometimes, indeed, not hid very deep, not above one between him and the farmer, namely, his banyan directly, or some other black person to represent him. But some have so managed the affair, that when you inquire who the farmer is, Was such a one farmer? No. Cantoo Baboo? No. Another? No. At last you find three deep of fictitious farmers, and you find the European gentlemen, high in place and authority, the real farmers of the settlement. So that the zemindars were dispossessed, the country racked and ruined for the benefit of a European, under the name of a farmer; for you will easily judge whether these gentlemen had fallen so deeply in love with the banyans, and thought so highly of their merits and services, as to reward them with all the possessions of the great landed interest of the country. Your lordships are too grave, wise, and discerning, to make it necessary for me to say more upon that subject. Tell me, that the banyans of English gentlemen, dependents on them at Calcutta, were the farmers throughout, and I believe I need not tell your lordships for whose benefit they were farmers.

But there is one of these, who comes so nearly, indeed so precisely, within this observation, that it is impossible for me to pass him by. Whoever has heard of Mr. Hastings's name with any knowledge of Indian connections has heard of his banyan Cantoo Baboo. This man is well known in the records of the company as his agent for receiving secret gifts, confiscations, and presents. You would have imagined that he would at least have kept him out of these farms, in order to give the measure a colour at least of disinterestedness and to show that this whole system of corruption and pecuniary oppression was carried on for the benefit of the company. The governor-general and council made an ostensible order, by which no collector or person concerned in the revenue should have any connection with these farms. This order did not include the governor-general in the words of it, but more than included him in the spirit of it; because his power to protect a farmer-general in the person of his own servant was infinitely greater than that of any subordinate person. Mr. Hastings, in breach of this order, gave farms to his own banyan. You find him the farmer of great, of vast, and extensive farms.

Another regulation that was made on that occasion was that no farmer should have, except in particular cases, which were marked, described, and accurately distinguished, a greater farm than what paid £10,000 a year to government. Mr. Hastings, who had broken the first regulation by giving any farm at all to his banyan, finding himself bolder, broke the second, too, and, instead of £10,000, gave him farms paying a revenue of £130,000 a year to the government. Men undoubtedly have been known to be under the dominion of their domestics; such things have happened to great men; they never have happened justifiably, in my opinion. They have never happened excusably; but we are acquainted sufficiently with the weakness of human nature to know that a domestic, who has served you in a near office long, and in your opinion faithfully, does, become a kind of relation; it brings on a great affection and regard for his interest. Now was this the case with Mr. Hastings and Cantoo Baboo? Mr. Hastings was just arrived at his government, and Cantoo Baboo had been but a year in his service; so that he could not in that time have contracted any great degree of friendship for him. These people do not live in your house; the Hindoo servants never sleep in it; they cannot eat with your servants; they have no second table, in which they can be continually about you, to be domesticated with yourself, a part of your being, as people's servants are to a certain degree. These persons live all abroad; they come at stated hours upon matters of business, and nothing more. But if it had been otherwise, Mr. Hastings's connection with Cantoo Baboo had been but of a year's standing; he had before served in that capacity Mr. Sykes, who recommended him to Mr. Hastings. Your lordships, then, are to judge whether such outrageous violations of all the principles, by which Mr. Hastings pretended to be guided in the settlement of these farms, were for the benefit of this old, decayed, affectionate servant of one year's standing—your lordships will judge of that.

I have here spoken only of the beginning of a great notorious system of corruption, which branched out so many ways, and into such a variety of abuses, and has afflicted that kingdom with such horrible evils from that day to this, that I will venture to say it will make one of the greatest, weightiest, and most material parts of the charge, that is now before you; as I believe I need not tell your lordships, that an attempt to set up the whole landed interest of a kingdom to auction must be attended, not only in that act, but every consequential act, with most grievous and terrible consequences.

My lords, I will now come to a scene of peculation of another kind; namely, a peculation by the direct sale of offices of justice; by the direct sale of the successions of families; by the sale of guardianships and trusts, held most sacred among the people of India; by the sale of them, not as before to farmers, not as you might imagine to near relations of the families, but a sale of them to the unfaithful servants of those families, their own perfidious servants, who had ruined their estates, who, if any balances had accrued to the government, had been the cause of those debts. Those very servants were put in power over their estates, their persons, and their families by Mr. Hastings for a shameful price. It will be proved to your lordships in the course of this business, that Mr. Hastings has done this in another sacred trust, the most sacred trust a man can have; that is, in the case of those vackiels—as they call them,—agents, or attorneys, who had been sent to assert and support the rights of their miserable masters before the council-general. It will be proved that these vackiels were by Mr. Hastings, for a price to be paid for it, put in possession of the very power, situation, and estates of those masters who sent them to Calcutta to defend them from wrong and violence. The selling offices of justice, the sale of succession in families, of guardianships and other sacred trusts, the selling masters to their servants, and principals to the attorneys they employed to defend themselves, were all parts of the same system; and these were the horrid ways in which he received bribes beyond any common rate.

When Mr. Hastings was appointed in the year 1773 to be governor-general of Bengal, together with Mr. Barwell, General Clavering, Colonel Monson, and Mr. Francis, the company, knowing the former corrupt state of their service,—but the whole corrupt system of Mr. Hastings at that time not being known, or even suspected at home,—did order them, in discharge of the spirit of the act of Parliament, to make an inquiry into all manner of corruptions and malversations in office, without the exception of any persons whatever. Your lordships are to know, that the act did expressly authorize the court of directors to frame a body of instructions, and to give orders to their new servants, appointed under the act of Parliament, lest it should be supposed that they, by their appointment under the act, could supersede the authority of the directors.

The directors, sensible of the power left in them over their servants by the act of Parliament, though their nomination was taken from them did, agreeably to the spirit and power of that act, give this order.

The council consisted of two parties: Mr. Hastings and Mr. Barwell, who were chosen, and kept there, upon the idea of their local knowledge; and the other three, who were appointed on account of their great parts and known integrity. And I will venture to say, that those three gentlemen did so execute their duty in India in all the substantial parts of it, that they will serve as a shield to cover the honour of England, whenever this country is upbraided in India.

They found a rumour running through the country of great peculations and oppressions. Soon after, when it was known what their instructions were, and that the council was ready, as is the first duty of all governors, even when there is no express order, to receive complaints against the oppressions and corruptions of government in any part of it, they found such a body—and that body shall be produced to your lordships—of corruption and peculation in every walk, in every department, in every situation of life, in the sale of the most sacred trusts, and in the destruction of the most ancient families of the country, as I believe in so short a time never was unveiled since the world began.

Your lordships would imagine that Mr. Hastings would at least ostensibly have taken some part in endeavouring to bring these corruptions before the public, or that he would, at least, have acted with some little management in his opposition. But alas ! it was not in his power ; there was not one, I think, but I am sure very few, of these general articles of corruption, in which the most eminent figure in the crowd, the principal figure, as it were, in the piece, was not Mr. Hastings himself. There were a great many others involved, for all departments were corrupted and vitiated. But you could not open a page, in which you did not see Mr. Hastings, or in which you did not see Cantoo Baboo. Either the black or white side or Mr. Hastings constantly was visible to the world in every part of these transactions.

With the other gentlemen, who were visible too, I have at present no dealing. Mr. Hastings, instead of using any management on that occasion, instantly set up his power and authority directly against the majority of the council, directly against his colleagues, directly against the authority of the East India Company and the authority of the act of Parliament, to put a dead stop to all these inquiries. He broke up the council the moment they attempted to perform this part of their duty. As the evidence multiplied upon him, the daring exertions of his power in stopping all inquiries increased continually. But he gave a credit and authority to the evidence by these attempts to suppress it.

Your lordships have heard that among the body of the accusers of this corruption there was a principal man in the country, a man of the first rank and authority in it, called Nundcomar, who had the management of revenues amounting to £150,000 a year, and who had, if really inclined to play the small game with which he has been charged by his accusers, abundant means to gratify himself in playing great ones ; but Mr. Hastings *has himself given him, upon the records of the company, a character, which would at least justify the council in making some inquiry into* charges made by him.

First, he was perfectly competent to make them, because he was in the management of those affairs, from which Mr. Hastings is supposed to have received corrupt emolument. He and his son were the chief managers in those transactions. He was, therefore, perfectly competent to it. Mr. Hastings has cleared his character; for, though it is true in the contradictions, in which Mr. Hastings has entangled himself, he has abused and insulted him, and particularly after his appearance as an accuser, yet before this he has given this testimony of him, that the hatred that had been drawn upon him, and the general obloquy of the English nation, was on account of his attachment to his own prince and the liberties of his country. Be he what he might, I am not disposed, nor have I the least occasion, to defend either his conduct or his memory.

It is to no purpose for Mr. Hastings to spend time in idle objections to the character of Nundcomar. Let him be as bad as Mr. Hastings represents him. I suppose he was a caballing, bribing, intriguing politician, like others in that country, both black and white. We know that associates in dark and evil actions are not generally the best of men; but be that as it will, it generally happens that they are the best of all discoverers. If Mr. Hastings were the accuser of Nundcomar, I should think the presumptions equally strong against Nundcomar, if he had acted as Mr. Hastings has acted. He was not only competent, but the most competent of all men to be Mr. Hastings's accuser. But Mr. Hastings has himself established both his character, and his competency, by employing him against Mahomed Reza Khân. He shall not blow hot and cold. In what respect was Mr. Hastings better than Mahomed Reza Khân, that the whole rule, principle, and system of accusation and inquiry should be totally reversed in general, nay, reversed in the particular instance, the moment he became accuser against Mr. Hastings. Such was the accuser. He was the man that gave the bribes, and, in addition to his own evidence, offers proof by other witnesses.

What was the accusation? Was the accusation improbable, either on account of the subject-matter, or the actor in it? Does such an appointment as that of Munny Begum in the most bare-faced evasion of his orders appear to your lordships a matter that contains no just presumptions of guilt, so that when a charge of bribery comes upon it, you are prepared to reject it, as if the action were so clear and proper that no man could attribute it to an improper motive? And, as to the man, is Mr. Hastings a man against whom a charge of bribery is improbable? Why, he owns it. He is a professor of it. He reduces it into scheme and system. He glories in it. He turns it to merit, and declares it is the best way of supplying the exigencies of the company. Why, therefore, should it be held improbable?—But I cannot mention this proceeding without shame and horror.

My lords, when this man appeared as an accuser of Mr. Hastings, if he was a man of bad character, it was a great advantage to Mr. Hastings to be accused by a man of that description. There was no likelihood of any great credit being given to him.

This person, who, in one of those sales, of which I have already given you some account in the history of the last period of the revolutions of Bengal, had been, or thought he had been, cheated of his money, had made some discoveries, and been guilty of that great irremissible sin in India, the disclosure of peculation. He afterwards came with a second disclosure, and was likely to have odium enough upon the occasion. He directly charged Mr. Hastings with the receipt of bribes amounting together to about £40,000 sterling, given by himself, on his own account, and that of Munny Begum. The charge was accompanied with every particular, which could facilitate proof or detection, time, place, persons, species, to whom paid, by whom received. Here was a fair opportunity for Mr. Hastings at once to defeat the malice of his enemies, and to clear his character to the world. His course was different. He railed much at the accuser, but did not attempt to refute the accusation. He refuses to permit the inquiry to go on, attempts to dissolve the council, commands his banyan not to attend. The council, however, goes on, examines to the bottom, and resolves that the charge was proved, and that the money ought to go to the company. Mr. Hastings then broke up the council, I will not say whether legally or illegally. The company's law counsel thought he might legally do it; but he corruptly did it, and left mankind no room to judge but that it was done for the screening of his own guilt; for a man may use a legal power corruptly, and for the most shameful and detestable purposes. And thus matters continued, till he commenced a criminal prosecution against this man,—this man whom he dared not meet as a defendant.

Mr. Hastings, instead of answering the charge, attacks the accuser. Instead of meeting the man in front, he endeavoured to go round, to come upon his flanks and rear, but never to meet him in the face upon the ground of his accusation, as he was bound by the express authority of law, and the express injunctions of the directors, to do. If the bribery is not admitted on the evidence of Nundcomar, yet his suppressing it is a crime—a violation of the orders of the court of directors. He disobeyed those instructions; and if it be only for disobedience, for rebellion against his masters, putting the corrupt motive out of the question, I charge him for this disobedience, and especially on account of the principles, upon which he proceeded in it.

Then he took another step; he accused Nundcomar of a conspiracy, which was a way he then and ever since has used, whenever means were taken to detect any of his own iniquities.

And here it becomes necessary to mention another circumstance of history, that the legislature, not trusting entirely to the governor-general and council, had sent out a court of justice to be a counter-security against these corruptions, and to detect and punish any such misdemeanours as might appear. And this court, I take for granted, has done great services.

Mr. Hastings flew to this court, which was meant to protect in their situations informers against bribery and corruption rather than to protect the accused from any of the preliminary methods, which must indispensably be used for the purpose of detecting their guilt; he flew to this court, charging this Nundcomar and others with being conspirators.

A man might be convicted as a conspirator, and yet afterwards live; he might put the matter into other hands, and go on with his information; nothing less than stone-dead would do the business. And here happened an odd concurrence of circumstances. Long before Nundcomar preferred his charge he knew that Mr. Hastings was plotting his ruin, and that for this purpose he had used a man, whom he, Nundcomar, had turned out of doors, called Mohun Persaud. Mr. Hastings had seen papers put upon the board, charging him with this previous plot for the destruction of Nundcomar; and this identical person, Mohun Persaud, whom Nundcomar had charged as Mr. Hastings's associate in plotting his ruin, was now again brought forward, as the principal evidence against him. I will not enter (God forbid I should!) into the particulars of the subsequent trial of Nundcomar; but you will find the marks and characters of it to be these. You will find a close connection between Mr. Hastings and the chief-justice, which we shall prove. We shall prove that one of the witnesses who appeared there was a person who had been before, or has since been, concerned with Mr. Hastings in his most iniquitous transactions. You will find what is very odd, that in this trial for forgery, with which this man stood charged, forgery in a private transaction, all the persons who were witnesses, or parties to it, had been, before or since, the particular friends of Mr. Hastings,—in short, persons from that rabble, with whom Mr. Hastings was concerned, both before and since, in various transactions and negotiations of the most criminal kind. But the law took its course. I have nothing more to say than that the man is gone—hanged justly if you please; and that it did so happen luckily for Mr. Hastings,—it so happened, that the relief of Mr. Hastings and the justice of the court, and the resolution never to relax its vigour, did all concur just at a happy nick of time and moment; and Mr. Hastings accordingly had the full benefit of them all.

His accuser was supposed to be what men may be, and yet very competent for accusers,—namely, one of his accomplices in guilty actions, one of those persons who may have a great deal to say of bribes. All that I contend for is that he was in the closest intimacy with Mr. Hastings, was in a situation for giving bribes, and that Mr. Hastings was proved afterwards to have received a sum of money from him, which may be well referred to bribes.

This example had its use in the way in which it was intended to operate and in which alone it could operate. It did not discourage forgeries; they went on at their usual rate, neither more nor less. But it put an end to all accusations against all persons in power for any corrupt practice. Mr. Hastings observes that no man in India complains of him. It is generally true. The voice of all India is stopped. All complaint was strangled with the same cord that strangled Nundcomar. This murdered not only that accuser, but all future accusation; and not only defeated, but totally vitiated and reversed, all the ends for which this country, to its eternal and indelible dishonour, had sent out a pompous embassy of justice to the remotest parts of the globe.

But though Nundcomar was put out of the way by the means by which he was removed, a part of the charge was not strangled with him. Whilst the process against Nundcomar was carrying on before Sir Elijah Impey, the process was continuing against Mr. Hastings in other modes; the receipt of a part of those bribes from Munny Begum to the amount of £15,000 was proved against him; and that a sum, to the same amount, was to be paid to his associate, Mr. Middleton, as it was proved at Calcutta, so it will be proved at your lordships' bar, to your entire satisfaction, by records and living testimony now in England. It was, indeed, obliquely admitted by Mr. Hastings himself.

The excuse for this bribe, fabricated by Mr. Hastings, and taught to Munny Begum, when he found that she was obliged to prove it against him, was, that it was given to him for his entertainment, according to some pretended custom, at the rate of £200 a day, whilst he remained at Moorshedabad. My lords, this leads me to a few reflections on the apology or defence of this bribe. We shall certainly, I hope, render it clear to your lordships, that it was not paid in this manner, as a daily allowance, but given in a gross sum. But take it in his own way, it was no less illegal, and no less contrary to his covenant; but if true under the circumstances, it was a horrible aggravation of his crime.

The first thing that strikes is that visits from Mr. Hastings are pretty severe things; and hospitality at Moorshedabad is an expensive virtue, though for provision it is one of the cheapest countries in the universe. No wonder that Mr. Hastings lengthened his visit, and made it extend nearly three months. Such hosts and such guests cannot be soon parted. Two hundred pounds a day for a visit! It is at the rate of £73,000 a year for himself; and, as I find his companion was put on the same allowance, it will be £146,000 a year for hospitality to two English gentlemen.

I believe that there is not a prince in Europe who goes to such expensive hospitality of splendour. But that you may judge of the true nature of this hospitality of corruption, I must bring before you the business of the visitor, and the condition of the host, as stated by Mr. Hastings himself, who best knows what he was doing.

He was then at the old capital of Bengal, at the time of this expensive entertainment, on a business of retrenchment, and for the establishment of a most harsh, rigorous, and oppressive economy. He wishes the task were assigned to spirits of a less gentle kind. By Mr. Hastings's account, he was giving daily and hourly wounds to his humanity, in depriving of their sustenance hundreds of persons of the ancient nobility of a great fallen kingdom. Yet it was in the midst of this galling duty, it was at that very moment of his tender sensibility, that from the collected morsels plucked from the famished mouths of hundreds of decayed, indigent, and starving nobility, he gorged his ravenous maw with £200 a day for his entertainment. In the course of all this proceeding, your lordships will not fail to observe, he is never corrupt, but he is cruel; he never dines with comfort, but where he is sure to create a famine. He never robs from the loose superfluity of standing greatness; he devours the fallen, the indigent, the necessitous. His extortion is not like the generous rapacity of the princely eagle, who snatches away the living, struggling prey; he is a vulture, who feeds upon the prostrate, the dying, and the dead. As his cruelty is more shocking than his corruption, so his hypocrisy has something more frightful than his cruelty. For whilst his bloody and rapacious hand signs proscriptions, and now sweeps away the food of the widow and the orphan, his eyes overflow with tears, and he converts the healing balm, that bleeds from wounded humanity, into a rancorous and deadly poison to the race of man.

Well, there is an end to this tragic entertainment, this feast of Tantalus. The few left on the pension list, the poor remnants that had escaped, were they paid by his administratrix and deputy, Munny Begum? Not a shilling. No fewer than forty-nine petitions, mostly from the widows of the greatest and most splendid houses of Bengal, came before the council, praying in the most deplorable manner for some sort of relief out of the pittance assigned them. His colleagues, General Clavering, Colonel Monson, and Mr. Francis, men, who, when England is reproached for the government of India, will, I repeat it, as a shield be held between this nation and infamy, did, in conformity to the strict orders of the directors, appoint Mahomed Reza Khân to his old offices, that is, to the general superintendency of the household and the administration of justice, a person, who, by his authority, might keep some order in the ruling family and in the State. The court of directors authorized them to assure those offices to him, with a salary reduced, indeed, to £30,000 a year, during his good behaviour. But Mr. Hastings, as soon as he obtained a majority by the death of the two best men ever sent to India, notwithstanding the orders of the court of directors, in spite of the public faith solemnly pledged to Mahomed Reza Khân, without a shadow of complaint, had the audacity to dispossess him of all his offices, and appoint his bribing patroness, the old dancing girl, Munny Begum, once more to the viceroyalty and all its attendant honours and functions.

The pretence was more insolent and shameless than the act. Modesty does not long survive innocence. He brings forward the miserable pageant of the nabob, as he called him, to be the instrument of his own disgrace and the scandal of his family and government. He makes him to pass by his mother, and to petition us to appoint Munny Begum once more to the administration of the viceroyalty. He distributed Mahomed Reza Khân's salary as a spoil.

When the orders of the court to restore Mahomed Reza Khân, with their opinion on the corrupt cause of his removal, and a second time to pledge to him the public faith for his continuance, were received, Mr. Hastings, who had been just before a pattern of obedience, when the despoiling, oppressing, imprisoning, and persecuting this man was the object, yet when the order was of a beneficial nature, and pleasant to a well-formed mind, he at once loses all his old principles, he grows stubborn and refractory, and refuses obedience. And in this sullen, uncomplying mood he continues, until, to gratify Mr. Francis in an agreement on some of their differences, he consented to his proposition of obedience to the appointment of the court of directors. He grants to his arrangement of convenience what he had refused to his duty, and replaces that magistrate. But mark the double character of the man, never true to any thing but fraud and duplicity. At the same time that he publicly replaces this magistrate, pretending compliance with his colleague, and obedience to his masters, he did, in defiance of his own and the public faith, privately send an assurance to the nabob, that is, to Munny Begum, informing her that he was compelled by necessity to the present arrangement in favour of Mahomed Reza Khân, but that on the first opportunity he would certainly displace him again. And he kept faith with his corruption; and to show how vainly any one sought protection in the lawful authority of this kingdom, he displaced Mahomed Reza Khân from the lieutenancy and controllership, leaving him only the judicial department miserably curtailed.

But does he adhere to his old pretence of freedom to the nabob? No such thing. He appoints an absolute master to him under the name of resident, a creature of his personal favour, Sir J. Doiley, from whom there is not one syllable of correspondence, and not one item of account. How grievous this yoke was to that miserable captive appears by a paper of Mr. Hastings, in which he acknowledges that the nabob had offered, out of the £160,000 payable to him yearly, to give up to the company no less than £40,000 a year, in order to have the free disposal of the rest. On this all comment is superfluous. Your lordships are furnished with a standard, by which you may estimate his real receipt from the revenue assigned to him, the nature of the pretended residency, and its predatory effects. It will give full credit to what was generally rumoured and believed, that substantially and beneficially the nabob never received £50 out of the £160,000; which will account for his known poverty and wretchedness, and that of all about him.

Thus, by his corrupt traffic of bribes with one scandalous woman, he disgraced and enfeebled the native Mahomedan government, captived the person of the sovereign, and ruined and subverted the justice of the country. What is worse, the steps taken for the murder of Nundcomar, his accuser, have confirmed and given sanction not only to the corruptions then practised by the governor-general, but to all of which he has since been guilty. This will furnish your lordships with some general idea, which will enable you to judge of the bribe for which he sold the country government.

Under this head you will have produced to you full proof of his sale of a judicial office to a person called Khân Jehân Khân and the modes he took to frustrate all inquiry on that subject upon a wicked and false pretence that according to his religious scruples he could not be sworn.

The great end and object I have in view is to show the criminal tendency, the mischievous nature, of these crimes, and the means taken to elude their discovery. I am now giving your lordships that general view, which may serve to characterize Mr. Hastings's administration in all the other parts of it.

It was not true in fact, as Mr. Hastings gives out, that there was nothing now against him, and that when he had got rid of Nundcomar and his charge, he got rid of the whole. No such thing. An immense load of charges of bribery remained. They were coming afterwards from every part of the province, and there was no office in the execution of justice which he was not accused of having sold in the most flagitious manner.

After all this thundering, the sky grew calm and clear, and Mr. Hastings sat with recorded peculation, with peculation proved upon oath on the minutes of that very council; he sat at the head of that council and that board where his peculations were proved against him. These were afterwards transmitted, and recorded in the registers of his masters, as an eternal monument of his corruption and of his high disobedience and flagitious attempts to prevent a discovery of the various peculations of which he had been guilty, to the disgrace and ruin of the country committed to his care.

Mr. Hastings, after the execution of Nundcomar, if he had intended to make even a decent and commonly sensible use of it, would naturally have said: "This man is justly taken away, who has accused me of these crimes; but as there are other witnesses, as there are other means of a further inquiry, as the man is gone, of whose perjuries I might have reason to be afraid, let us now go into the inquiry." I think he did very ill not to go into the inquiry, when the man was alive; but be it so that he was afraid of him, and waited till he was removed, why not afterwards go into such an inquiry? Why not go into an inquiry of all the other peculations and charges upon him, which were innumerable, one of which I have just mentioned in particular, the charge of Munny Begum,—of having received from her, or her adopted son, a bribe of £40,000?

Is it fit for a governor to say,—will Mr. Hastings say before this august assembly: "I may be accused in a court of justice, I am upon my defence, let all charges remain against me, I will not give you an account"? Is it fit that a governor should sit with recorded bribery upon him at the head of a public board, and the government of a great kingdom, when it is in his power by inquiry to do it away? No; the chastity of character of a man in that situation ought to be as dear to him as his innocence. Nay, more depended upon it. His innocence regarded himself, his character regarded the public justice, regarded his authority, and the respect due to the English in that country. I charge it upon him, that not only did he suppress the inquiry to the best of his power, and it shall be proved, but he did not in any one instance endeavour to clear off that imputation and reproach from the English government. He went further, he never denied hardly any of those charges at the time. They are so numerous, that I cannot be positive; some of them he might meet with some sort of denial, but the most part he did not.

The first thing a man under such an accusation owes to the world is to deny the charge; next to put it to the proof; and lastly to let inquiry freely go on. He did not permit this, but stopped it all in his power. I am to mention some exceptions perhaps hereafter, which will tend to fortify the principle tenfold.

He promised, indeed, the court of directors, to whom he never denied the facts, a full and liberal explanation of these transactions; which full and liberal explanation he never gave. Many years passed; even Parliament took notice of it; and he never gave a liberal explanation, or any explanation at all, of them. A man may say, I am threatened with a suit in a court, and it may be very disadvantageous to me, if I disclose my defence. That is a proper answer for a man in common life, who has no particular character to sustain; but is that a proper answer for a governor accused of bribery? That accusation transmitted to his masters, and his masters giving credit to it? Good God! is that a state in which a man is to say: "I am upon the defensive? I am on my guard? I will give you no satisfaction? I have promised it, but I have already deferred it for seven or eight years?" Is not this tantamount to a denial?

Mr. Hastings, with this great body of bribery against him, was providentially freed from Nundcomar, one of his accusers; and as good events do not come alone,—I think there is some such proverb,—it did so happen that all the rest, or a great many of them, ran away. But, however, the recorded evidence of the former charges continued, no new evidence came in, and Mr. Hastings enjoyed that happy repose, which branded peculation, fixed and eternized upon the records of the company, must leave upon a mind conscious of its own integrity.

My lords, I will venture to say there is no man but owes something to his character. It is the grace, undoubtedly, of a virtuous, firm mind often to despise common vulgar calumny; but if there is an occasion in which it does become such a mind to disprove it, it is the case of being charged in high office with pecuniary malversation, pecuniary corruption. There is no case, in which it becomes an honest man—much less a great man—to leave upon record specific charges against him of corruption in his government, without taking any one step whatever to refute them.

Though Mr. Hastings took no step to refute the charges, he took many steps to punish the authors of them; and those miserable people, who had the folly to make complaints against Mr. Hastings, to make them under the authority of an act of Parliament, under every sanction of public faith, yet in consequence of those charges every person concerned in them has been, as your lordships will see, since his restoration to power, absolutely undone; brought from the highest situation to the lowest misery, so that they may have good reason to repent they ever trusted an English council, that they ever trusted a court of directors, that they ever trusted an English act of Parliament, that they ever dared to make their complaints.

And here I charge upon Mr. Hastings, that by never taking a single step to defeat, or detect the falsehood of, any of those charges against him, and by punishing the authors of them, he has been guilty of such a subversion of all the principles of British government, as will deserve, and will, I dare say, meet, your lordships' most severe animadversion.

In the course of this inquiry we find a sort of pause in his peculations, a sort of gap in the history, as if pages were torn out. No longer we meet with the same activity in taking money, that was before found; not even a trace of complimentary presents is to be found in the records during the time, whilst General Clavering, Colonel Monson, and Mr. Francis formed the majority of the council. There seems to have been a kind of truce with that sort of conduct for a while, and Mr. Hastings rested upon his arms. However, the very moment Mr. Hastings returned to power, peculation began again just at the same instant; the moment we find him free from the compulsion and terror of a majority of persons otherwise disposed than himself, we find him at his peculation again.

My lords, at this time serious inquiries had begun in the House of Commons concerning peculation. They did not go directly to Bengal, but they began upon the coast of Coromandel, and with the principal governors there. There was, however, a universal opinion—and justly founded—that these inquiries would go to far greater lengths. Mr. Hastings was resolved then to change the whole course and order of his proceeding. Nothing could persuade him upon any account to lay aside his system of bribery; that he was resolved to persevere in. The point was how to reconcile it with his safety. The first thing he did was to attempt to conceal it, and accordingly we find him depositing very great sums of money in the public treasury through the means of the two persons I have already mentioned, namely, the deputy treasurer and the accountant, paying them in and taking bonds for them as money of his own, and bearing legal interest.

This was his method of endeavouring to conceal some, at least, of his bribes, for I would not suggest, nor have your lordships to think, that I believe that these were his only bribes, for there is reason to think there was an infinite number besides; but it did so happen, that they were those bribes which he thought might be discovered, some of which he knew were discovered, and all of which he knew might become the subject of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Hastings said he might have concealed them forever. Every one knows the facility of concealing corrupt transactions everywhere, in India particularly. But this is by himself proved not to be universally true, at least not to be true in his own opinion. For he tells you in his letter from Cheltenham, that he would have concealed the nabob's £100,000 but that the magnitude rendered it easy of discovery. He, therefore, avows an intention of concealment.

But it happens here very singularly, that this sum, which his fears of discovery by others obliged him to discover himself, happens to be one of those of which no trace whatsoever appears, except merely from the operation of his own apprehensions. There is no collateral testimony; Middleton knew nothing of it; Anderson knew nothing of it. It was not directly communicated to the faithful Larkins, or the trusty Crofts,—which proves, indeed, the facility of concealment. The fact is, you find the application always upon the discovery. But concealment or discovery is a thing of accident.

The bribes which I have hitherto brought before your lordships belong to the first period of his bribery, before he thought of the doctrine, on which he has since defended it. There are many other bribes, which we charge him with having received during this first period, before an improving conversation and close virtuous connection with great lawyers had taught him how to practise bribes in such a manner as to defy detection, and, instead of punishment, to plead merit. I am not bound to find order and consistency in guilt; it is the reign of disorder. The order of the proceeding, as far as I am able to trace such a scene of prevarication, direct fraud, falsehood, and falsification of the public accounts, was this: From bribes he knew he could never abstain; and his then precarious situation made him the more rapacious. He knew that a few of his former bribes had been discovered, declared, recorded; that for the moment, indeed, he was secure, because all informers had been punished and all concealers rewarded. He expected hourly a total change in the council, and that men like Clavering and Monson might be again joined to Francis; that some great avenger should arise from their ashes,—*Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor,*—and that a more severe investigation, and an infinitely more full display, would be made of his robbery than hitherto had been done. He therefore began, in the agony of his guilt, to cast about for some device by which he might continue his offence, if possible, with impunity, and possibly make a merit of it. He therefore first carefully perused the act of

Parliament, forbidding bribery, and his old covenant engaging him not to receive presents. And here he was more successful than upon former occasions. If ever an act was studiously and carefully framed to prevent bribery, it is that law of the thirteenth of the king, which he well observes admits no latitudes of construction, no subterfuge, no escape, no evasion. Yet has he found a defence of his crimes even in the very provisions which were made for their prevention and their punishment. Besides the penalty which belongs to every informer, the East India Company was invested with a fiction of property in all such bribes, in order to drag them with more facility out of the corrupt hands which held them. The covenant, with an exception of £100, and the act of Parliament without any exception, declared that the governor-general and council should receive no presents for their own use. He therefore concluded that the system of bribery and extortion might be clandestinely and safely carried on, provided the party taking the bribes had an inward intention and mental reservation that they should be privately applied to the company's service, in any way the briber should think fit, and that on many occasions this would prove the best method of supply for the exigencies of their service.

He accordingly formed, or pretended to form, a private bribe exchequer, collateral with, and independent of, the company's public exchequer, though in some cases administered by those whom for his purposes he had placed in the regular official department. It is no wonder that he has taken to himself an extraordinary degree of merit. For surely such an invention of finance I believe never was heard of,—an exchequer wherein extortion was the assessor, fraud the cashier, confusion the accountant, concealment the reporter, and oblivion the remembrancer; in short, such as I believe no man, but one driven by guilt into frenzy, could ever have dreamed of.

He treats the official and regular directors with just contempt, as a parcel of mean, mechanical bookkeepers. He is an eccentric bookkeeper, a Pindaric accountant. I have heard of "the poet's eye in a fine frenzy rolling." Here was a revenue, exacted from whom he pleased, at what times he pleased, in what proportions he pleased, through what persons he pleased, by what means he pleased, to be accounted for or not, at his discretion, and to be applied to what service he thought proper. I do believe your lordships stand astonished at this scheme; and, indeed, I should be very loth to venture to state such a scheme at all, however I might have credited it myself, to any sober ears, if, in his defence before the House of Commons and before the lords, he had not directly admitted the fact of taking the bribes or forbidden presents, and had not in those defences, and much more fully in his correspondence with the directors, admitted the fact, and justified it upon these very principles.

As this is a thing so unheard of and unexampled in the world, I shall first endeavour to account, as well as I can, for his motives to it, which your lordships will receive or reject, just as you shall find them tally with the evidence before you. I say, his motives to it, because I contend that public valid reasons for it he could have none, and the idea of making the corruption of the governor-general a resource to the company never did nor could for a moment enter into his thoughts. I shall then take notice of the judicial constructions upon which he justifies his acting in this extraordinary manner. And lastly, show you the concealments, prevarications, and falsehoods with which he endeavours to cover it, because wherever you find a concealment you make a discovery. Accounts of money received and paid ought to be regular and official.

He wrote over to the court of directors that there were certain sums of money he had received, and which were not his own, but that he had received them for their use. By this time, his intercourse with gentlemen of the law became more considerable than it had been before. When first attacked for presents, he never denied the receipt of them, or pretended to say they were for public purposes; but on looking more into the covenants, and probably with better legal advice, he found that no money could be legally received for his own use; but as these bribes were directly given and received, as for his own use, yet, says he, there was an inward destination of them in my own mind to your benefit, and to your benefit have I applied them.

Now here is a new system of bribery, contrary to law, very ingenious in the contrivance, but, I believe, as unlikely to produce its intended effect upon the mind of man as any pretence that was ever used. Here Mr. Hastings changes his ground. Before, he was accused as a peculator; he did not deny the fact; he did not refund the money; he fought it off, he stood upon the defensive, and used all the means in his power to prevent the inquiry. That was the first era of his corruption, a bold, ferocious, plain, downright use of power. In the second he is grown a little more careful and guarded, the effect of subtilty. He appears no longer as a defendant, he holds himself up with a firm, dignified, and erect countenance, and says, I am not here any longer as a delinquent, a receiver of bribes, to be punished for what I have done wrong, or at least to suffer in my character for it. No, I am a great inventive genius, who have gone out of all the ordinary roads of finance, have made great discoveries in the unknown regions of that science, and have for the first time established the corruption of the supreme magistrate as a principle of resource for government.

There are crimes, undoubtedly, of great magnitude, naturally fitted to create horror, and that loudly call for punishment, that have yet no idea of turpitude annexed to them ; but unclean hands, bribery, venality, and peculation are offences of turpitude, such as, in a governor, at once debase the person, and degrade the government itself, making it not only horrible, but vile and contemptible in the eyes of all mankind. In this humiliation and abjectness of guilt, he comes here not as a criminal on his defence, but as a vast fertile genius, who has made astonishing discoveries in the art of government,—*Dicam insigne, recens, alio indictum ore*,—who, by his flaming zeal and the prolific ardour and energy of his mind, has boldly dashed out of the common path, and served his country by new and untrodden ways ; and now he generously communicates, for the benefit of all future governors, and all future governments, the grand arcanum of his long and toilsome researches. He is the first, but if we do not take good care he will not be the last, that has established the corruption of the supreme magistrate among the settled resources of the State ; and he leaves this principle as a bountiful donation, as the richest deposit that ever was made in the treasury of Bengal. He claims glory and renown from that, by which every other person since the beginning of time, has been dishonoured and disgraced. It has been said of an ambassador, that he is a person employed to tell lies for the advantage of the court that sends him. His is patriotic bribery and public-spirited corruption. He is a peculator for the good of his country. It has been said that private vices are public benefits. He goes the full length of that position, and turns his private peculation into a public good. This is what you are to thank him for. You are to consider him as a great inventor upon this occasion. Mr. Hastings improves on this principle. He is a robber in gross, and a thief in detail ; he steals, he filches, he plunders, he oppresses, he extorts,—all for the good of the dear East India Company,—all for the advantages of his honoured masters, the proprietors,—all in gratitude to the dear perfidious court of directors, who have been in a practice to heap "insults on his person, slanders on his character, and indignities on his station ; who never had the confidence in him that they had in the meanest of his predecessors."

If you sanction this practice, if, after all you have exacted from the people by your taxes and public imposts, you are to let loose your servants upon them to extort by bribery and peculation what they can from them, for the purpose of applying it to the public service only whenever they please,—this shocking consequence will follow from it. If your governor is discovered in taking a bribe, he will say, "What is that to you? Mind your business, I intend it for the public service." The man who dares to accuse him loses the favour of the governor-general and the

India Company. They will say the governor has been doing a meritorious action, extorting bribes for our benefit, and you have the impudence to think of prosecuting him. So that the moment the bribe is detected, it is instantly turned into a merit; and we shall prove that this is the case with Mr. Hastings, whenever a bribe has been discovered.

I am now to inform your lordships that when he made these great discoveries to the court of directors he never tells them who gave him the money, upon what occasion he received it, by what hands, or to what purposes he applied it.

When he can himself give no account of his motives, and even declares that he cannot assign any cause, I am authorized and required to find motives for him,—corrupt motives for a corrupt act. There is no one capital act of his administration that did not strongly imply corruption. When a man is known to be free from all imputation of taking money, and it becomes an established part of his character, the errors, or even crimes, of his administration ought to be, and are in general, traced to other sources. You know it is a maxim. But once convict a man of bribery in any instance, and once by direct evidence, and you are furnished with a rule of irresistible presumption, that every other irregular act, by which unlawful gain may arise, is done upon the same corrupt motive. *Semel malus præsumitur semper malus.* As for good acts, candour, charity, justice oblige me not to assign evil motives, unless they serve some scandalous purpose, or terminate in some manifest evil end, so justice, reason, and common sense compel me to suppose that wicked acts have been done upon motives correspondent to their nature. Otherwise, I reverse all the principles of judgment, which can guide the human mind, and accept even the symptoms, the marks, and criteria of guilt, as presumptions of innocence. One that confounds good and evil is an enemy to the good.

His conduct upon these occasions may be thought irrational. But, thank God, guilt was never a rational thing; it distorts all the faculties of the mind, it perverts them, it leaves a man no longer in the free use of his reason, it puts him into confusion. He has recourse to such miserable and absurd expedients for covering his guilt as all those who are used to sit in the seat of judgment know have been the cause of detection of half the villainies in the world. To argue that these could not be his reasons, because they were not wise, sound, and substantial, would be to suppose what is not true, that bad men were always discreet and able. But I can very well from the circumstances discover motives, which may affect a giddy, superficial, shattered, guilty, anxious, restless mind, full of the weak resources of fraud, craft, and intrigue, that might induce him to make these discoveries, and to make them in the manner he has done. Not rational and well-fitted for their purposes, I am very ready to admit. For God forbid that guilt should ever leave a man the free undisturbed use of his faculties. For as guilt never rose from a true use of our rational faculties, so it is very frequently subversive of them. God forbid that prudence, the first of all the virtues, as well as the supreme director of them all, should ever be employed in the service of any of the vices. No, it takes the lead, and is never found where justice does not accompany it; and if ever it is attempted to bring it into the service of the vices, it immediately subverts their cause. It tends to their discovery, and, I hope and trust, finally to their utter ruin and destruction.

In the first place I am to remark to your lordships, that the accounts he has given of one of these sums of money are totally false and contradictory. Now, there is not a stronger presumption, nor can one want more reason, to judge a transaction fraudulent, than that the accounts given of it are contradictory; and he has given three accounts utterly irreconcilable with each other. He is asked, "How came you to take bonds for this money if it was not your own? How came you to vitiate and corrupt the state of the company's records, and to state yourself a lender to the company, when in reality you were its debtor?" His answer was, "I really cannot tell; I have forgot my reasons; the distance of time is so great (namely, a time of about two years, or not so long) I cannot give an account of the matter; perhaps I had this motive, perhaps I had another (but what is the most curious), perhaps I had none at all, which I can now recollect." You shall hear the account which Mr. Hastings himself gives, his own fraudulent representation of these corrupt transactions. "For my motives for withholding the several receipts from the knowledge of the council, or of the court of directors, and for taking bonds for part of these sums, and paying others into the treasury as deposits on my own account, I have generally accounted in my letter to the honourable the court of directors of the twenty-second of May, 1782, namely, that I either chose to conceal the first receipts from public curiosity by receiving bonds for the amount, or possibly acted without any studied design, which my memory, at that distance of time, could verify; and that I did not think it worth my care to observe the same means with the rest. It will not be expected that I should be able to give a more correct explanation of my intentions after a lapse of three years, having declared at the time, that many particulars had escaped my remembrance; neither shall I attempt to add more than the clearer affirmation of the facts implied in that report of them, and such inferences, as necessarily, or with a strong probability, follow them."

My lords, you see, as to any direct explanation, that he fairly gives it up; he has used artifice and stratagem, which he knows will not do, and at last attempts to cover the treachery of his conduct by the treachery of his memory. Frequent applications were made to Mr. Hastings upon this article from the company,—gentle hints, *gemitus columbæ*,—rather little amorous complaints, that he was not more open and communicative; but all these gentle insinuations were never able to draw from him any further account till he came to England. When he came here, he left not only his memory, but all his notes and references, behind in India. When in India, the company could get no account of them, because he himself was not in England; and when he was in England, they could get no account, because his papers were in India. He then sends over to Mr. Larkins to give that account of his affairs, which he was not able to give himself. Observe, here is a man taking money privately, corruptly, and which was to be sanctified by the future application of it, taking false securities to cover it, and who, when called upon to tell whom he got the money from, for what ends, and on what occasion, neither will tell in India, nor can tell in England, but sends for such an account as he has thought proper to furnish.

I am now to bring before you an account of what I think much the most serious part of the effects of his system of bribery, corruption, and peculation. My lords, I am to state to you the astonishing and almost incredible means he made use of to lay all the country under contribution, to bring the whole into such dejection as should put his bribes out of the way of discovery. Such another example of boldness and contrivance I believe the world cannot furnish.

I have already shown amongst the mass of his corruptions, that he let the whole of the lands to farm to the banyans. Next, that he sold the whole Mahomedan government of that country to a woman. This was bold enough, one should think; but without entering into the circumstances of the revenue change in 1772, I am to tell your lordships, that he had appointed six provincial councils, each consisting of many members who had the ordinary administration of civil justice in that country and the whole business of the collection of the revenues.

These provincial councils accounted to the governor-general and council, who, in the revenue department, had the whole management, control, and regulation of the revenue. Mr. Hastings did, in several papers to the court of directors, declare that the establishment of these provincial councils, which at first he started only as experimental, had proved useful in the experiment. And on that use, and upon that experiment, he had sent even the plan of an act of Parliament to have it confirmed with the last and most sacred authority of this country.

The court of directors desired that if he thought any other method more proper he would send it to them for their approbation.

Thus the whole face of the British government, the whole of its order and constitution, remained from 1772 to 1781. He had got rid some time before this period, by death, of General Clavering; by death, of Colonel Monson; and by vexation and persecution, and his consequent dereliction of authority, he had shaken off Mr. Francis. The whole council consisting only of himself and Mr. Wheler, he, having the casting vote, was in effect the whole council; and if ever there was a time when principle, decency, and decorum rendered it improper for him to do any extraordinary acts without the sanction of the court of directors, that was the time. Mr. Wheler was taken off, despair, perhaps, rendering the man, who had been in opposition futilely before, compliable. The man is dead. He certainly did not oppose him; if he had, it would have been in vain. But those very circumstances which rendered it atrocious in Mr. Hastings to make any change induced him to make this. He thought that a moment's time was not to be lost,—that the other colleagues might come, when he might be overpowered by a majority again, and not able to pursue his corrupt plans. Therefore he was resolved,—your lordships will remark the whole of this most daring and systematic plan of bribery and peculation,—he resolved to put it out of the power of his council in the future to check or control him in any of his evil practices.

The first thing he did was to form an ostensible council at Calcutta for the management of the revenues, which was not effectually bound, except it thought fit, to make any reference to the supreme council. He delegated to them—that is, to four covenanted servants—those functions which, by act of Parliament and the company's orders, were to be exercised by the council-general; he delegated to four gentlemen, creatures of his own, his own powers, but he laid them out to good interest. It appears odd that one of the first acts of a governor-general, so jealous of his power as he is known to be, as soon as he had all the power in his own hands, should be to put all the revenues out of his own control. This, upon the first view, is an extraordinary proceeding. His next step was, without apprizing the court of directors of his intention, or without having given an idea of any such intention to his colleagues while alive, either those who died in India, or those who afterwards returned to Europe, in one day, in a moment, to annihilate the whole authority of the provincial councils, and to delegate the whole power to these four gentlemen. These four gentlemen had for their secretary an agent given them by Mr. Hastings; a name that you will often hear of, a name at the sound of which all India turns pale,—the most wicked, the most atrocious, the boldest, the most dexterous villain, that ever the rank of servitude of that country has produced. My lords, I am speaking with the most assured freedom, because there never was a friend of Mr. Hastings, there never was a foe of Mr. Hastings, there never was any human person, that ever differed on this occasion, or expressed any other idea of Gunga Govin Sing, the friend of Mr. Hastings, whom he intrusted with this important post. But you shall hear, from the account given by themselves, what the council thought of their functions, of their efficiency for the charge, and in whose hands that efficiency really was. I beg, hope, and trust, that your lordships will learn from the persons themselves, who were appointed to execute the office, their opinion of the real execution of it in order that you may judge of the plan, for which he destroyed the whole English administration in India. "The committee must have a dewan, or executive officer, call him by what name you please. This man in fact has all the revenue, paid at the presidency, at his disposal, and can, if he has any abilities, bring all the renters under contribution. It is little advantage to restrain the committee themselves from bribery or corruption, when their executive officer has the power of practising both undetected.

"To display the arts employed by a native on such occasions would fill a volume. He discovers the secret resources of the zemindars and renters, their enemies and competitors; and by the engines of hope and fear, raised upon these foundations, he can work them to his purpose. The committee, with the best intentions, best abilities, and steadiest application, must, after all, be a tool in the hands of their dewan."

Your lordships see what the opinion of the council was of their own constitution. You see for what it was made. You see for what purpose the great revenue trust was taken from the council-general, from the supreme government. You see for what purposes the executive power was destroyed. You have it from one of the gentlemen of this commission, at first four in number, and afterwards five, who was the most active efficient member of it. You see it was made for the purpose of being a tool in the hands of Gunga Govin Sing; that integrity, ability, and vigilance, could avail nothing; that the whole country might be laid under contribution by this man, and that he could thus practise bribery with impunity. Thus, your lordships see the delegation of all the authority of the country, above and below, is given by Mr. Hastings to this Gunga Govin Sing. The screen, the veil spread before this transaction, is torn open by the very people themselves, who are the tools in it. They confess they can do nothing; they know they are instruments in the hands of Gunga Govin Sing; and Mr. Hastings uses his name and authority to make them such in the hands of the basest, the wickedest, the corruptest, the most audacious and atrocious villain ever heard of. It is to him all the English authority is sacrificed, and four gentlemen are appointed to be his tools and instruments. Tools and instruments for what? They themselves state, that, if he has the inclination, he has the power and ability to lay the whole country under contribution, that he enters into the most minute secrets of every individual in it, gets into the bottom of their family affairs, and has a power totally to subvert and destroy them; and we shall show upon that head that he well fulfilled the purposes for which he was appointed. Did Mr. Hastings pretend to say that he destroyed the provincial councils for their corruptness or insufficiency, when he dissolved them? No; he says he has no objection to their competency, no charge to make against their conduct, but that he has destroyed them for his new arrangement. And what is his new arrangement? Gunga Govin Sing. Forty English gentlemen were removed from their offices by that change. Mr. Hastings did it, however, very economically; for all these gentlemen were instantly put upon pensions, and consequently burdened the establishment with a new charge. Well, but the new council was formed and constituted upon a very economical principle also. These five gentlemen, you will have it in proof, with the necessary expenses of their office, were a charge of £62,000 a year upon the establishment. But for great, eminent, capital services, £62,000, though a much larger sum than what was thought fit to be allowed for the members of the supreme council itself, may be admitted. I will pass it. It shall be granted to Mr. Hastings, that these pensions, though they created a new burden on the establishment, were all well disposed, provided the council did their duty. But you have heard what they say themselves,—they are not there put to do any duty, they can do no duty; their abilities, their integrity availed them nothing, they are tools in the hands of Gunga Govin Sing. Mr. Hastings, then, has loaded the revenue with £62,000 a year to make Gunga Govin Sing master of the kingdom of Bengal, Bahar, and Orissa. What must the thing to be moved be, when the machinery, when the necessary tools for Gunga Govin Sing, have cost £62,000 a year to the company? There it is; it is not my representation,—not the representation of observant strangers, of good and decent people that understand the nature of that service,—but the opinion of the tools themselves.

Now, did Mr. Hastings employ Gunga Govin Sing without a knowledge of his character? His character was known to Mr. Hastings; it was recorded long before, when he was turned out of another office. During my long residence, says he, in this country, this is the first time I heard of the character of Gunga Govin Sing being infamous. No information I have received, though I have heard many people speak ill of him, ever pointed to any particular act of infamy committed by Gunga Govin Sing. I have no intimate knowledge of Gunga Govin Sing. What I understand of his character has been from Europeans as well as natives. After—" He had many enemies at the time he was proposed to be employed in the company's service, and not one advocate among the natives who had immediate access to myself. I think, therefore, if his character had been such as has been described, the knowledge of it could hardly have failed to have been ascertained to me by the specific facts. I have heard him loaded, as I have many others, with general reproaches, but have never heard any one express a doubt of his abilities." Now, if anything in the world should induce you to put the whole trust of the revenues of Bengal, both above and below, into the hands of a single man, and to delegate to him the whole jurisdiction of the country, it must be that he either was, or at least was reputed to be, a man of integrity. Mr. Hastings does not pretend that he is reputed to be a man of integrity. He knew that he was not able to contradict the charge brought against him; and that he had been turned out of office by his colleagues, for reasons assigned upon record, and approved by the directors, for malversation in office. He had, indeed, crept again into the Calcutta Committee; and they were upon the point of turning him out for malversation, when Mr. Hastings saved them the trouble by turning out the whole committee, consisting of a president and five members. So that in all times, in all characters, in all places, he stood as a man of a bad character and evil repute, though supposed to be a man of great abilities.

My lords, permit me for one moment to drop my representative character here, and to speak to your lordships only as a man of some experience in the world, and conversant with the affairs of men and with the characters of men.

I do then declare my conviction, and wish it may stand recorded to posterity, that there never was a bad man, that had ability for good service. It is not in the nature of such men; their minds are so distorted to selfish purposes, to knavish, artificial, and crafty means of accomplishing those selfish ends, that if put to any good service, they are poor, dull, helpless. Their natural faculties never have that direction,—they are paralytic on that side; the muscles, if I may use the expression, that ought to move it, are all dead. They know nothing, but how to pursue selfish ends by wicked and indirect means. No man ever knowingly employed a bad man on account of his abilities, but for evil ends. Mr. Hastings knew this man to be bad; all the world knew him to be bad; and how did he employ him? In such a manner as that he might be controlled by others? A great deal might be said for him, if this had been the case. There might be circumstances, in which such a man might be used in a subordinate capacity. But who ever thought of putting such a man virtually in possession of the whole authority, both of the committee and the council-general, and of the revenues of the whole country ?

I will do Mr. Hastings the justice to say, that if he had known there was another man more accomplished in all iniquity than Gunga Govin Sing he would not have given him the first place in his confidence. But there is another next to him in the country, whom you are to hear of by and by, called Debi Sing. This person in the universal opinion of all Bengal is ranked next to Gunga Govin Sing ; and, what is very curious, they have been recorded by Mr. Hastings as rivals in the same virtues.

"Arcades ambo,
Et cantare pares, et respondere parati."

But Mr. Hastings has the happiest modes in the world ; these rivals were reconciled on this occasion, and Gunga Govin Sing appoints Debi Sing, superseding all the other officers for no reason whatever upon record. And because, like champions, they ought to go in pairs, there is an English gentleman, one Mr. Goodlad, whom you will hear of presently, appointed along with him. Absolute strangers to the rajah's family, the first act they do is to cut off one thousand out of one thousand six hundred a month from his allowance. They state, though there was a great number of dependents to maintain, that six hundred would be enough to maintain him. There appears in the account of these proceedings to be such a flutter about the care of the rajah, and the management of his household—in short, that there never was such a tender guardianship as, always with the knowledge of Mr. Hastings, is exercised over this poor rajah, who had just given, if he did give, £40,000 for his own inheritance, if it was his due,—for the inheritance of others, if it was not his due. One would think he was entitled to some mercy ; but probably, because the money could not otherwise be supplied, his establishment was cut down by Debi Sing and Mr. Goodlad a thousand a month, which is just twelve thousand a year.

When Mr. Hastings had appointed those persons to the guardianship who had an interest in the management of the rajah's education and fortune, one would have thought, before they were turned out, he would at least have examined whether such a step was proper or not. No, they were turned out, without any such examination ; and when I come to inquire into the proceedings of Gunga Govin Sing's committee, I do not find that the new guardians have brought to account one single shilling they received, appointed as they were by that council newly made to superintend all the affairs of the rajah.

There is not one word to be found of an account. Debi Sing's honour, fidelity, and disinterestedness, and that of Mr. Goodlad, is sufficient; and that is the way in which the management and superintendence of one of the greatest houses in that country is given to the guardianship of strangers. And how is it managed? We find Debi Sing in possession of the rajah's family, in possession of his affairs, in the management of his whole zemindary; and in the course of the next year he is to give him in farm the whole of the revenues of these three provinces. Now, whether the peshcush was received for the nomination of the rajah, as a bribe in judgment, or whether Mr. Hastings got it from Debi Sing, as a bribe in office, for appointing him to the guardianship of a family that did not belong to him, and for the dominion of three great, and once wealthy, provinces—which is best or worst I shall not pretend to determine. You find the rajah in his possession; you find his education, his household in his possession. The public revenues are in his possession; they are given over to him.

If we look at the records, the letting of these provinces appears to have been carried on by the new committee of revenue, as the course and order of business required it should. But by the investigation into Mr. Hastings's money transactions, the insufficiency and fallacy of these records is manifest beyond a doubt. From this investigation it is discovered that it was in reality a bargain secretly struck between the governor-general and Debi Sing, and that the committee were only employed in the mere official forms. From the time that Mr. Hastings newly modelled the revenue system, nothing is seen in its true shape. We now know, in spite of the fallacy of these records, who the true grantor was; it will not be amiss to go a little further in supplying their defects, and to inquire a little concerning the grantee. This makes it necessary for me to inform your lordships who Debi Sing is.

[Mr. Burke here read the Committee's recommendation of Debi Sing to the Governor-General and Council].

Here is a choice, here is Debi Sing presented for his knowledge in business, his trust, and fidelity, and that he is a person against whom no objection can be made. This is presented to Mr. Hastings, by him recorded in the council books, and by him transmitted to the court of directors. Mr. Hastings has since recorded that he knew this Debi Sing,—though he here publicly authorizes the nomination of him to all that great body of trusts,—that he knew him to be a man completely capable of the most atrocious iniquities that were ever charged upon man. Debi Sing is appointed to all those great trusts through the means of Gunga Govin Sing, from whom he, Mr. Hastings, had received £30,000 as a part of a bribe.

Now, though it is a large field, though it is a thing that, I must confess, I feel a reluctance almost in venturing to undertake, exhausted as I am, yet such is the magnitude of the affair, such the evil consequences that followed from a system of bribery, such the horrible consequences of superseding all the persons in office in the country to give it into the hands of Debi Sing, that though it is the public opinion, and though no man that has ever heard the name of Debi Sing does not know that he was only second to Gunga Govin Sing, yet it is not to my purpose, unless I prove that Mr. Hastings knew his character at the very time he accepts him as a person against whom no exception could be made.

It is necessary to inform your lordships who this Debi Sing was, to whom these great trusts were committed, and those great provinces given.

It may be thought, and not unnaturally, that in this sort of corrupt and venal appointment to high trust and office, Mr. Hastings has no other consideration than the money he received. But whoever thinks so will be deceived. Mr. Hastings was very far from indifferent to the character of the persons he dealt with. On the contrary, he made a most careful selection ; he had a very scrupulous regard to the aptitude of the men for the purposes for which he employed them, and was much guided by his experience of their conduct in those offices which had been sold to them upon former occasions.

Except Gunga Govin Sing, whom, as justice required, Mr. Hastings distinguished by the highest marks of his confidence, there was not a man in Bengal, perhaps not upon earth, a match for this Debi Sing. He was not an unknown subject ; not one rashly taken up as an experiment. He was a tried man ; and if there had been one more desperately and abandonedly corrupt, more wildly and flagitiously oppressive, to be found unemployed in India, large as his offers were, Mr. Hastings would not have taken this money from Debi Sing.

Debi Sing was one of those who, in the early stages of the English power in Bengal, attached himself to those natives who then stood high in office. He courted Mahomed Reza Khân, a Mussulman of the highest rank, of the tribe of Koreish, whom I have already mentioned, then at the head of the revenue, and now at the head of the criminal justice of Bengal, with all the supple assiduity, of which those who possess no valuable art or useful talent are commonly complete masters. Possessing large funds acquired by his apprenticeship and novitiate in the lowest frauds, he was enabled to lend to this then powerful man, in the several emergencies of his variable fortune, very large sums of money. This great man had been brought down by Mr. Hastings, under the orders of the court of directors, upon a cruel charge, to Calcutta. He was accused of many crimes, and acquitted, £220,000 in debt. That is to say, as soon as he was a great debtor, he ceased to be a great criminal. Debi Sing obtained, by his services, no slight influence over Mahomed Reza Khân, a person of a character very different from his.

From that connection he was appointed to the farm of the revenue, and inclusively of the government of Purnea, a province of very great extent, and then in a state of no inconsiderable opulence. In this office he exerted his talents with so much vigour and industry, that in a very short time the province was half depopulated and totally ruined.

The farm, on the expiration of his lease, was taken by a set of adventurers in this kind of traffic from Calcutta. But when the new undertakers came to survey the object of their future operations and future profits, they were so shocked at the hideous and squalid scenes of misery and desolation that glared upon them in every quarter, that they instantly fled out of the country, and thought themselves but too happy to be permitted, on the payment of a penalty of £12,000, to be released from their engagements.

To give in a few words as clear an idea as I am able to give of the immense volume which might be composed of the vexations, violence, and rapine of that tyrannical administration, the territorial revenue of Purnea, which had been let to Debi Sing at the rate of £160,000 sterling a year, was with difficulty leased for a yearly sum under £90,000, and with all rigour of exaction produced in effect little more than £60,000, falling greatly below one-half of its original estimate. So entirely did the administration of Debi Sing exhaust all the resources of the province. So totally did his baleful influence blast the very hope and spring of all future revenue.

The administration of Debi Sing was too notoriously destructive not to cause a general clamour. It was impossible that it should be passed over without animadversion. Accordingly, in the month of September 1772, Mr. Hastings, then at the head of the committee of circuit, removed him for maladministration, and he has since publicly declared on record, that he knew him to be capable of all the most horrid and atrocious crimes that can be imputed to man.

This brand, however, was only a mark for Mr. Hastings to find him out hereafter in the crowd; to identify him for his own; and to call him forth into action, when his virtues should be sufficiently matured for the services, in which he afterwards employed him through his instruments, Mr. Anderson and Gunga Govin Sing. In the meantime he left Debi Sing to the direction of his own good genius.

Debi Sing was stigmatized in the company's records, his reputation was gone, but his funds were safe. In the arrangement made by Mr. Hastings in the year 1773, by which provincial councils were formed, Debi Sing became deputy steward or secretary, soon in effect and influence principal steward, to the provincial council of Moorshedabad, the seat of the old government, and the first province of the kingdom ; and to his charge were committed various extensive and populous provinces, yielding an annual revenue of one hundred and twenty lacs of rupees, or £1,500,000. This division of provincial council included Rungpore, Edrackpore, and others, where he obtained such a knowledge of their resources as subsequently to get possession of them.

Debi Sing found this administration composed mostly of young men, dissipated and fond of pleasure, as is usual at that time of life, but desirous of reconciling those pleasures, which usually consume wealth, with the means of making a great and speedy fortune, at once eager candidates for opulence and perfect novices in all the roads that lead to it. Debi Sing commiserated their youth and inexperience, and took upon him to be their guide.

There is a revenue in that country, raised by a tax more productive than laudable. It is an imposition on public prostitutes, a duty upon the societies of dancing girls ; those seminaries, from which Mr. Hastings has selected an administrator of justice and governor of kingdoms. Debi Sing thought it expedient to farm this tax, not only because he neglected no sort of gain, but because he regarded it as no contemptible means of power and influence. Accordingly, in plain terms, he opened a legal brothel, out of which he carefully reserved—you may be sure—the very flower of his collection for the entertainment of his young superiors, ladies recommended not only by personal merit, but, according to the Eastern custom, by sweet and enticing names, which he had given them, for, if they were to be translated, they would sound : Riches of my Life, Wealth of my Soul, Treasure of Perfection, Diamond of Splendour, Pearl of Price, Ruby of Pure Blood and other metaphorical descriptions, that, calling up dissonant passions to enhance the value of the general harmony, heightened the attractions of love with the allurements of avarice. A moving seraglio of these ladies always attended his progress, and were always brought to the splendid and multiplied entertainments, with which he regaled his council. In these festivities, whilst his guests were engaged with the seductions of beauty, the intoxications of the most delicious wines of France, and the voluptuous vapour of perfumed Indian smoke, uniting the vivid satisfactions of Europe with the torpid blandishments of Asia, the great magician himself, chaste in the midst of dissoluteness, sober in the centre of debauch, vigilant in the lap of negligence and oblivion, attended with an eagle's eye the moment for thrusting in business, and at such times was able to carry without difficulty points of shameful enormity, which at other hours he would not so much as have dared to mention to his employers, young men rather careless and inexperienced than intentionally corrupt. Not satisfied with being pander to their pleasures, he anticipated, and was purveyor to, their wants, and supplied them with a constant command of money; and by these means he reigned with an uncontrolled dominion over the province and over its governors.

For you are to understand that in many things we are very much misinformed with regard to the true seat of power in India. Whilst we were proudly calling India a British government, it was in substance a government of the lowest, basest, and the most flagitious of the native rabble, to whom the far greater part of the English, who figured in employment and station, had from their earliest youth been slaves and instruments. Banyans had anticipated the period of their power in premature advances of money, and have ever after obtained the entire dominion over their nominal masters.

By these various ways and means, Debi Sing contrived to add job to job, employment to employment, and to hold, besides the farms of two very considerable districts, various trusts in the revenue; sometimes openly appearing; sometimes hid two or three deep in false names; emerging into light, or shrouding himself in darkness, as successful or defeated crimes rendered him bold or cautious. Every one of these trusts was marked with its own fraud; and for one of those frauds committed by him in another name, by which he became deeply in balance to the revenue, he was publicly whipped by proxy.

All this while Mr. Hastings kept his eye upon him, and attended to his progress. But, as he rose in Mr. Hastings's opinion, he fell in that of his immediate employers. By degrees, as reason prevailed and the fumes of pleasure evaporated, the provincial council emerged from their first dependence, and, finding nothing but infamy attending the councils and services of such a man, resolved to dismiss him. In this strait and crisis of his power, the artist turned himself into all shapes. He offered great sums individually; he offered them collectively; and at last put a *carte blanche* on the table—all to no purpose! What! are you stones?—Have I not men to deal with?—Will flesh and blood refuse me?

When Debi Sing found that the council had entirely escaped, and were proof against his offers, he left them with a sullen and menacing silence. He applied where he had good intelligence that these offers would be well received, and that he should at once be revenged of the council, and obtain all the ends which through them he had sought in vain.

Without hesitation or scruple, Mr. Hastings sold a set of innocent officers; sold his fellow-servants of the company, entitled by every duty to his protection; sold English subjects, recommended by every tie of national sympathy; sold the honour of the British government itself; without charge, without complaint, without allegation of crime in conduct, or of insufficiency in talents. He sold them to the most known and abandoned character which the rank servitude of that clime produces. For him, he entirely broke and quashed the council of Moorshedabad, which had been the settled government for twelve years,—a long period in the changeful history of India,—at a time, too, when it had acquired a great degree of consistency, an official experience, a knowledge and habit of business, and was making full amends for early errors.

For now Mr. Hastings, having buried Colonel Monson and General Clavering, and having shaken off Mr. Francis, who retired half dead from office, began at length to respire; he found elbow-room once more to display his genuine nature and disposition, and to make amends in a riot and debauch of peculation for the forced abstinence to which he was reduced during the usurped dominion of honour and integrity.

It was not enough that the English were thus sacrificed to the revenge of Debi Sing. It was necessary to deliver over the natives to his avarice. By the intervention of bribe brokerage, he united the two great rivals in iniquity, who before, from an emulation of crimes, were enemies to each other, Gunga Govin Sing and Debi Sing. He negotiated the bribe and the farm of the latter through the former, and Debi Sing was invested in farm for two years with the three provinces of Dinagepore, Edrackpore, and Rungpore,—territories, making together a tract of land superior in dimensions to the northern counties of England, Yorkshire included.

To prevent anything which might prove an obstacle to the full swing of his genius, he removed all the restraints which had been framed to give an ostensible credit, to give some show of official order to the plans of revenue administration framed from time to time in Bengal. An officer, called a dewan, had been established in the provinces, expressly as a check on the person who should act as farmer-general. This office he conferred along with that of farmer-general on Debi Sing, in order that Debi might become an effectual check upon Sing; and thus these provinces, without inspection, without control, without law, and without magistrates, were delivered over by Mr. Hastings, bound hand and foot, to the discretion of the man, whom he had before recorded as the destroyer of Purnea, and capable of every most atrocious wickedness that could be imputed to man.

Fatally for the natives of India, every wild project and every corrupt sale of Mr. Hastings, and those whose example he followed, is covered with a pretended increase of revenue to the company. Mr. Hastings would not pocket his bribe of £40,000 for himself without letting the company in as a sharer and accomplice. For the province of Rungpore, the object to which I mean in this instance to confine your attention, £7,000 a year were added. But lest this avowed increase of rent should seem to lead to oppression, great and religious care was taken in the covenant, so stipulated with Debi Sing that this increase should not arise from any additional assessment whatsoever on the country, but solely from improvements in the cultivation and the encouragement to be given to the landholder and husbandman. But as Mr. Hastings's bribe of a far greater sum was not guarded by any such provision, it was left to the discretion of the donor in what manner he was to indemnify himself for it.

Debi Sing fixed the seat of his authority at Dinagepore, where as soon as he arrived he did not lose a moment in doing his duty. If Mr. Hastings can forget his covenant, you may easily believe that Debi Sing had not a more correct memory, and, accordingly, as soon as he came into the province, he instantly broke every covenant which he had entered into, as a restraint on his avarice, rapacity, and tyranny, which, from the highest of the nobility and gentry to the lowest husbandman, were afterwards exercised with a stern and unrelenting impartiality upon the whole people. For, notwithstanding the province before Debi Sing's lease was, from various causes, in a state of declension, and in balance of the revenue of the preceding year, at his very first entrance into office he forced from the zemindars or landed gentry an enormous increase of their tribute. They refused compliance. On this refusal he threw the whole body of zemindars into prison, and thus in bonds and fetters compelled them to sign their own ruin by an increase of rent, which they knew they could never realize.

Having thus gotten them under, he added exaction to exaction, so that every day announced some new and varied demand, until, exhausted by these oppressions, they were brought to the extremity to which he meant to drive them,—the sale of their lands.

The lands held by the zemindars of that country are of many descriptions. The first and most general are those that pay revenue. The others are of the nature of demesne lands, which are free and pay no rent to government. The latter are for the immediate support of the zemindars and their families, as from the former they derive their influence, authority, and the means of upholding their dignity. The lands of the former description were immediately attached, sequestered, and sold for the most trifling consideration. The rent-free lands, the best and richest lands of the whole province, were sold—sold for—what do your lordships think? They were sold for less than one year's purchase,—at less than one year's purchase, at the most underrated value; so that the fee simple of an English acre of rent-free land sold at the rate of seven or eight shillings. Such a sale on such terms strongly indicated the purchaser. And how did it turn out in fact? The purchaser was the very agent and instrument of Mr. Hastings, Debi Sing himself. He made the exaction; he forced the sale; he reduced the rate; and he became the purchaser at less than one year's purchase, and paid with the very money which he had extorted from the miserable vendors.

When he had thus sold and separated these lands, he united the whole body of them, amounting to about £7,000 a year (but according to the rate of money and living in that country equivalent to a rental in England of £30,000 a year); and then having raised in the new letting, as on the sale he had fraudulently reduced those lands, he reserved them as an estate for himself, or to whomsoever resembling himself Mr. Hastings should order them to be disposed.

The lands, thus sold for next to nothing, left, of course, the late landholder still in debt. The failure of fund, the rigorous exaction of debt, and the multiplication of new arbitrary taxes next carried off the goods. There is a circumstance attending this business, which will call for your lordships' pity. Most of the landholders or zemindars in that country happened at that time to be women. The sex there is in a state certainly resembling imprisonment, but guarded as a sacred treasure with all possible attention and respect. None of the coarse male hands of the law can reach them; but they have a custom, very cautiously used in all good governments there, of employing female bailiffs, or sergeants, in the execution of the law, where that sex is concerned. Guards, therefore, surrounded the houses, and then female sergeants and bailiffs entered into the habitations of these female zemindars, and held their goods and persons in execution, nothing being left but, what was daily threatened, their life and honour. The landholders, even women of eminent rank and condition, for such the greater part of the zemindars then were, fled from the ancient seats of their ancestors and left their miserable followers and servants, who in that country are infinitely numerous, without protection and without bread. The monthly instalment of Mr. Hastings's bribe was become due, and his rapacity must be fed from the vitals of the people.

The zemindars, before their own flight, had the mortification of seeing all the lands assigned to charitable and to religious uses, the humane and pious foundations of themselves and their ancestors, made to support infirmity and decrepitude, to give feet to the lame and eyes to the blind, and to effect which they had deprived themselves of many of the enjoyments of life, cruelly sequestered and sold at the same market of violence and fraud, where their demesne possessions and their goods had been before made away with. Even the lands and funds set aside for their funeral ceremonies, in which they hoped to find an end to their miseries, and some indemnity of imagination for all the substantial sufferings of their lives ; even the very feeble consolations of death were by the same rigid hand of tyranny, a tyranny more consuming than the funeral pile, more greedy than the grave, and more inexorable than death itself, seized and taken to make good the honour of corruption and the faith of bribery pledged to Mr. Hastings or his instruments.

Thus it fared with the better and middling orders of the people. Were the lower, the more industrious, spared ? Alas ! as their situation was far more helpless, their oppression was infinitely more sore and grievous, the exactions yet more excessive, the demand yet more vexatious, more capricious, more arbitrary. To afford your lordships some idea of the conditions of those who were served up to satisfy Mr. Hastings's hunger and thirst for bribes, I shall read it to you in the very words of the representative tyrant himself, Rajah Debi Sing. Debi Sing, when he was charged with a fraudulent sale of the ornaments of gold and silver of women, who, according to the modes of that country, had starved themselves to decorate their unhappy persons, argued on the improbability of this part of the charge, in these very words :—

"It is notorious," says he, "that poverty generally prevails amongst the husbandmen of Rungpore, more perhaps than in any other parts of the country. They are seldom possessed of any property, except at the time they reap their harvest ; and at others, barely procure their subsistence. And this is the cause that such numbers of them are swept away by the famine. Their effects are only a little earthenware, and their houses only a handful of straw, the sale of a thousand of which would not perhaps produce twenty shillings."

These were the opulent people from whose superfluities Mr. Hastings was to obtain a gift of £40,000 over and above a large increase of rent, over and above the exactions by which the farmer must reimburse himself for the advance of the money, by which he must obtain the natural profit of the farm, as well as supply the peculium of his own avarice.

Therefore your lordships will not be surprised at the consequences. All this unhappy race of little farmers and tillers of the soil were driven like a herd of cattle by his extortioners, and compelled by imprisonments, by fetters, and by cruel whippings, to engage for more than the whole of their substance or possible acquisition.

Over and above this, there was no mode of extortion which the inventive imagination of rapacity could contrive, that was not contrived and was not put in practice. On its own day your lordships will hear with astonishment, detestation, and horror, the detail of these tyrannous inventions; and it will appear that the aggregate of these superadded demands amounted to as great a sum as the whole of the compulsory rent on which they were piled.

The country being in many parts left wholly waste, and in all parts considerably depopulated by the first rigours, the full rate of the district was exacted from the miserable survivors. Their burdens were increased as their fellow-labourers, to whose joint efforts they were to owe the means of payment, diminished. Driven to make payments, beyond all possible calculation, previous to receipts and above their means, in a very short time they fell into the hands of usurers.

The usurers, who under such a government held their own funds by a precarious tenure, and were to lend to those whose substance was still more precarious,—to the natural hardness and austerity of that race of men,—had additional motives to extortion, and made their terms accordingly. And what were the terms these poor people were obliged to consent to, to answer the bribes and peshcush paid to Mr. Hastings? Five, ten, twenty, forty per cent.? No! at an interest of six hundred per cent. per annum, payable by the day! A tiller of land to pay six hundred per cent., to discharge the demands of government! What exhaustless fund of opulence could supply this destructive resource of wretchedness and misery? Accordingly, the husbandman ground to powder between the usurer below and the oppressor above, the whole crop of the country was forced at once to market; and the market glutted, overcharged, and suffocated, the price of grain fell to the fifth part of its usual value. The crop was then gone, but the debt remained. A universal treasury extent, and process of execution, followed on the cattle and stock, and was enforced, with more or less rigour, in every quarter. We have it in evidence that in those sales five cows were sold for not more than seven or eight shillings. All other things were depreciated in the same proportion. The sale of the instruments of husbandry succeeded to that of the corn and stock. Instances there are, where, all other things failing, the farmers were dragged from the court to their houses in order to see them first plundered and then burned down before their faces. It was not a rigorous collection of revenue, it was a savage war made upon the country.

The peasants were left little else than their families and their bodies. The families were disposed of. It is a known observation that those who have the fewest of all other worldly enjoyments are the most tenderly attached to their children and wives. The most tender of parents sold their children at market. The most fondly jealous of husbands sold their wives. The tyranny of Mr. Hastings extinguished every sentiment of father, son, brother, and husband.

I come now to the last stage of their miseries; everything visible and vendible was seized and sold. Nothing but the bodies remained.

It is the nature of tyranny and rapacity never to learn moderation from the ill success of first oppressions; on the contrary, all oppressors, all men thinking highly of the methods dictated by their nature, attribute the frustration of their desires to the want of sufficient rigour. Then they redouble the efforts of their impotent cruelty, which producing, as they must ever produce, new disappointments, they grow irritated against the objects of their rapacity; and then rage, fury, and malice,—implacable because unprovoked,—recruiting and reinforcing their avarice, their vices are no longer human. From cruel men they are transformed into savage beasts, with no other vestiges of reason left but what serves to furnish the inventions and refinements of ferocious subtlety, for purposes of which beasts are incapable and at which fiends would blush.

Debi Sing and his instruments suspected, and in a few cases they suspected justly, that the country people had purloined from their own estates, and had hidden in the secret places in the circumjacent deserts, some small reserve of their own grain to maintain themselves during the unproductive months of the year, and to leave some hope for a future season. But the under-tyrants knew that the demands of Mr. Hastings would admit no plea for delay, much less for subtraction of his bribe, and that he would not abate a shilling of it to the wants of the whole human race. These hoards, real or supposed, not being discovered by menaces and imprisonment, they fell upon the last resource, the naked bodies of the people. And here, my lords, began such a scene of cruelties and tortures as I believe no history has ever presented to the indignation of the world; such as I am sure, in the most barbarous ages, no politic tyranny, no fanatic persecution has ever yet exceeded. Mr. Patterson, the commissioner appointed to inquire into the state of the country, makes his own apology and mine for opening this scene of horrors to you, in the following words: "The punishments inflicted upon the ryots of Rungpore and Dinagepore for non-payment were in many instances of such a nature that I would rather wish to draw a veil over them than shock your feelings by the detail. But however disagreeable the task may be to myself, it is absolutely necessary for the sake of justice, humanity, and the honour of government that they should be exposed to be prevented in future."

My lords, they began by winding cords round the fingers of the unhappy freeholders of those provinces, until they clung to and were almost incorporated with one another, and then they hammered wedges of iron between them, until, regardless of the cries of the sufferers, they had bruised to pieces and forever crippled those poor, honest, innocent laborious hands, which had never been raised to their mouths but with a penurious and scanty proportion of the fruits of their own soil; but those fruits, denied to the wants of their own children, have for more than fifteen years past furnished the investment for our trade with China, and been sent annually out, and without recompense, to purchase for us that delicate meal with which your lordships, and all this auditory, and all this country, have begun every day for these fifteen years at their expense. To those beneficent hands that labour for our benefit, the return of the British government has been cords and hammers and wedges. But there is a place where these crippled and disabled hands will act with resistless power. What is it that they will not pull down when they are lifted to heaven against their oppressors? Then what can withstand such hands? Can the power that crushed and destroyed them? Powerful in prayer, let us at least deprecate, and thus endeavour to secure ourselves from the vengeance which those mashed and disabled hands may pull down upon us. My lords, it is an awful consideration. Let us think of it.

But to pursue this melancholy but necessary detail, I am next to open to your lordships, what I am hereafter to prove, that the most substantial and leading yeomen, the responsible farmers, the parochial magistrates, and chiefs of villages, were tied two and two by the legs together, and their tormentors, throwing them with their heads downwards over a bar, beat them on the soles of the feet with rattans until the nails fell from the toes, and then attacking them at their heads, as they hung downwards, as before at their feet, they beat them with sticks and other instruments of blind fury until the blood gushed out at their eyes, mouths, and noses.

Not thinking that the ordinary whips and cudgels, even so administered, were sufficient to others,—and often also to the same, who had suffered as I have stated,—they applied, instead of rattan and bamboo, whips made of the branches of the bale tree, a tree full of sharp and strong thorns which tear the skin and lacerate the flesh far worse than ordinary scourges.

For others, exploring with a searching and inquisitive malice stimulated by an insatiate rapacity all the devious paths of nature for whatever is most unfriendly to man, they made rods of a plant highly caustic and poisonous, called *bechettea*, every wound of which festers and gangrenes, adds double and treble to the present torture, leaves a crust of leprous sores upon the body, and often ends in the destruction of life itself.

At night these poor innocent sufferers, these martyrs of avarice and extortion, were brought into dungeons; and in the season when nature takes refuge in insensibility from all the miseries and cares which wait on life, they were three times scourged, and made to reckon the watches of the night by periods and intervals of torment. They were then led out in the severe depth of winter, which there at certain seasons would be severe to any one, and to the Indians is most severe and almost intolerable,—they were led out before break of day, and, stiff and sore as they were with the bruises and wounds of the night, were plunged into water, and whilst their jaws clung together with the cold, and their bodies were rendered infinitely more sensible, the blows and stripes were renewed upon their backs; and then, delivering them over to soldiers, they were sent into their farms and villages to discover where a few handfuls of grain might be found concealed, or to extract some loan from the remnants of compassion and courage not subdued in those who had reason to fear that their own turn of torment would be next, that they should succeed them in the same punishment and that their very humanity, being taken as a proof of their wealth, would subject them—as it did in many cases subject them—to the same inhuman tortures. After this circuit of the day through their plundered and ruined villages, they were remanded at night to the same prison; whipped, as before, at their return to the dungeon, and at morning whipped at their leaving it; and then sent as before to purchase, by begging in the day, the reiteration of the torture in the night. Days of menace, insult, and extortion; nights of bolts, fetters, and flagellation succeeded to each other in the same round, and for a long time made up all the vicissitudes of life to these miserable people.

But there are persons whose fortitude could bear their own suffering; there are men who are hardened by their very pains; and the mind, strengthened even by the torments of the body, rises with a strong defiance against its oppressor. They were assaulted on the side of their sympathy. Children were scourged almost to death in the presence of their parents. This was not enough. The son and father were bound close together, face to face, and body to body, and in that situation cruelly lashed together, so that the blow, which escaped the father, fell upon the son, and the blow, which missed the son, wound over the back of the parent. The circumstances were combined by so subtle a cruelty, that every stroke, which did not excruciate the sense, should wound and lacerate the sentiments and affections of nature.

On the same principle and for the same ends, virgins, who had never seen the sun, were dragged from the inmost sanctuaries of their houses, and in the open court of justice, in the very place where security was to be sought against all wrong and all violence,—but where no judge or lawful magistrate had long sat, but in their place the ruffians and hangmen of Warren Hastings occupied the bench,—these virgins, vainly invoking heaven and earth, in the presence of their parents, and whilst their shrieks were mingled with the indignant cries and groans of all the people, publicly were violated by the lowest and wickedest of the human race. Wives were torn from the arms of their husbands, and suffered the same flagitious wrongs, which were, indeed, hid in the bottoms of the dungeons, in which their honour and their liberty were buried together. Often they were taken out of the refuge of this consoling gloom, stripped naked, and thus exposed to the world, and then cruelly scourged; and in order that cruelty might riot in all the circumstances that melt into tenderness the fiercest natures, the nipples of their breasts were put between the sharp and elastic sides of cleft bamboos. Here, in my hand, is my authority; for otherwise one would think it incredible. But it did not end there. Growing from crime to crime, ripened by cruelty for cruelty, these fiends, at length outraging sex, decency, nature, applied lighted torches and slow fire—I cannot proceed for shame and horror! These infernal furies planted death in the source of life, and where that modesty, which, more than reason, distinguishes men from beasts, retires from the view, and even shrinks from expression, there they exercised and glutted their unnatural, monstrous, and nefarious cruelty,—there, where the reverence of nature and the sanctity of justice dare not to pursue, nor venture to describe their practices.

These, my lords, were sufferings which we feel all in common in India and in England, by the general sympathy of our common nature. But there were in that province—sold to the tormentors by Mr. Hastings—things done, which, from the peculiar manners of India, were even worse than all I have laid before you, as the dominion of manners, and the law of opinion, contribute more to their happiness and misery than anything in mere sensitive nature can do.

The women thus treated lost their caste. My lords, we are not here to commend or blame the institutions and prejudices of a whole race of people, radicated in them by a long succession of ages, on which no reason or argument, on which no vicissitudes of things, no mixtures of men, or foreign conquest, have been able to make the smallest impression. The aboriginal Gentû inhabitants are all dispersed into tribes or castes; each caste born to an invariable rank, rights, and descriptions of employment, so that one caste cannot by any means pass into another. With the Gentûs certain impurities or disgraces, though without any guilt of the party, infer loss of caste; and when the highest caste, that of Brahmin, which is not only noble but sacred, is lost, the person who loses it does not slide down into one lower but reputable—he is wholly driven from all honest society. All the relations of life are at once dissolved. His parents are no longer his parents; his wife is no longer his wife; his children, no longer his, are no longer to regard him as their father. It is something far worse than complete outlawry, complete attainder, and universal excommunication. It is a pollution even to touch him; and if he touches any of his old caste, they are justified in putting him to death. Contagion, leprosy, plague, are not so much shunned. No honest occupation can be followed. He becomes an *Halichore* if, which is rare, he survives that miserable degradation.

Upon those whom all the shocking catalogue of tortures I have mentioned could not make to flinch, one of the modes of losing caste for Brahmins, and other principal tribes, was practised. It was to harness a bullock at the court door, put the Brahmin on his back, and lead him through the towns, with drums beating before him. To intimidate others, this bullock, with drums, the instruments according to their ideas of outrage, disgrace, and utter loss of caste, was led through the country, and as it advanced, the country fled before it. When any Brahmin was seized he was threatened with this pillory, and for the most part he submitted in a moment to whatever was ordered. What it was may be thence judged. But when no possibility existed of complying with the demand, the people, by their cries, sometimes prevailed on the tyrants to have it commuted for cruel scourging, which was accepted as mercy. To some Brahmins this mercy was denied, and the act of indelible infamy executed. Of these men one came to the company's commissioner with the tale, and ended with these melancholy words: "I have suffered this indignity; my caste is lost; my life is a burden to me; I call for justice." He called in vain.

Your lordships will not wonder that these monstrous and oppressive demands, exacted with such tortures, threw the whole province into despair. They abandoned their crops on the ground. The people in a body would have fled out of its confines, but bands of soldiers invested the avenues of the province, and, making a line of circumvallation, drove back those wretches, who sought exile, as a relief, into the prison of their native soil. Not suffered to quit the district, they fled to the many wild thickets, which oppression had scattered through it, and sought amongst the jungles and dens of tigers a refuge from the tyranny of Warren Hastings. Not able long to exist here, pressed at once by wild beasts and famine, the same despair drove them back ; and seeking their last resource in arms, the most quiet, the most passive, the most timid of the human race, rose up in a universal insurrection, and, what will always happen in popular tumults, the effects of the fury of the people fell on the meaner and sometimes the reluctant instruments of the tyranny, who in several places, were massacred. The insurrection began in Rungpore, and soon spread its fire to the neighbouring provinces which had been harassed by the same person with the same oppressions. The English chief in that province had been the silent witness, most probably the abettor and accomplice, of all these horrors. He called in first irregular, and then regular, troops, who, by dreadful and universal military execution, got the better of the impotent resistance of unarmed and undisciplined despair. I am tired with the detail of the cruelties of peace. I spare you those of a cruel and inhuman war and of the executions, which, without law or process, or even the shadow of authority, were ordered by the English revenue chief in that province.

It has been necessary to lay these facts before you,—and I have stated them to your lordships far short of their reality, partly through my infirmity, and partly on account of the odiousness of the task of going through things that disgrace human nature,—that you may be enabled fully to enter into the dreadful consequences which attend a system of bribery and corruption in a governor-general. On a transient view, bribery is rather a subject of disgust than horror ; the sordid practice of a venal, mean, and abject mind ; and the effect of the crime seems to end with the act. It looks to be no more than the corrupt transfer of property from one person to another ; at worst a theft. But it will appear in a very different light when you regard the consideration for which the bribe is given, namely, that a governor-general, claiming an arbitrary power in himself, for that consideration delivers up the properties, the liberties, and the lives of a whole people to the arbitrary discretion of any wicked and rapacious person who will be sure to make good from their blood the purchase he has paid for his power over them. It is possible that a man may pay a bribe merely to redeem himself from some evil. It is bad, however, to live under a power whose violence has no restraint except in its avarice. But no man ever paid a bribe for a power to charge and tax others, but with a view to oppress them. No man ever paid a bribe for the handling of the public money, but to peculate from it. When once such offices become thus privately and corruptly venal the very worst men will be chosen,—as Mr. Hastings has in fact constantly chosen the very worst,—because none but those who do not scruple the use of any means, are capable, consistently with profit, to discharge at once the rigid demands of a severe public revenue and the private bribes of a rapacious chief magistrate. Not only the worst men will be thus chosen, but they will be restrained by no dread whatsoever in the execution of their worst oppressions. Their protection is sure. The authority that is to restrain, to control, to punish them, is previously engaged; he has his retaining fee for the support of their crimes. Mr. Hastings never dared, because he could not, arrest oppression in its course, without drying up the source of his own corrupt emolument. Mr. Hastings never dared, after the fact, to punish extortion in others, because he could not, without risking the discovery of bribery in himself. The same corruption, the same oppression, and the same impunity will reign through all the subordinate gradations.

A fair revenue may be collected without the aid of wicked, violent, and unjust instruments. But when once the line of just and legal demand is transgressed, such instruments are of absolute necessity, and they comport themselves accordingly. When we know that men must be well paid—and they ought to be well paid—for the performance of honourable duty, can we think that men will be found to commit wicked, rapacious, and oppressive acts with fidelity and disinterestedness, for the sole emolument of dishonest employers? No; they must have their full share of the prey, and the greater share as they are the nearer and more necessary instruments of the general extortion. We must not therefore flatter ourselves, when Mr. Hastings takes £40,000 in bribes for Dinagepore and its annexed provinces, that from the people nothing more than £40,000 is extorted. I speak within compass, four times forty must be levied on the people; and these violent sales, fraudulent purchases, confiscations, inhuman and unutterable tortures, imprisonment, irons, whips, fines, general despair, general insurrection, the massacre of the officers of revenue by the people, the massacre of the people by the soldiery, and the total waste and destruction of the finest provinces in India, are things of course; and all a necessary consequence involved in the very substance of Mr. Hastings's bribery.

I therefore charge Mr. Hastings with having destroyed, for private purposes, the whole system of government by the six provincial councils, which he had no right to destroy.

I charge him with having delegated to others that power which the act of Parliament had directed him to preserve unalienably in himself.

I charge him with having formed a committee to be mere instruments and tools, at the enormous expense of £62,000 per annum.

I charge him with having appointed a person their dewan, to whom these Englishmen were to be subservient tools, whose name, to his own knowledge, was by the general voice of India, by the general recorded voice of the company, by recorded official transactions, by everything that can make a man known, abhorred, detested, and stamped with infamy, and with giving him the whole power, which he had thus separated from the council-general, and from the provincial councils.

I charge him with taking bribes of Gunga Govin Sing.

I charge him with not having done that bribe-service, which fidelity even in iniquity requires at the hands of the worst of men.

I charge him with having robbed those people of whom he took the bribes.

I charge him with having fraudulently alienated the fortunes of widows.

I charge him with having, without right, title, or purchase, taken the lands of orphans and given them to wicked persons under him.

I charge him with having removed the natural guardians of a minor rajah, and with having given that trust to a stranger, Debi Sing, whose wickedness was known to himself and all the world, and by whom the rajah, his family and dependents, were cruelly oppressed.

I charge him with having committed to the management of Debi Sing three great provinces, and thereby with having wasted the country, ruined the landed interest, cruelly harassed the peasants, burned their houses, seized their crops, tortured and degraded their persons, and destroyed the honour of the whole female race of that country.

In the name of the Commons of England, I charge all this villainy upon Warren Hastings, in this last moment of my application to you.

My lords, what is it that we want here to a great act of national justice? Do we want a cause, my lords? You have the cause of oppressed princes, of undone women of the first rank, of desolated provinces, and of wasted kingdoms.

Do you want a criminal, my lords? When was there so much iniquity ever laid to the charge of any one? No, my lords, you must not look to punish any other such delinquent from India. Warren Hastings has not left substance enough in India to nourish such another delinquent.

My lords, is it a prosecutor you want? You have before you the Commons of Great Britain as prosecutors; and, I believe, my lords, that the sun, in his beneficent progress round the world, does not behold a more glorious sight than that of men, separated from a remote people by the material bounds and barriers of nature, united by the bond of a social and moral community,—all the Commons of England resenting, as their own, the indignities and cruelties that are offered to all the people of India.

Do we want a tribunal? My lords, no example of antiquity, nothing in the modern world, nothing in the range of human imagination, can supply us with a tribunal like this. My lords, here we see virtually in the mind's eye that sacred majesty of the Crown, under whose authority you sit, and whose power you exercise. We see in that invisible authority, what we all feel in reality and life, the beneficent powers and protecting justice of his Majesty. We have here the heir apparent to the Crown, such as the fond wishes of the people of England wish an heir apparent of the Crown to be. We have here all the branches of the royal family in a situation between majesty and subjection, between the sovereign and the subject, offering a pledge in that situation for the support of the rights of the Crown and the liberties of the people, both which extremities they touch. My lords, we have a great hereditary peerage here; those, who have their own honour, the honour of their ancestors, and of their posterity, to guard, and who will justify, as they have always justified, that provision in the Constitution by which justice is made an hereditary office. My lords, we have here a new nobility, who have risen and exalted themselves by various merits, by great military services which have extended the fame of this country from the rising to the setting sun. We have those, who by various civil merits and various civil talents have been exalted to a situation, which they well deserve, and in which they will justify the favour of their sovereign and the good opinion of their fellow-subjects, and make them rejoice to see those virtuous characters, that were the other day upon a level with them, now exalted above them in rank, but feeling with them in sympathy what they felt in common with them before. We have persons exalted from the practice of the law, from the place in which they administered high, though subordinate justice, to a seat here, to enlighten with their knowledge and to strengthen with their votes those principles which have distinguished the courts in which they have presided.

My lords, you have here also the lights of our religion; you have the bishops of England. My lords, you have that true image of the primitive church in its ancient form, in its ancient ordinances, purified from the superstitions and the vices which a long succession of ages will bring upon the best institutions. You have the representatives of that religion which says that their God is love, that the very vital spirit of their institution is charity,—a religion, which so much hates oppression, that when the God whom we adore appeared in human form, he did not appear in a form of greatness and majesty, but in sympathy with the lowest of the people, and thereby made it a firm and ruling principle that their welfare was the object of all government, since the person, who was the Master of Nature, chose to appear himself in a subordinate situation. These are the considerations which influence them, which animate them, and will animate them against all oppression, knowing that he who is called first among them and first among us all, both of the flock that is fed and of those who feed it, made himself "the servant of all."

My lords, these are the securities which we have in all the constituent parts of the body of this House. We know them, we reckon, we rest upon them, and commit safely the interests of India and of humanity into your hands. Therefore, it is with confidence, that, ordered by the Commons,

I impeach Warren Hastings, of high crimes and misdemeanours.

I impeach him in the name of the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled, whose parliamentary trust he has betrayed.

I impeach him in the name of all the Commons of Great Britain, whose national character he has dishonoured.

I impeach him in the name of the people of India, whose laws, rights, and liberties he has subverted; whose properties he has destroyed; whose country he has laid waste and desolate.

I impeach him in the name, and by virtue of, those eternal laws of justice which he has violated.

I impeach him in the name of human nature itself, which he has cruelly outraged, injured, and oppressed in both sexes, in every age, rank, situation, and condition of life.

GIOSUÈ CARDUCCI

(1836-1907).

THE Italian poet was born in Tuscany, the son of a physician of old Florentine family. He was well educated, and after a short period of teaching joined a circle of enthusiastic young men zealous both for politics and literature. They opposed to the prevalent romantic taste of the day their belief in the necessity of a return to classical literature. A strongly classical spirit is predominant throughout all Carducci's poetry.

In 1860 he became Professor at Bologna and startled the public with a defiant " Hymn to Satan." " Levia Gravia," a volume of lyrics published in 1868, placed him at the head of the Italian poets of his day. " Decennalia " followed in 1871, the " Nuove Poesie " in 1875, and the three series of the " Odi Barbare " in 1877-1889.

About 1880 a certain Angelo Sommaruga, printer, began publishing the work of several young unknown writers. He founded a review called " La Cronaca Bizantina," and to gain for his coterie what he believed would prove a famous name persuaded Carducci who was living in retirement to write for his press. Under this encouragement Carducci recommenced his literary activity and began the production of his best work. Within the next few years Sommaruga published the three volumes of the " Confessioni e Battaglie," the " Ça Ira " sonnets, the " Nuove Odi Barbare " and many articles, pamphlets and essays. And at this time he wrote his most perfect verse in the " Elegy on the Urn of Shelley," the Odes to Rome and to Monte Mario, the " Canzone di Legnano " and the " Intermezzo." A poem he had written in honour of the Queen alienated his revolutionary friends and in his defence he wrote a manifesto which, it has been said, will remain one of the noblest and most powerful pieces of contemporary literature. After this he changes ; his last work shows a quietness and fatigue, a retreat from the conflict of his life.

He sat in the Italian chamber for a short while in 1876 ; was a member of the higher council of education ; became a Senator in 1890 ; and was awarded the Nobel prize for literature in 1906.

" Patriotism," it has been said, " the grandeur of work, the soul-satisfying power of justice are the poet's dominant ideas. His philosophy is Pagan. His poems form a kind of lyric record of the Italian struggle for independence."

THE WORK OF DANTE

THE studies, the times, trials and sorrows of Dante, who had been the renewer of the lyric of love in Florence, made of him in the following twenty years (from 1293 to 1313), the greatest lay philosopher of the Italian people.

In those years, between the limits of a town and in the ambit of Christianity, Italy had and Dante saw such events as change the course of the lives of men and the ideas of centuries, *i.e.*, the new popular constitution which drew the poet to the Government, and the troubled changes of the Guelf Commune which cast him into exile; the last political attempts of the Papacy and the captivity of Avignon; the first appearance of the majesty of the Empire, after sixty years of intercession, and the death of the Emperor Henry VII. Between these shocks of generous and vital faiths and of rude and mournful delusions, between these ascents and failures lay the path followed by the thought of Dante in the second season of his life, a laborious and meditative, political and doctrinal life.

Of his first manifestation of such a life, the "Vita Nuova," and of his first poetry, the poetry of the "Dolce Stil Nuovo," but one expression is left: The "donna gentile" (the gentlewoman), which is Philosophy, the successor and rival of Beatrice. By her, allegory, viz.: the mystic essence of esthetic form in the church, school, and arts of the Middle-Ages, rose to rule over the thought of Dante; and he was the first and perhaps the most eager to unite her thenceforth with popular poetry, in which from chivalrous love, the only subject till then allowed, he boldly passed to philosophical and moral meditations. This part of his life in which were written the "Amoroso Convivio," the songs belonging to it, and the treatises derived from it, is the period of the Mediæval classicism of Dante.

With the "Amoroso Convivio" the exile wanted to unveil his greatness, darkened as it were by a sad poverty, to disdainful or uninterested people. He is full of a noble indignation against those men who give themselves to literature for the sake of money and honours, and strongly asserts that he is only writing for those who have goodness of soul, be they princes, knights or gentlewomen. The importance of his work in the history of culture lies in the fact that a layman dared draw philosophy out of the religious schools, introducing it into civil life. Its value, for the history of the thought both of the poet and Italy, consists in Dante having brought to a scientific work his conscience and an almost civil enthusiasm, and in his having given to an impersonal scholasticism, long since dead, all his eloquence, at times magnificent and grave like his thought, at times simple and sincere like his passion.

In its remaining part the philosophy of the "Convivio" is theological. Also for Dante, as well as for the Greeks, philosophy is a loving use of wisdom; but this wisdom, according to St. Thomas of Aquinas and Bonaventura, is eternally ordered to help and demonstrate Faith; and before the demonstration of Faith, the "divine opinion of Aristotle," as the poet calls it, comes to an end, except when Dante unites the theories of Aristotle with the dogmas of the Christian religion, as he does in the spiritual doctrine regarding the human soul. But Alighieri, as formerly the Romans, generally gives his preference to the practical part of philosophy, viz.: the moral and historical sides. And here, three parts of the "Convivio" shine conspicuous to the Latin people and to the world for their affirmation and divination. Firstly, when the poet, beyond and above the aspirations of his time and of the Renaissance, glorifies the vulgar tongue, that is to say the tongue of the people, almost announcing the reign of public opinion both in philosophy and literature: "This will be a new Sun which will give light to those who are in gloom and darkness." Secondly, when, following the opinion of Guido Guinizzelli, announcing beforehand the definition of Bartolo of Sassoferrato and the greatest conquest of the year 1789, the poet says that nobility means perfection, that it applies to everyone, and it derives from a habit which is possible to each individual, except to him who has abused the opportunities given him for good, to work evil. Lastly, when, talking of the primacy and destinies of Rome, he writes with eager eloquence those noble things which were to be the sowing of historical philosophy for more learned times, and a source of new ardour to the magnanimous men who thought and fought for the resurrection of Italy in still greater times.

On the "Amoroso Convivio" depend the treatises of the "De Vulgari Eloquentia" and "De Monarchia," as moral philosophy, applied to the possibilities of rhyme, becomes, according to mediæval ideas, a poetical science, and when it is employed for the needs of the States, in accordance with the ideas of both the Middle and Greek Ages, it becomes political.

The "De Vulgari Eloquentia" develops and completes, in a doctrinal style, the treatment of the vulgar tongue, which in the "Convivio" had been sentimental, and is the first philological and poetical treatise of the Romance languages. As philological science it outran the times by ascertaining the common origin and common family of the new Latin languages and by distinguishing the different terms of the Italian dialects. As poetical science it outran its age and also the earlier opinions of the poet himself, because, while in the "Vita Nuova" he gave the rhymes in vulgar tongue no other subject but love, here he makes them sing of arms and rectitude, claiming for himself the rule of minstrel of righteousness among the Italians. Moreover, starting from the principle of the "Volgare Illustre," which is a question of style rather than of language, Alighieri intimated the end of the poetry of dialect and of regional schools, viz.: the schools of Sicily, Apulia, Bologna and Florence, announcing, as the herald of his own glory, the beginning of an Italian poetry and literature. And, lastly, in order to explain the aims, reasons and practice of poetry, Dante, rising above all who had composed poetry, during three centuries, in France, Italy and Germany, laid the foundation of the new art in a conscious and initiating individuality, with traditions and rules such as to temper and tune the following motives and elements: the popular and that of the Court, the civil and ecclesiastical, the Romantic and Classical.

In "De Monarchia" the moral doctrine regarding the human soul and the two kinds of perfection and happiness for which it has been created, the political doctrine about the ruling of Christian civil society, and the historical doctrine on the destinies providentially assigned to the Roman people (which doctrines had already some of their germs in the "Convivio"), receive a large and severe development in three books which are the most perfect treatises of Dante, gathering together all his political ideas.

Man, as the only being capable of sharing corruption and incorruption, aims in such a way at a double perfection and happiness, temporary in this life, eternal in the other. He reaches the former by exercising his intellectual capabilities, and attains to the latter through the exercise of the theological virtues. Such aims and methods are demonstrated and given to man both by reason and philosophy, by faith and theology; but man can be caused, by infirmity and covetousness, to fall and go astray, therefore the necessity of a light, guidance and control. They are to be found in the temporal power of the Roman Emperor on one side, and in the spiritual power of the Roman Pope on the other. To ensure that the two rulers should guide mankind to this end, the world requires union. It is necessary that peace on earth to all men of good will should respond to the blessedness of heaven. But on this earth covetousness engenders discord, which cannot be subdued but by a single ruler, who, having everybody subject to his power and no personal aspirations, may lead and rule, with justice, princes, people and Commune, according to the teaching of philosophy. Although kingdoms, nations and cities have each of them different characteristics of their own, which necessitate their being governed by different laws, yet there are common laws which are suitable to the whole of the human race, to lead her to peace. These laws must be given by the Monarch to the different princes and rulers. In the same way, the practical intellect, in order to be able to act, receives the major premise from the speculative intellect, adding to it the minor premise, which is its own work. The dignity of such universal monarchy, which is necessary to the well being of the world and is the sole resource of any earthly power, was brought by God to the Roman people, already prepared to receive it by the coming of Æneas to Italy, just at the time in which through Mary was ready the work of redemption, and qualified for it by the conquest of the world, a legitimate conquest because it was God's judgment between Rome and the other peoples.

In fact the Roman Empire was established and recognised by God Himself, by His taking human form under its rule, by subjecting Himself at His birth to the census of Cæsar Octavianus, and to the judgment of Pontius Pilatus at His death.

The Empire meaning the dominion of the Roman people on earth, the majesty of the Roman people is transferred to the Emperor, whatever may be the nation he belongs to. Italy is the garden of the Empire, not Germany, and from there the Roman Prince wields his sceptre over all the other monarchies and peoples, with the aim of forming a Christian Republic of the world, a Republic whose members shall be all the States, the kingdom of France as well as the smallest Italian Community. The authority of the Empire comes straight from God, neither can the Church pretend to any supremacy over it or confer on it any power, for she had no part in its establishment, its existence having begun earlier, nor do any of the writings of the Old or New Testament support this assumption in any way. Even the Emperor himself is appointed by God, and his electors are but instruments in the hands of God. Thus the Emperor holds his power on earth independently of the Pope; he is subject to the Pope only in so far as the temporal happiness, to which the Emperor is the guide, is a means to the eternal happiness to which the Pope directs his flock. Cæsar must therefore venerate Peter as the eldest son venerates his father, so that, illuminated by his paternal grace, he may better enlighten the earth. But the Popes, by claiming and usurping their primacy over the civil power of the Emperors, the Papacy, by realising in itself the Guelf principles contrary to the universal monarchy, and the ecclesiastical Government, by not observing the laws of the Empire, preventing its legitimate authority and stimulating, through bad example, the greed for earthly wealth, are the causes of the wickedness of the world. And this disorganized Government must needs drag on till it be badly destroyed, because, if one authority exceeds, it cannot be controlled by the other, and must consequently be the cause of universal corruption and anarchy.

It is impossible to deny the greatness of this ideal conception of the peace of the world in a kind of a league of united Christian States, of which the Emperor should be but the president; yet it is perhaps equally difficult to admire in it anything but the vision of a great poet, who is already a humanitarian and who dreams once more of the past, reflecting its beneficent light in the mirror of his immense genius. In fact, all the great poets who are almost created to integrate their countries by restoring their times, seem to be driven by the force of nature to find their ideals, or place them, in the age which is passing by. So did Homer sing what in Greece no more existed in his time nor could any more exist. Is it perhaps because the gods and heroes stand out more giant-like in the past, and is death but a twilight in the world of poetry?

MARCUS CATO
(THE ELDER)

(234-149 B.C.).

CATO "the Elder," born at Tusculum, was distinguished as soldier, censor, and stoic philosopher. He fought in the second Punic war; was successful in putting down a formidable rebellion in Spain; and in 191, he gained fresh honours in the campaign against Antiochus. But the permanence of Cato's name in classic history comes chiefly from his austere code of life. He strenuously strove against the growing refinement and luxury in the society of that time and demanded a return to the strict and simple life of the ancient Romans. He was a type of the stern and unbending Conservative of the classical age; one opposed to innovations of every type.

After his election as Censor, he proved so rigorous in discharge of his duties that "Censor" became a permanent addition to his name.

He went on a mission to Carthage (175 B.C.) and feared their power and menace to Rome so much, that after his return he invariably ended each of his speeches in the Senate with the words: "Carthage must be destroyed" ("delenda est Carthago").

WOMAN'S RIGHTS

(Delivered in the Senate, Rome).

IF, Romans, every individual among us had made it a rule to maintain the prerogative and authority of a husband with respect to his own wife, we should have less trouble with the whole sex. But now our privileges, overpowered at home by female contumacy, are, even here in the forum, spurned and trodden under foot; and because we are unable to withstand each separately, we now dread their collective body. I was accustomed to think it a fabulous and fictitious tale that, in a certain island, the whole race of males was utterly extirpated by a conspiracy of the women. But the utmost danger may be apprehended equally from either sex, if you suffer cabals and secret consultations to be held; scarcely, indeed, can I determine, in my own mind, whether the act itself, or the precedent that it affords, is of more pernicious tendency. The latter of these more particularly concerns us consuls and the other magistrates; the former, you, my fellow-citizens; for whether the measure proposed to your consideration be profitable to the State or not, is to be determined by you who are to vote on the occasion. As to the outrageous behaviour of these women, whether it be merely an act of their own, or owing to your instigations, Marcus Fundanius and Lucius Valerius, it unquestionably implies culpable conduct in magistrates. I know not whether it reflects greater disgrace on you, tribunes, or on the consuls: on you certainly, if you have brought these women hither for the purpose of raising tribunitian sedition; on us if we suffer laws to be imposed upon us by a secession of women, as was done formerly by that of the common people. It was not without painful emotions of shame that I, just now, made my way into the forum through the midst of a band of women.

Had I not been restrained by respect for the modesty and dignity of some individuals among them, rather than of the whole number, and been unwilling that they should be seen rebuked by a consul, I should not have refrained from saying to them, "What sort of practice is this of running out into the public, besetting the streets, and addressing other women's husbands? Could not each have made the same request to her husband at home? Are your blandishments more seducing in public than in private, and with other women's husbands than with your own? Although, if females would let their modesty confine them within the limits of their own rights, it did not become you, even at home, to concern yourselves about any laws that might be passed or repealed here." Our ancestors thought it not proper that women should perform any, even private business, without a director; but that they should ever be under the control of parents, brothers, or husbands. We, it seems, suffer them now to interfere in the management of State affairs, and to thrust themselves into the forum, into general assemblies, and into assemblies of election; for what are they doing at this moment in your streets and lanes? What, but arguing, some in support of the motion of tribunes; others contending for the repeal of the law?

This is the smallest of the injunctions laid on them by usage or the laws, all which women bear with impatience; they long for entire liberty; nay, to speak the truth, not for liberty, but for unbounded freedom in every particular; for what will they not attempt, if they now come off victorious? Recollect all the institutions respecting the sex, by which our forefathers restrained them and subjected them to their husbands; and yet even with the help of all these restrictions they can scarcely be kept within bounds. If, then, you suffer them to throw these off one by one, to tear them all asunder, and, at last, be set on an equal footing with yourselves, can you imagine that they will be any longer tolerable? Suffer them once to arrive at an equality with you, and they will from that moment become your superiors.

LORD CHATHAM

(WILLIAM, VISCOUNT PITT AND EARL OF CHATHAM)

(1708-1778).

(*See Biographical Note, Section* ii.).

THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION

(A Speech delivered in the House of Lords in Reply to Lord Mansfield in the Case of Wilkes, January 9th, 1770).

THERE is one plain maxim, to which I have invariably adhered through life; that in every question in which my liberty or my property were concerned, I should consult and be determined by the dictates of common sense. I confess, my lords, that I am prone to distrust the refinements of learning, because I have seen the ablest and most learned men equally liable to deceive themselves and to mislead others. The condition of human nature would be lamentable indeed, if nothing less than the greatest learning and talents, which fall to the share of so small a number of men, were sufficient to direct our judgment and our conduct. But Providence has taken better care of our happiness, and given us, in the simplicity of common sense, a rule for our direction, by which we can never be misled. I confess, my lords, I had no other guide in drawing up the amendment which I submitted to your consideration; and, before I heard the opinion of the noble lord who spoke last, I did not conceive that it was even within the limits of possibility for the greatest human genius, the most subtle understanding, or the acutest wit, so strangely to misrepresent my meaning, and to give it an interpretation so entirely foreign from what I intended to express, and from that sense which the very terms of the amendment plainly and distinctly carry with them. If there be the smallest foundation for the censure thrown upon me by that noble lord, if, either expressly, or by the most distant implication, I have said or insinuated any part of what the noble lord has charged me with, discard my opinions forever, discard the motion with contempt.

My lords, I must beg the indulgence of the House. Neither will my health permit me, not do I pretend to be qualified to follow that learned lord minutely through the whole of his argument. No man is better acquainted with his abilities and learning, nor has a greater respect for them than I have. I have had the pleasure of sitting with him in the other House, and always listened to him with attention. I have not now lost a word of what he said, nor did I ever. Upon the present question I meet him without fear. The evidence which truth carries with it is superior to all argument; it neither wants the support nor dreads the opposition of the greatest abilities. If there be a single word in the amendment to justify the interpretation which the noble lord has been pleased to give it, I am ready to renounce the whole. Let it be read, my lords; let it speak for itself. [The amendment was read.] In what instance does it interfere with the privileges of the House of Commons? In what respect does it question their jurisdiction, or suppose an authority in this House to arraign the justice of their sentence? I am sure that every lord who hears me will bear me witness, that I said not one word touching the merits of the Middlesex election. So far from conveying any opinion upon that matter in the amendment, I did not even in discourse deliver my own sentiments upon it. I did not say that the House of Commons had done either right or wrong; but, when his Majesty was pleased to recommend it to us to cultivate unanimity among ourselves, I thought it the duty of this House, as the great hereditary council of the Crown, to state to his Majesty the distracted condition of his dominions, together with the events which had destroyed unanimity among his subjects. But, my lords, I stated events merely as facts, without the smallest addition either of censure or of opinion. They are facts, my lords, which I am not only convinced are true, but which I know are indisputably true. For example, my lords, will any man deny that discontents prevail in many parts of his Majesty's dominions? or that those discontents arise from the proceedings of the House of Commons touching the declared incapacity of Mr. Wilkes? It is impossible. No man can deny a truth so notorious. Or will any man deny that those proceedings refused, by a resolution of one branch of the Legislature only, to the subject his common right? Is it not indisputably true, my lords, that Mr. Wilkes had a common right, and that he lost it in no other way but by a resolution of the House of Commons? My lords, I have been tender of misrepresenting the House of Commons. I have consulted their journals, and have taken the very words of their own resolution. Do they not tell us in so many words, that Mr. Wilkes, having been expelled, was thereby rendered incapable of serving in that Parliament? And is it not in their resolution alone which refuses to the subject his common right? The amendment says further, that the electors of Middlesex are deprived of their free choice of a representative. Is this a false fact, my lords? Or have I given an unfair representation of it? Will any man presume to affirm that Colonel Luttrell is the free choice of the electors of Middlesex? We all know the contrary. We all know that Mr. Wilkes (whom I mention without either praise or censure) was the favourite of the county, and chosen by a very great and acknowledged majority to represent them in Parliament. If the noble lord dislikes the manner in which these facts are stated, I shall think myself happy in being advised by him how to alter it. I am very little anxious about terms, provided the substance be preserved; and these are facts, my lords, which I am sure will always retain their weight and importance, in whatever form of language they are described.

Now, my lords, since I have been forced to enter into the explanation of an amendment, in which nothing less than the genius of penetration could have discovered an obscurity, and having, as I hope, redeemed myself in the opinion of the House, having redeemed my motion from the severe representation given of it by the noble lord, I must a little longer entreat your lordships' indulgence. The Constitution of this country has been openly invaded in fact; and I have heard, with horror and astonishment, that very invasion defended upon principle. What is this mysterious power, undefined by law, unknown to the subject, which we must not approach without awe, nor speak of without reverence—which no man may question, and to which all men must submit? My lords, I thought the slavish doctrine of passive obedience had long since exploded; and, when our Kings were obliged to confess that their title to the Crown, and the rule of their government, had no other foundation than the known laws of the land, I never expected to hear a divine right, or a divine infallibility, attributed to any other branch of the Legislature. My lords, I beg to be understood. No man respects the House of Commons more than I do, or would contend more strenuously than I would to preserve to them their just and legal authority. Within the bounds prescribed by the Constitution, that authority is necessary to the well-being of the people. Beyond that line, every exertion of power is arbitrary, is illegal; it threatens tyranny to the people, and destruction to the State. Power without right is the most odious and detestable object that can be offered to the human imagination. It is not only pernicious to those who are subject to it, but tends to its own destruction. It is what my noble friend [Lord Lyttleton] has truly described it, *Res detestabilis et caduca.* My lords, I acknowledge the just power, and reverence the Constitution of the House of Commons. It is for their own sakes that I would prevent their assuming a power which the Constitution has denied them, lest, by grasping at an authority they have no right to, they should forfeit that which they legally possess. My lords, I affirm that they have betrayed their constituents, and violated the Constitution. Under pretence of declaring the law, they have made a law, and united in the same persons the office of legislator and judge!

I shall endeavour to adhere strictly to the noble lord's doctrine, which is, indeed, impossible to mistake, so far as my memory will permit me to preserve his expressions. He seems fond of the word jurisdiction; and I confess, with the force and effect which he has given it, it is a word of copious meaning and wonderful extent. If his lordship's doctrine be well founded, we must renounce all those political maxims by which our understandings have hitherto been directed, and even the first elements of learning taught in our schools when we were schoolboys. My lords, we knew that jurisdiction was nothing more than *jus dicere*. We knew that *legem facere* and *legem dicere* (to make law and to declare it) were powers clearly distinguished from each other in the nature of things, and wisely separated from each other by the wisdom of the English Constitution. But now, it seems, we must adopt a new system of thinking! The House of Commons, we are told, have a supreme jurisdiction, and there is no appeal from their sentence; and that, wherever they are competent judges, their decision must be received and submitted to as, *ipso facto*, the law of the land. My lords, I am a plain man, and have been brought up in a religious reverence for the original simplicity of the laws of England. By what sophistry they have been perverted, by what artifices they have been involved in obscurity, is not for me to explain. The principles, however, of the English laws are still sufficiently clear; they are founded in reason, and are the masterpieces of human understanding; but it is in the text that I would look for a direction to my judgment, not in the commentaries of modern professors. The noble lord assures us that he knows not in what code the law of Parliament is to be found; that the House of Commons, when they act as judges, have no law to direct them but their own wisdom; that their decision is law; and if they determine wrong, the subject has no appeal but to heaven. What then, my lords? Are all the generous efforts of our ancestors, are all those glorious contentions by which they meant to secure to themselves, and to transmit to their posterity, a known law, a certain rule of living, reduced to this conclusion, that, instead of the arbitrary power of a King, we must submit to the arbitrary power of a House of Commons? If this be true, what benefit do we derive from the exchange? Tyranny, my lords, is detestable in every shape, but in none so formidable as when it is assumed and exercised by a number of tyrants. But, my lords, this is not the fact; this is not the Constitution. We have a law of Parliament. We have a code in which every honest man may find it. We have Magna Charta. We have the Statute Book, and the Bill of Rights.

If a case should arise unknown to these great authorities, we have still that plain English reason left, which is the foundation of all our English jurisprudence. That reason tells us that every judicial court and every political society must be invested with those powers and privileges which are necessary for performing the office to which they are appointed. It tells us, also, that no court of justice can have a power inconsistent with, or paramount to, the known laws of the land; that the people, when they choose their representatives, never mean to convey to them a power of invading the rights, or trampling on the liberties of those whom they represent. What security would they have for their rights, if once they admitted that a court of judicature might determine every question that came before it, not by any known positive law, but by the vague, indeterminate, arbitrary rule of what the noble lord is pleased to call the wisdom of the court? With respect to the decision of the courts of justice, I am far from denying them their due weight and authority; yet, placing them in the most respectable view, I still consider them, not as law, but as an evidence of the law. And before they can arrive even at that degree of authority, it must appear that they are founded in and confined by reason; that they are supported by precedents taken from good and moderate times; that they do not contradict any positive law; that they are submitted to without reluctance by the people; that they are unquestioned by the Legislature (which is equivalent to a tacit confirmation); and what, in my judgment, is by far the most important, that they do not violate the spirit of the Constitution. My lords, this is not a vague or loose expression. We all know what the Constitution is. We all know that the first principle of it is that the subject shall not be governed by the *arbitrium* of any one man or body of men (less than the whole Legislature), but by certain laws, to which he has virtually given his consent, which are open to him to examine, which are not beyond his ability to understand. Now, my lords, I affirm, and am ready to maintain, that the late decision of the House of Commons upon the Middlesex election is destitute of every one of those properties and conditions which I hold to be essential to the legality of such a decision. It is not founded in reason; for it carries with it a contradiction, that the representative should perform the office of the constituent body. It is not supported by a single precedent; for the case of Sir Robert Walpole is but a half precedent, and even that half is imperfect. Incapacity was indeed declared, but his crimes are stated as the ground of the resolution, and his opponent was declared to be not duly elected, even after his incapacity was established. It contradicts Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights, by which it is provided that no subject shall be deprived of his freehold, unless by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land; and that elections of members to serve in Parliament shall be free. So far is this decision from being submitted to the people, that they have taken the strongest measures, and adopted the most positive language to express their discontent. Whether it will be questioned by the Legislature will depend upon your lordships' resolution; but that it violates the spirit of the Constitution, will, I think, be disputed by no man who has heard this day's debate, and who wishes well to the freedom of his country. Yet, if we are to believe the noble lord, this great grievance, this manifest violation of the first principles of the Constitution, will not admit of a remedy. It is not even capable of redress, unless we appeal at once to heaven! My lords, I have better hopes of the Constitution, and a firmer confidence in the wisdom and constitutional authority of this House. It is to your ancestors, my lords, it is to the English barons, that we are indebted for the laws and Constitution we possess. Their virtues were rude and uncultivated, but they were great and sincere. Their understandings were as little polished as their manners, but they had hearts to distinguish right from wrong; they had heads to distinguish truth from falsehood; they understood the rights of humanity, and they had the spirit to maintain them.

My lords, I think that history has not done justice to their conduct, when they obtained from their sovereign that great acknowledgment of national rights contained in Magna Charta; they did not confine it to themselves alone, but delivered it as a common blessing to the whole people. They did not say, these are the rights of the great barons, or these are the rights of the great prelates. No, my lords, they said, in the simple Latin of the times, *nullus liber homo* (no free man), and provided as carefully for the meanest subject as for the greatest. These are uncouth words, and sound but poorly in the ears of scholars; neither are they addressed to the criticism of scholars, but to the hearts of free men. These three words, *nullus liber homo*, have meaning which interests us all, they deserve to be remembered—they deserve to be inculcated in our minds—they are worth all the classics. Let us not, then, degenerate from the glorious example of our ancestors. Those iron barons (for so I may call them when compared with the silken barons of modern days) were the guardians of the people; yet their virtues, my lords, were never engaged in a question of such importance as the present. A breach has been made in the Constitution—the battlements are dismantled—the citadel is open to the first invader—the walls totter—the Constitution is not tenable. What remains, then, but for us to stand foremost in the breach, and repair it, or perish in it?

Great pains have been taken to alarm us with the consequences of a difference between the two Houses of Parliament; that the House of Commons will resent our presuming to take notice of their proceedings; that they will resent our daring to advise the Crown, and never forgive us for attempting to save the State. My lords, I am sensible of the importance and difficulty of this great crisis; at a moment such as this, we are called upon to do our duty, without dreading the resentment of any man. But if apprehensions of this kind are to affect us, let us consider which we ought to respect the most, the representative or the collective body of the people. My lords, five hundred gentlemen are not ten millions; and if we must have a contention, let us take care to have the English nation on our side. If this question be given up, the freeholders of England are reduced to a condition baser than the peasant of Poland. If they desert their own cause, they deserve to be slaves! My lords, this is not merely the cold opinion of my understanding, but the glowing expression of what I feel. It is my heart that speaks. I know I speak warmly, my lords; but this warmth shall neither betray my argument nor my temper. The kingdom is in a flame. As mediators between a King and people, is it not our duty to represent to him the true condition and temper of his subjects? It is a duty which no particular respects should hinder us from performing; and whenever his Majesty shall demand our advice, it will then be our duty to inquire more minutely into the cause of the present discontents. Whenever that inquiry shall come on, I pledge myself to the House to prove that, since the first institution of the House of Commons, not a single precedent can be produced to justify their late proceedings. My noble and learned friend (the Lord Chancellor Camden) has pledged himself to the House that he will support that assertion.

My lords, the character and circumstances of Mr. Wilkes have been very improperly introduced into this question, not only here, but in that court of judicature where his cause was tried—I mean the House of Commons. With one party he was a patriot of the first magnitude; with the other, the vilest incendiary. For my own part, I consider him merely and indifferently as an English subject, possessed of certain rights which the laws have given him, and which the laws alone can take from him. I am neither moved by his private vices nor by his public merits. In his person, though he were the worst of men, I contend for the safety and security of the best. God forbid, my lords, that there should be a power in this country of measuring the civil rights of the subject by his moral character, or by any other rule but the fixed laws of the land! I believe, my lords, I shall not be suspected of any personal partiality to this unhappy man. I am not very conversant in pamphlets and newspapers; but from what I have heard, and from the little I have read, I may venture to affirm that I have had my share in the compliments which have come from that quarter. As for motives of ambition (for I must take to myself a part of the noble Duke's insinuation), I believe, my lords, there have been times in which I have had the honour of standing in such favour in the closet, that there must have been something extravagantly unreasonable in my wishes if they might not all have been gratified. After neglecting those opportunities I am now suspected of coming forward, in the decline of life, in the anxious pursuit of wealth and power which it is impossible for me to enjoy. Be it so! There is one ambition at least, which I ever will acknowledge, which I will not renounce but with my life. It is the ambition of delivering to my posterity those rights of freedom which I have received from my ancestors. I am not now pleading the cause of the individual, but of every freeholder in England. In what manner this House may constitutionally interpose in their defence, and what kind of redress this case will require and admit of, is not at present the subject of our consideration. The amendment, if agreed to, will naturally lead us to such an inquiry. That inquiry may, perhaps, point out the necessity of an act of the Legislature, or it may lead us, perhaps, to desire a conference with the other House; which one noble lord affirms is the only parliamentary way of proceeding, and which another noble lord assures us the House of Commons would either not come to, or would break off with indignation. Leaving their lordships to reconcile that matter between themselves, I shall only say that, before we have inquired, we cannot be provided with materials; consequently, we are not at present prepared for a conference.

It is not impossible, my lords, that the inquiry I speak of may lead us to advise his Majesty to dissolve the present Parliament; nor have I any doubt of our right to give that advice, if we should think it necessary. His Majesty will then determine whether he will yield to the united petitions of the people of England, or maintain the House of Commons in the exercise of a legislative power which heretofore abolished the House of Lords and overturned the monarchy. I willingly acquit the present House of Commons of having actually formed so detestable a design; but they cannot themselves foresee to what excesses they may be carried hereafter; and, for my own part, I should be sorry to trust to their future moderation. Unlimited power is apt to corrupt the minds of those who possess it; and this I know, my lords, that where law ends, tyranny begins!

GILBERT K. CHESTERTON

(1874-).

MR. CHESTERTON has now for many years worn the motley and been content to delight us with his literary antics. He insists on playing the part of mediæval jester in our modern tragicomedy, and, like the Shakespearian fool, unmasks our pretences by his folly and teaches wisdom by his wit. His books are the fantastic gambols, the pert capers, the veiled gravity of the professional jester translated into print. They win us with their heartiness and their brilliant paradox, and make us momentarily credulous of the unbelievable and the irrational.

The best of them are "The Defendant," "The Napoleon of Notting Hill," "The Innocence of Father Brown," "Manalive," and "The Flying Inn." But Mr. Chesterton is no mean poet, too. He has written the magnificent "Ballad of the White Horse" and the poems in "The Ballad of Saint Barbara." "Lepanto" is his, one of the best of battle pieces. "Magic" is a play, but a play that stands on its head and kicks its heels defiantly in the air. He has written criticism and essays on social subjects also.

Like his play, Mr. Chesterton himself has stood on his head and kicked his heels, until he has become red in the face with paradox and a little exhausted by his inverted posture. But though wilful and at times a little childish, the pose has been well and brilliantly sustained, and if we prefer to stand upon our feet we do not the less admire Mr. Chesterton for his amusing pertinacity of contradiction.

THE SUPERSTITIONS OF THE SCEPTIC[1]

I PROPOSE to start my rambling discourse by taking whatever has lately been said by Mr. Bernard Shaw and say the opposite. You will forgive me therefore if in this very disconnected discourse the starting point, and in a sense the text, is found in the recent work of my old friend and enemy. I suppose everybody here has heard of, and most people have probably either read or seen, the very interesting play called St. Joan ; and I am not going to take up the function of the hundreds of young dramatic critics that I see before me by attempting to deal with it as a play, because my concern with it is only in one particular; but I will say by way of indicating my own general view of the subject that when I had read and seen it I wrote to my friend Bernard Shaw to ask him when his play on the subject of Joanna Southcott was coming out. That is a taunt which may appear to you somewhat cryptic and obscure, but it is really I think very relevant. You know that all sorts of things have been said about St. Joan of Arc at various periods. Shakespeare unfortunately represented her as a repulsive female adventurer; Voltaire, as something indescribable; Lord Byron said she was a fanatical strumpet; and Bernard Shaw has said that she was a Protestant progressive, and the founder as it were of the modern world. You will notice that it is only that last insult which is represented as having made her turn in her grave and rise indignant from the dead. None of the other descriptions of St. Joan, as far as I know, ever concerned themselves with the ghost of St. Joan returning to the earth—it required a further and terrible accusation to stir those sacred bones even in imagination; and the suggestion that she was responsible for the modern world was too much for anybody.

---

[1] Printed by permission of the President of the I.D.K. Club.

But there is one particular passage in that play which will serve very well as a starting point for the little that I want to suggest this evening, and that is the fine passage of that very fair argument on the subject of persecution, in which the Inquisitor, if I remember right, says, very truly as I think, that errors grow with an astonishing rapidity and with a bizarre variety that nobody could expect, and that some movement that began with an apparently well-meaning and simple man suggesting certain apparently more or less harmless things, will rapidly end with people committing some crime like infanticide, or insisting on going about without clothes. Now the only reason I am not going to discuss all the very interesting questions that are raised on that point in the argument is that it seems to me—and that is the point of my reference to Joanna Southcott—it seems to me that Bernard Shaw proves too much, I mean he proves too much for his own purpose, because he succeeds, I think, in convincing a fair and reasonable reader that if it was true that Joan of Arc stood for individualism in religion, and the right of each person to oppose his voice or his voices to the general sense of Christendom, if Joan of Arc meant that, then she was wrong, and that is all. I do not mean that I think she was wrong, but that Bernard Shaw thinks that she was wrong. There is nowhere in the whole of the play anything of the nature of a real answer to the Inquisitor or the Archbishop upon the common sense of the question. Joan of Arc does not prove that it would be a good thing for everybody to follow a purely individualistic religion ; she does not attempt to. The argument really remains on the other side. In other words, if she did maintain that view, she was wrong, and if she maintained the view that anyone who has a psychical experience must trust that against common sense and against civilisation, to say nothing of any other authority—if she maintained that, she was wrong, wrong by the consensus of common sense people everywhere.

Because as we all know there are a large number of people by this time hearing voices which sometimes say very singular things, and a great many of those people do so far illustrate the general subject that I am attempting to suggest this evening, that they were, a great many of them, at one time sceptics of the most complete sort. It is not specially of them that I want to speak this evening, but it is well to note as we pass that in the ordinary literal sense of the words we have seen a great many very great sceptics pass into what a good many of us at any rate would call very great superstitions. We have seen great men of science, for instance, who were agnostics or materialists, telling us things for which certainly the rationalists of the nineteenth century and still more of the eighteenth century could have found no term except raving madness. I mean men who doubted a great deal more than I ever doubted have come to believe more than I could possibly believe. We have seen people who thought it fantastical to believe that there could be a resurrection of a glorified body come to tell us of the resurrection of glorified niblicks and brassies for the purpose of playing a game of glorified golf. We have seen people who could not believe in the Sacramental mystery that was symbolised by the old legend of the Holy Grail, gravely tell us that people in the world of happy souls still have whiskies and sodas. It seems to me, by the way, rather characteristic of the rather third-rate character of that sort of religion, that they do say whiskies and sodas when they might at least be poetical and traditional and say ale or wine.

I say in passing that we know the theory that each person should trust his psychical experience as an absolute, and ask for no other view and allow nothing to balance it or to moderate it at all ; that view has developed very fully in the modern world, and most of us when we see it do not like it. It developed of course in a great many ways ; apart from the present development of things like spiritualism it developed in a great many sects and leaders of various sorts ; and that was what I meant when I asked why this coldness, this neglect amounting almost to indifference, of the greatness of Joanna Southcott. Joanna Southcott is surely a far better example of pure individualism in religion, of a person who listens solely to her own voices, of a person who would not let any priest or council come between her and God ; and she is, moreover, a person much nearer to us, our fellow country-woman, and we are not obliged in honouring her to do what I know is always very painful to the friends of the international friendship of nations—pay a compliment to France. We are not obliged to go back a great many more years in the past than the life of Methuselah in the future, and we have not reached things so remote or so obscure or so alien. We can find quite within our own time a great prophetess who stood up and declared with absolute clarity certain oracles of spiritual sources, and who has actually left her testament behind her; I believe there are some boxes or something that nobody has opened yet and they may contain news of prodigious spiritual value to the world.

If Bernard Shaw's ideal is the modern ideal, why does he have to go back to the medieval world to get it? And why does he describe in the play of Methuselah infinite ages stretching forward into conditions that seem to me to be full of more and more depression, and have to go back five hundred years to find inspiration and hope? The reason, I take it, is that all common sense people are really now agreed that the mere individual mysticism that relies upon the internal voices and nothing else is certainly wrong ninety-nine times that it is right once, and is when left to itself an anarchical and insane element in society. But I do not speak specially of those cases like that of Joanna Southcott, except in passing, because the thing I have to deal with this evening is not the ordinary excesses or extravagances of belief, but a certain element of credulity that strangely enough seems to me to come with and to a large extent to arise out of the mode of scepticism. As I say, it is illustrated sufficiently well in actual fact in the case of the remarkable appearance of scientists as spiritualists. But I am not dealing with that, but with something that is considerably more difficult to describe; and I must ask your indulgence if I do not make it as clear as I should wish to, because it is a rather large question and one that covers several centuries, and requires something like a little historical imagination, I think, to see it as a whole.

When St. Joan was dead and the medieval order broke up, we all know that for good or evil there did come into the world an intellectual and religious disruption, whether we call it variety or anarchy, or by the language of praise or blame—call it if you like individualism; and to a very great extent it was not only individualism, but scepticism. Now when the Inquisitor in Bernard Shaw's play, whose words I have taken as a text, says that if you allow people spiritual individualism, without sang froid as it were, and without anything to balance it, you will have wild things like people walking about without clothes; he says something that has been illustrated often enough in human history. It seems to me in a certain sense he rather understates the case, because the thing that I wish to point out to you this evening is that when you leave everything in a more or less sceptical and undecided condition, what happens is not necessarily, or perhaps even generally, extravagance and madness, but in a sense the very opposite. What happens is constraint and servitude, that is to say that one of the immediate results of cutting loose is, for some reason that I do not understand, that you chain yourself up again and chain yourself much more completely.

Whatever the old system of Christendom may have been and whatever we think of it, it is historically true that when people broke away from it they showed a most mysterious disposition for rushing, apparently of their own free will, into prisons and lunatic asylums, especially lunatic asylums, but lunatic asylums are prisons; and it is that aspect of them I am thinking of especially at the moment. It is as if one were to write a story about a man who had the rather nervous job of leading along on some journey a companion who had a morbid mono-mania for going to prison. One could imagine rather an amusing story made out of it, how you had to get him past police stations as they get drunkards past public houses. Something of that mysterious impulse seems for some reason or other to exist in the human intellect when it is emancipated or made sceptical or detached, or whatever phrase you may use; and I want very rapidly, if it does not bore you, to point out how curiously that has happened again and again in the last two or three centuries of our era.

Of course the first and most obvious example is that when the intellect was as it were left floating loose—and it must always be remembered that I have no intention of going into it in any detail—it must always be remembered as a historical fact that the interregnum of the Renaissance and of the general system of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was very much of an intellectual interregnum. That is to say, there was a considerable period before the formation of a possible new system like the Puritan system, a period during which large numbers of people were floating about very much as they are floating about in the world to-day, people whose spirit I suppose was represented by Montaigne or by some of the Italian cultured sceptics of the time; and therefore you did have a period when there was a great deal of what one may call scepticism in the air, and the final form of modern Europe had by no means been yet taken. What happened for instance in the countries like our own and in Scotland and in parts of Germany and in Holland, was a very extraordinary thing, which Matthew Arnold, you remember, summed up by saying the English people entered the prison of Puritanism and had the key turned on them for two hundred years. It is perhaps an exaggeration to say the English people entered it, and it is perhaps an exaggeration to say they were there for two hundred years.

You will notice that Matthew Arnold, who was certainly detached and in many ways in sympathy with the change, used also the word "prison," which is the key of what I am insisting on. A large mass of people became so extraordinarily interested, for some reason that I have never quite understood, in one particular thin thread of argument, the logical argument from the omnipotence of God to the full Calvinist doctrine of predestination—became so extraordinarily interested in that one particular piece of Calvinistic logic, that they did to a very great extent transform the whole of social life as far as they could with a new atmosphere and a new spirit, and put upon themselves all kinds of very real and very rigid limitations. I will not go into all those, because it raises rather an old controversy which is not really relevant ; but it is enough to say that it is quite obvious that the people did feel the bonds as bonds. I am not sneering at them for that. Every man who has a religion feels some of its bonds as bonds at certain moments. But I am pointing out that these people had drifted into a system of which the bondage was very severe indeed. Nobody can read any of the great Puritans like Milton, etc., without feeling that there is a distinct resistance or struggle of Puritan humanity against the limits of the new system. But all I am concerned to point out in connection with this argument is that what had landed them in that severe and gloomy system overshadowed a vast part of our people until a very short time ago.

Almost all of the great nineteenth century humanitarians, people like Dickens or Hood, or any of the hundred others who lived to preach a more generous and liberal conception of human pleasure, you will almost always find that they talk of the last generation as having been practically Calvinistic. They talk of the life of the old home or the family traditions, as if they were Puritanical in the most gloomy degree. Therefore I say that that influence—a very restricting influence—was (and that is the point which I am concerned with here) the direct immediate result of breaking loose, and what was called thinking for yourself. It was their religious liberty that created their social slavery.

Now the time came towards the end of the seventeenth century when it became increasingly obvious that this gloomy and grinding creed was not going to be permanently borne, and people began to break away from it in various ways, to break out of the prison into which they had entered voluntarily, to break with great difficulty out of the prison they had built for themselves; and you get at the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth the full growth of modern scepticism in the ordinary sense of the word, the spirit that applies—as it is conceived—the humane and rational test to everything, and refuses superstitions and arbitrary doctrines and all the rest of it. Now I am going studiously to refrain in this discussion as far as I can from any terms that can be called terms of abuse as distinct from terms of history. I could say a vast deal about the Puritans, and the sort of things that a great many people said about the Puritans when they were there, the kind of things that Ben Jonson said; but I am not abusing any of these people; I am trying to trace the course of what always seemed to me a rather curious course of events. In the same way as I am not attacking the Puritans, so I am not attacking the Deists or the Sceptics of the eighteenth century. On the contrary, it always seems to me that there was something rather beautiful and touching about that brief interlude of contented Paganism, during which men thought for a very short time indeed that they could be wholly satisfied with this earth and this life. Bitter as Voltaire was, and foul as he often was, there is about some of his utterances also the suggestion of a curious innocence. When he said, "After all, a man must cultivate his garden," it always gives me a certain feeling as if it was the garden of Eden—that curious interlude when man believed that this earth was Eden, and that by being ordinarily humane and reasonably logical and practical, all problems would solve themselves.

EARL OF CLARENDON (EDWARD HYDE)

(1608-1674).

EDWARD HYDE, afterwards first Earl of Clarendon, is remarkable, though by no means singular, among the great men of his day in having achieved a double reputation, first as a reformer and Radical, and afterwards as a Conservative and restorer of royal authority. He was born at Dinton, in Wiltshire, February 18th, 1608, and at the age of thirty-two entered political life as a Member of Parliament when the struggle between Charles I. and the Commons was at its most critical stage. Hyde took the popular side against the King in Hampden's case and in the impeachment of Lord Keeper Finch; but when attack was made on Episcopacy as a church establishment, he began to lean to the royal cause and finally, after the retreat of the King from London, he left his seat in the House of Commons and joined him at York. In 1643 he became Chancellor of the Exchequer under Charles I., and after the restoration was Lord Chancellor of England from 1660 to 1667 under Charles II. His devotion to the interests of royalty was too logical to suit the dissolute King, and it rendered him so odious to the Commons that in 1667 he was impeached for high treason. Deserted by the King, he was obliged to leave the country for France, where he died December 9th, 1674. He is best known by his "True Historical Narrative of the Rebellion and Civil Wars of England," and by his "Autobiography"—works which stand at the head of their class in the literature of the Stuart period.

IN JOHN HAMPDEN'S CASE

(Speech in the Case of Ship-Money, between the King and John Hampden, 13th Exchequer, Charles I., 1636).

THERE cannot be a greater instance of a sick and languishing commonwealth than the business of this day. Good God! how have the guilty these late years been punished, when the judges themselves have been such delinquents! It is no marvel that an irregular, extravagant, arbitrary power, like a torrent, hath broken in upon us, when our banks and our bulwarks, the laws, were in the custody

of such persons. Men who had lost their innocence could not preserve their courage; nor could we look that they who had so visibly undone us themselves should have the virtue or credit to rescue us from the oppression of other men. It was said by one who always spoke excellently that the twelve judges were like the twelve lions under the throne of Solomon: "Under the throne in obedience, but yet lions." Your lordships shall this day hear of six, who (be they what they will be else) were no lions, who upon vulgar fears delivered up the precious forts they were trusted with, almost without assault; and in a tame easy trance of flattery and servitude, lost and forfeited (shamefully forfeited) that reputation, awe, and reverence which the wisdom, courage, and gravity of their venerable predecessors had contracted and fastened to the places they now hold, and even rendered that study and profession, which in all ages hath been (and I hope now shall be) of an honourable estimation, so contemptible and vile that, had not this blessed day come, all men would have had that quarrel to the law itself which Marcius had to the Greek tongue, who thought it a mockery to learn that language the masters whereof lived in bondage under others. And I appeal to these unhappy gentlemen themselves with what a strange negligence, scorn, and indignation the faces of all men, even of the meanest, have been directed towards them since (to call it no worse) that fatal declension of their understandings in those judgments of which they stand here charged before your lordships. But, my lords, the work of this day is the greatest instance of a growing and thriving commonwealth too; and is as the dawning of a fair and lasting day of happiness to this kingdom.

It is in your lordships' power (and I am sure it is in your lordships' will) to restore the dejected broken people of this island to their former joy and security, the successors of these men to their own privileges and veneration: *Et sepultas prope leges revocare.* So these judges enter themselves and harden their hearts by more particular trespasses upon the law; by impositions and taxes upon the merchants in trade; by burdens and pressures upon the gentry in knighthood; before they could arrive at that universal destruction of the King by Ship-Money, which promised reward and security for all their former services by doing the work of a Parliament to his Majesty in supplies, and seemed to delude justice in leaving none to judge them, by making the whole kingdom party to their oppression. My lords, the Commons assembled in Parliament hope that your lordships will call these judges speedily before you to answer these articles laid to their charge, that the nation may be satisfied in your lordships' justice upon them as their crimes demerit.

WILLIAM COBBETT

(1762-1835).

WILLIAM COBBETT revelled in the turmoil of controversy, and apparently was never happier than when undergoing prosecution for libellous or seditious utterances. Indeed, much of his work as editor and author was done in prison. His disposition to row against the current and to take the part of the " under dog " was conspicuous in his life in America as well as in England. A British soldier discharged in Canada, he began the publication of his " Peter Porcupine Papers " and his " Porcupine Gazette " in Wilmington, and in 1796 set up as a bookseller and publisher of his own writings in Philadelphia. There he was as much against the government as he ever was against that of England after his return from America. His praises of Great Britain, his scorn of American institutions and attacks on American statesmen involved him in prosecutions for libel which in 1800 drove him back to England, where he was at first regarded as a loyal refugee, the champion of monarchy and order. He dined with Windham, was introduced to Pitt, and was offered a share in the " True Briton." But he refused the gift, opened a bookshop in Pall Mall, and revived his " Porcupine Gazette," which was followed in 1802 by the " Weekly Political Register." Ere long his windows were broken by an angry mob, and he again incurred heavy fines. In 1809 his comments on the flogging of several militiamen exposed him to a fine of £1,000 and two years imprisonment. From his prison he continued the publication of the " Political Register." By 1817 his debts and other difficulties compelled him to take refuge for a time in the United States, and it was while in America that he wrote his English grammar, of which ten thousand copies were sold in a month. He was a self-educated man, a vigorous if not a polished speaker and writer. His speeches and lectures in the principal cities of England and Scotland drew large audiences. He was born March 9th, 1762, in Surrey. In 1832 he was elected to the House of Commons, not long after the disagreement of a jury had delivered him from a prosecution for inciting rebellion. In 1834 he was re-elected, but his health failed, and he died June 16th, 1835. A long list of his printed books can be found in the catalogue of any public library.

THE MAN ON THE TOWER

(Speech before the Court of King's Bench, Defending himself against a Charge of Libel, in July, 1831).

THE fact is that I am the watchman, the man on the tower, who can be neither coaxed, nor wheedled, nor bullied; and I have expressed my determination never to quit my post until I obtain a cheap government for the country, and, by doing away with places and pensions, prevent the people's pockets from being picked. These men know that if I were to get into the House of Commons under a reformed Parliament, I should speedily effect that object, and therefore they are resolved to get rid of me by some means or other; but, thank God, gentlemen, you will not let them effect it on the present occasion.

I have little else to add, except to state what evidence I shall lay before you. The first witness I shall call will be the Lord Chancellor, and I will put in the letter to the Luddites, which, by delivery to Lord Brougham for publication, I, in point of law, republished at the very time when I was said to be endeavouring to stir up the labourers to sedition and outrage. I will then call his lordship to prove the fact respecting the application for it, and he will tell you that I stipulated no terms, but that the whole of the letter should be published. I shall then call the Earl of Radnor, who knows me and all my sentiments well, and he will tell you whether I am a likely man to design and endeavour to do that which this false and malicious Whig indictment charges me with wishing to do. I shall also call several persons of the highest respectability from Kent, Sussex, and other parts of the country to prove that I have not done anything to stir up disturbance, but that I have done a great deal to prevent it and to restore quiet. I shall then call Lord Melbourne to prove that the sentence on Goodman was not executed, but that he was sent out of the country, whereas Cook was put to death. When the jury shall have heard all this, and shall have read over the various publications, I have not the slightest doubt but that they will dismiss with scorn and contempt this groundless charge of the Whig Attorney-General. This is the second time in my life that I have been prosecuted by an Attorney-General, and brought before this court. I have been writing for thirty years, and only twice out of that long period have I been brought before this court. The first time was by an apostate Whig. What, indeed, of evil have the Whigs not done? Since then, although there have been six Attorney-Generals, all Tories, and although, were I a Crown lawyer, I might pick out plenty of libels from my writings, if this be a libel, yet I have never for twenty-one years been prosecuted until this Whig government came in. But the Whigs were always a most tyrannical faction; they always tried to make tyranny double tyranny; they were always the most severe, the most grasping, the most greedy, the most tyrannical faction whose proceedings are recorded in history. It was they who seized what remained of the Crown lands; it was they who took to themselves the last portion of Church property; it was they who passed the monstrous Riot Act; it was they also who passed the Septennial Bill. The Government are now acquiring great credit for doing away with the rotten boroughs; but if they deserve credit for doing them away, let it be borne in mind that the Whigs created them. They established an interest in the regulation, and gave consistency and value to corruption. Then came the excise laws, which were brought in by the Whigs; and from them, too, emanated that offensive statute by which Irish men and Irish women may be transported without judge or jury. There is, indeed, no faction so severe and cruel; they do everything by force and violence. The Whigs are the Rehoboam of England; the Tories ruled us with rods, but the Whigs scourge us with scorpions.

The last time I was brought before this court I was sent out of it to two years' imprisonment among felons, and was condemned to pay, at the expiration of the two years, a fine of one thousand pounds sterling to the King, which the King took and kept. But this was not all; I was bound, too, in a penalty of five thousand pounds myself, and obliged to procure two sureties in two thousand five hundred pounds each, to keep the peace for seven years. . . . I was carried seventy miles from my family and shut up in a jail, doubtless with the hope that I should expire from stench and mortification of mind. It pleased God, however, to bless me with health, and, though deprived of liberty, by dint of sobriety and temperance I outlived the base attempt to destroy me. What crime had I committed? For what was it that I was condemned to this horrible punishment? Simply for writing a paragraph in which I expressed the indignation I felt at an English local militiaman having been flogged under a guard of German bayonets! I only expressed the indignation I felt, and I should have been a base creature, indeed, if I had not expressed it. But now military flogging excites universal indignation. If there be at present any of the jury alive who found me guilty and sentenced me to that punishment, what remorse must they not feel for their conduct when they perceive that all the writers in every periodical of the present day, even including the favourite publication of the Whig Attorney-General, are now unanimous in deprecating the system of military flogging altogether! Yet for expressing my disapprobation of that system I was tossed into a dungeon like Daniel into the lion's den. But why am I now tossed down before this court by the Attorney-General? What are my sins? I have called on the Government to respect the law. I have cautioned them that hard-hearted proceedings are driving the labourers to despair! That is my crime! If the Government really wish to avoid disturbances in the country, let them give us back the old laws; let them give the people the old game law, and repeal the new law; and let them do away with the other grinding laws that oppress the poor. I have read with horror which I cannot describe of a magistrate being accused to the Lord Chancellor of subornation of perjury; I have read of that magistrate being reinstated and I have shuddered with horror at supposing that a poor starving labourer may be brought before such a man, and in conjunction with another such magistrate may be doomed to seven years' transportation for being out at night. And such a magistrate may be himself a game preserver! This is a monstrous power, and certainly ought to be abolished. The ministry, however, will perhaps adopt the measures I have recommended, and then prosecute me for recommending them. Just so it is with parliamentary reform, a measure which I have been foremost in recommending for twenty years. I have pointed out and insisted upon the sort of reform that we must have; and they are compelled already to adopt a large part of my suggestions, and avowedly against their will. They hate me for this; they look upon it as I do, that they are married to Reform, and that I am the man who has furnished the halter in which they are led to church. For supplying that halter they have made this attack on me through the Attorney-General, and will slay me if they can. The Whigs know that my intention was not bad. This is a mere pretence to inflict pecuniary ruin on me, or cause me to die of sickness in a jail, so that they may get rid of me, because they can neither buy nor silence me. It is their fears which make them attack me, and it is my death they intend. In that object they will be defeated, for, thank heaven, you stand between me and destruction. If however, your verdict should be—which I do not anticipate—one that will consign me to death by sending me to a loathsome dungeon, I will with my last breath pray to God to bless my country and curse the Whigs; and I bequeath my revenge to my children and the labourers of England.

ON REFORM AND REFORMERS

A FEW years ago, that is, in 1816, Lord Milton said, in the House of Commons, that he should like to come to close quarters with the reformers—I suppose he had some fellow to do with who was not very troublesome—but he said he should like to come to close quarters with the reformers. Gentlemen, the time has arrived when he may come to close quarters with them. But how did he show his inclination? Why, in the first place, in the very next year he might have come to close quarters, but what did he do? Why, when a million and a half of petitions were presented for reform, my Lord Milton answered their arguments by voting for a gagging bill, and his father for a gagging bill and a dungeon bill too. That was the way he came to close quarters, then; and now, where there is a prospect of close quarters again, he shows his boldness, and his propensity to grapple with the reformers, by slinking away from the county of Yorkshire, and creeping in for a rotten borough. Oh, yes, my Lord Milton was not going to face thousands of men, whom he must have faced had he sought to be re-elected; depend upon it, he is so strongly disposed to come to close quarters with the reformers that he would prefer to walk quietly in for a rotten borough—the place lately filled by the Attorney-General—and leaves Yorkshire to be filled by the lawyer Brougham. Gentlemen, you see his desire was not to come to close quarters with the reformers, but to get out of the way, not to be so prominent in the House as before, but to put forward a talking lawyer, who has talent to wheedle the people, and make them believe that they have got somewhat nearer the mark than before, in consequence of his election. It is therefore of the greatest importance that we take a view of this lawyer and his party, for they will be armed against the duke. Gentlemen, we shall have the duke (the Duke of Wellington) with us, if we behave with becoming spirit.

Gentlemen, we shall have the Whigs, as they call themselves, and very properly too, arrayed against the duke, trying to prevent that which he may be disposed to give to us from being efficient for our good. Let me, then, call your attention to this faction of pretended patriots, pretended lovers of liberty, friends of the people, for unless we be on our guard against them we shall be cheated at last, and the day of our deliverance be deferred. Look at their conduct, then. This faction has succeeded in deceiving the people for a long while, and it still has its hold upon the minds and affections of some. What pretension has this faction, then, to patriotism and friendship for the people?

In the first place, they made the national debt, and all the evils arising out of it; they passed the Septennial Bill; they made the excise laws, and when they came into power they passed every odious law. In the plenitude of their power, in 1806, the first thing they did was to add to the number of German troops in the country; the second thing was to pass a law enabling Lord Grenville to unite in his own person the two offices of First Lord of the Treasury and Auditor of the Exchequer, that he might receive £12,000 a year of the public money. This really seemed to be a measure of impossibility—to give a man £4,000 a year for auditing *his own account*—to be so incongruous, that it was, as the poet says, making impossibilities coalesce. The next thing they did was—not to propose excise laws, for those they had passed long before—but it was to propose a law by Lord Henry Petty, now the Marquis of Lansdowne, to bring the exciseman into every private house, to lay a tax upon the beer brewed by any man for his own consumption. So that an Englishman's house would have been his castle with a vengeance if that law had passed. We complain of the Tories pressing us down with taxes, but they have never, though bad enough, God knows, they have never been half so bad as the others. The Whigs say they are for retrenchment and economy; how did they show that in the income tax which they created?—that most unjust of all taxes. They laid a tax of 10 per cent on all property, as they called it, including in it every tradesman, and making him, in fact, pay seven times as much as the lord. At the same time they passed a law to augment the incomes of the royal family, and relieve them from the operation of the property tax. Yes, and they did more; for the law under which that family reigns—the law of settlement—stipulates positively and absolutely that no foreigner shall enjoy any pension or place of emolument under the Crown, but these Whigs appointed scores of foreigners, who are on the pension list to this day. Gentlemen, the Tories, bad as they are, never committed such indecencies as these. And how have these same men acted recently? They have now and then had a pretty little motion for Parliamentary reform—such as my Lord John Russell's scheme. But in 1827 mark their conduct. At that time Canning came into power, and he made a kind of coalition with them; he who had opposed the reformers all his lifetime, though he had taken £150,000 of our money. Well, they amalgamated with him. Oh, yes, they would all support the right honourable gentleman. To be sure, because he had got places and pensions to bestow. Brougham, you recollect, thought to get made Master of the Rolls, and Lord John Russell was, perhaps, to have been made an ambassador. One night when the House was sitting (for they do all their work by owl-light)—one night Mr. Peel asked how the honourable gentlemen who had taken their seats on the Treasury benches would agree with one another on the question of Parliamentary reform. Canning got up and said he would oppose reform in that House to the last moment of his life, let it come in what shape it might. Very well, that was all very well and very consistent in Canning, but how did the Whigs act ? Why Lord John Russell, who had a notice of motion for reforms before the House, got up, and said he had discovered the people did not want reform now, and therefore he should beg to withdraw his motion. Ay, and Brougham supported him. He said that the people for some years now had not wished for any such thing as Parliamentary reform ; therefore he would support his right honourable friend, notwithstanding that he objected to Parliamentary reform. Burdett, too, said he would support the right honourable gentleman, notwithstanding his declaration. That, then, was their conduct in 1827, only three years ago ; and is anyone to believe—is any man so foolish as to believe—that they are now sincere when they talk about reform ? All of them, however, dislike the ballot, and for the reasons I have upon a former occasion had the honour to state to you—because they know that it would be the great security of the independence of the people. This, gentlemen, will be their conduct, and against that we must be upon our guard. If we be not, we shall be cheated with some shuffling thing. My idea is that the duke may come to the House and propose a national kind of reform. Not a wild and visionary reform ; oh, no, to be sure not. Our answer will be : " No, my lord duke, we are for nothing wild and visionary ; we only want that every man able to carry a musket should have a vote, if he be in his senses, and be not tainted by indelible crime ; we want this, because our bodies are liable to be forced out in defence of your estates, my lord duke, if they should be placed in danger. Then we want that Parliaments should be shorter, because we perceive that the members grow very slack in their duties in the course of seven years, until they are just on the eve of an election. Twelve years is the average of a man's life, and therefore we think that seven years is too long for which to return a member to Parliament. And then we want the ballot, because of many things ; among the rest because it would put an end to canvassing and bribery ; and all those infamies which are practised once in about four or five years. We want, my lord duke, to put an end to this infamy, and if you call this wild and visionary—if you, who belong to three or four Bible societies—call it wild and visionary to put an end to that bribery and perjury which God has denounced and held up to execration—if you call this wild and visionary, my lord duke, we can only say that we have not the same dictionary to explain our words by." Gentlemen, if you stand to this firmly, let them go on with their projects; they may pass a law—and it would not be right to resist it; let us see the operation of it first. But this is the course I think the thing will take after they have been discussing parliamentary reform for some time; some man among them will get up, and will have the honesty and the boldness to make a point of the *ballot*. "There," he will say, "all the people understand that; give them the ballot." Yes, gentlemen, William IV. and the ballot all the world over! And my opinion is that when that comes to be discussed, if the man who brings it forward be in earnest, it will come to be—the ballot or nothing. When that question comes to be decided, they will have 200,000 voters waiting the result of the decision. They will not regard it with indifference; they will feel their own existence to be at stake. And thus I hope we shall get the thing we seek without disturbances or bloodshed. That we may do this is, I am sure, my sincere wish; and it has been the whole endeavour of my life to cause it to take place in my country.

RICHARD COBDEN

(1804-1865).

RICHARD COBDEN sacrificed his life by leaving his sick room and hastening to London in the spring of 1865 to resist in the House of Commons the proposed fortification of Canada. His Free Trade agitation had always been subordinated to the high moral purpose of promoting peace on earth and good-will among men. As he considered free commerce between nations the surest means of avoiding wars and abolishing armies, the proposition to fortify Canada at a time of strained relations between the United States and England aroused him to undertake a journey which proved fatal. When his death was announced to the House of Commons, his character and public services were praised as "an honour to England" by his former political antagonists, and his old friend and coadjutor, John Bright, over-powered by emotion after speaking a sentence or two in a tremulous voice, said he must leave to a calmer moment what he had to say "of the manliest and gentlest spirit that ever quitted or tenanted a human form."

In truth the production of men of the Cobden type is the greatest glory of modern England, and to the labours of such men she owes more of her greatness than to the splendid heroism of her warriors. A widow's son, with only such rudimentary education as could be obtained at a country grammar school, he found time in the midst of very assiduous and successful attention to commercial pursuits, to make himself one of the best informed and ablest teachers of his generation. After he had built up a business yielding him a profit of £8,000 a year, he turned aside from it and began to write the magazine articles and pamphlets which eventually revolutionized the politico-economic policy of England.

Omitting wholly the details of the great and incessant labours by which he forced Sir Robert Peel to repeal the Corn Laws in deference to public opinion, the barest mention can be made of his work as an international treaty reformer, and his remarkable series of peace congresses in the interest of arbitration as a substitute for war, as perhaps the most remarkable among many other distinguished services to his own country and to mankind. He became such a power in England that cabinet positions and even a baronetcy and seat in the Privy Council were offered him by Lord Palmerston and refused. Throughout his long parliamentary career he was one of England's foremost debaters of political, economical, and commercial questions, while at the same time he was the writer of essays that are enduring textbooks for the guidance of after generations.

He was born at his father's farmhouse near Midhurst in Sussex, June 3rd, 1804, and died in London, April 2nd, 1865.

FREE TRADE WITH ALL NATIONS

(Delivered at Manchester, January 15th, 1846).

I SHALL begin the few remarks which I have to offer to this meeting by proposing, contrary to my usual custom, a resolution ; and it is, "That the merchants, manufacturers, and other members of the National Anti-Corn-Law League claim no protection whatever for the manufactured products of this country, and desire to see obliterated forever the few nominally protective duties against foreign manufactures, which still remain upon our statute books." Gentlemen, if any of you have taken the pains to wade through the reports of the Protectionist meetings, as they are called, which have been held lately, you would see that our opponents, at the end of seven years of our agitation, have found out their mistake, and are abandoning the Corn Laws ; and now, like unskilful blunderers, as they are, they want to take up a new position, just as we are going to achieve the victory. Then they have been telling something very like fibs, when they claimed the Corn Laws as compensation for peculiar burdens. They say now that they want merely protection in common with all other interests, and they now call themselves the advocates of protection to native industry in all its branches ; and, by way of making the appeal to the less-informed portion of the community, they say that the Anti-Corn-Law League are merely the advocates of Free Trade in corn, but that we want to preserve a monopoly in manufactures.

Now, the resolution which I have to submit to you, and which we will put to this meeting to-night—the largest by far that I ever saw in this room, and comprising men of every class and of every calling in this district—let that resolution decide, once and forever, whether our opponents can with truth lay that to our charge henceforth. There is nothing new in this proposition, for at the very beginning of this agitation—at the meeting of the Chamber of Commerce—when that faint voice was raised in that small room in King Street in December 1838, for the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws—when that ball was set in motion which has been accumulating in strength and velocity ever since, why, the petition stated fairly that this community wanted no protection for its own industry. I will read the conclusion of that admirable petition. It is as follows:—

"Holding one of the principles of eternal justice to be the inalienable right of every man freely to exchange the result of his labour for the productions of other people, and maintaining the practice of protecting one part of the community at the expense of all other classes to be unsound and unjustifiable, your petitioners earnestly implore your honourable House to repeal all laws relating to the importation of foreign corn and other foreign articles of subsistence, and to carry out to the fullest extent, both as affects agriculture and manufactures, the true and peaceful principles of Free Trade, by removing all existing obstacles to the unrestricted employment of industry and capital."

We have passed similar resolutions at all our great aggregate meetings of delegates in London ever since that was issued.

I don't put this resolution as an argument or as an appeal to meet the appeals made in the protection societies' meetings. I believe that the men who now, in this seventh year of our discussion, can come forth before their country, and talk as those men have done—I believe that you might as well preach to the deaf adder. You cannot convince them. I doubt whether they have not been living in their shells, like oysters; I doubt whether they know such a thing is in existence as a railroad, or as penny postage. They are in profound ignorance of everything, and incapable of being taught. We don't appeal to them, but to a very large portion of this community, who don't take a very prominent part in this discussion—who may be considered as important lookers-on. Many have been misled by the reiterated assertions of our opponents; and it is at this eleventh hour to convince these men, and to give them an opportunity of joining our ranks, as they will do, that I offer this proof of disinterestedness and the fairness of our proposals. I don't intend to go into an argument to convince any man here that protection to all must be protection to none. It takes from one man's pocket, and allows him to compensate himself by taking an equivalent from another man's pocket, and if that goes on in a circle through the whole community, it is only a clumsy process of robbing all to enrich none, and simply has this effect, that it ties up the hands of industry in all directions. I need not offer one word to convince you of that. The only motive that I have for saying a word is, that what I say here may convince others elsewhere—the men who meet in protection societies. But the arguments I should adduce to an intelligent audience like this, would be spoken in vain to the Members of Parliament who are now the advocates of protection. I shall meet them in less than a week in London, and there I will teach the A B C of this protection. It is of no use trying to teach children words of five syllables, when they have not got out of the alphabet.

Well, what exhibitions these protectionists have been making of themselves! Judging from the length of their speeches, as you see them reported, you might fancy the whole community was in motion. Unfortunately for us, and for the reputation of our countrymen, the men who can utter the drivelling nonsense which we have had exhibited to the world lately, and the men who can listen to it, are very few in number. I doubt exceedingly whether all the men who have attended all the protection meetings, during the last month, might not very comfortably be put into this hall. But these protection societies have not only changed their principles, but it seems they have resolved to change their tactics. They have now, at the eleventh hour, again resolved that they will make their body political, and look after the registration. What simpletons they must have been to have thought that they could have done any good without that! So they have resolved that their societies shall spend their money in precisely the same way that the League have been expending theirs. They have hitherto been telling us, in all their meetings and in all their newspapers, that the League is an unconstitutional body; that it is an infernal club which aims at corrupting, at vitiating, and at swamping the registrations; and now, forsooth, when no good can possibly come of it—when they most certainly should have wisely abstained from imitating it, since they cannot do any good, and have kept up the strain they formerly had of calling the League an unconstitutional body, they resolve to rescind their resolution, and to follow his Grace, the Duke of Richmond's advice, and fight us with our own weapons. Now, I presume, we are a constitutional body. It is a fortunate thing that we have not got great dukes to lead us. But, now, of what force is this resolution? Like everything they do, it is farcical—it is unreal. The protection societies, from the beginning, have been nothing but phantoms. They are not realities. And what is their resolution—what does it amount to? They resolve that they will look after the registration. We all know that they have done their worst in that way already. We all know that these landlords may really make their acres a kind of electioneering property. We know right well that their land-agents are their electioneering agents. We know that their rent-rolls have been made their muster-rolls for fighting the battle of protection. These poor drivelling people say that we buy qualifications, and present them to our friends; that we bind them down to vote as we please. We have never bought a vote, and we never intend to buy a vote or to give one. Should we not be blockheads to buy votes and give them, when we have ten thousand persons ready to buy them at our request?

But I suspect that our protectionist friends have a notion that there is some plan—some secret, sinister plan—by which they can put fictitious votes on the register. Now I beg to tell them that the League is not more powerful to create votes than it is to detect the flaws in the bad votes of our opponents; and they may depend on it, if they attempt to put fictitious voters on the register, that we have our ferrets in every county, and that they will find out the flaws; and when the registration time comes, we'll have an objection registered against every one of their fictitious qualifications, and make them produce their title-deeds, and show that they have paid for them. Well, we have our protectionist opponents; but how we may congratulate ourselves on the position which they have given to this question by the discussion that has been raised everywhere during the last few months! We cannot enter a steamboat or a railroad carriage—nay, we cannot even go into an omnibus, but the first thing that any man does, almost before he has deposited his umbrella, is to ask, "Well, what is the last news about the Corn Laws?" Now, we, who remember how difficult it was, at the beginning of our agitation, to bring men's minds to the discussion of this question, when we think that every newspaper is now full of it—the same broad sheet containing, perhaps, a report of this meeting, and of the miserable drivelling of some hole-and-corner agricultural gathering—and when we think that the whole community is engaged in reading the discussion and pondering on the several arguments, we can desire no more. The League might close its doors to-morrow, and its work might be considered as done the moment it compels or induces people to discuss the question.

But the feeling I have alluded to is spreading beyond our own country. I am glad to hear that in Ireland the question is attracting attention. You have probably heard that my friend Mr. Bright and I have received a requisition signed by merchants and manufacturers of every grade and party in Belfast, soliciting us to go there and address them; and I deeply regret that we cannot put our feet on Irish ground to advocate this question. To-day I have received a copy of a requisition to the mayor of Drogheda, calling a meeting for next Monday, to petition for the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, and I am glad to notice at the head of that requisition the name of the Catholic Primate, Doctor Croly, a man eminent for learning, piety, and moderation; and that it is also headed by the rest of the Catholic clergy of that borough. I hope that these examples will not be without their due effect, in another quarter. We have, I believe, the majority of every religious denomination with us—I mean the dissenting denominations; we have them almost *en masse*, both ministers and laymen; and I believe the only body, the only religious body, which we may not say we have with us as a body, are the members of the Church of England.

On this point I will just offer this remark: The clergy of the Church of England have been placed in a most invidious, and, I think, an unfortunate position, by the mode in which their tithe commutation charge was fixed some years ago. My friend Colonel Thompson will recollect it, for he was in Parliament at the time, and protested against the way in which the tithe commutation rent-charge was fixed. He said, with the great foresight he has always shown in the struggle for the repeal of the Corn Laws, that it would make the clergy of the Church of England parties to the present Corn Law by fixing their tithe at a fixed quantity of corn, fluctuating according to the price of the last seven years. Let it be borne in mind, that every other class of the community may be directly compensated for the repeal of the Corn Laws—I mean every class connected with agriculture—except the clergy. The landlords may be compensated, if prices fall, by an increased quantity of produce; so also may the farmer and the labourer; but the clergy of the Church of England receive a given number of quarts of wheat for their tithe, whatever the price may be. I think, however, we may draw a favourable conclusion, under all the circumstances, from the fact that I believe there has not been one clergyman of the Church of England at all eminent for rank, piety, or learning, who has come out, notwithstanding the strong temptation of personal interest, to advocate the existing Corn Law. I think, that we may take this as a proof of the very strong appeal to justice which this question makes, and perhaps augur also that there is a strong feeling among the great body of the members of the Church of England in favour of Free Trade in corn.

Well, there is one other quarter in which we have seen the progress of sound principles—I allude to America. We have received the American President's message; we have had also the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and both President Polk and Mr. Secretary Walker have been taking my friend Colonel Thompson's task out of his hands, and lecturing the people of America on the subject of Free Trade. I have never read a better digest of the arguments in favour of Free Trade than that put forth by Mr. Secretary Walker, and addressed to the Congress of that country. I augur from all these things that our question is making rapid progress throughout the world, and that we are coming to the consummation of our labours. We are verging now towards the session of Parliament, and I predict that the question will either receive its quietus, or that it will lead to the dissolution of this Parliament; and then the next will certainly relieve us of our burden.

Now, many people are found to speculate on what Sir Robert Peel may do in the approaching session of Parliament. It is a very hazardous thing, considering that in one week only you will be as wise as I shall, to venture to make a prediction on this subject. You are very anxious, no doubt. Well, let us see if we can speculate a little on futurity, and relieve our anxiety. There are three courses open to Sir Robert Peel. He may keep the law as it is; he may totally repeal it; or he may do something between the two by tinkering his scale again, or giving us a fixed duty. Now, I predict that Sir Robert Peel will either keep the law as it is, or he will propose totally to abolish it. And I ground my prediction on this, because these are the only two things that anybody in the country wants him to do. There are some that want to keep protection as it is; others want to get rid of it; but nobody wants anything between the two. He has his choice to make, and I have this opinion of his sagacity, that, if he change at all, he will change for total repeal. But the question is, "Will he propose total and immediate repeal?" Now, there, if you please, I will forbear to offer a prediction. But I will venture to give you a reason or two why I think he ought to take total and immediate repeal. I don't think that any class is so much interested in having the Corn Law totally and immediately repealed as the farming class. I believe that it is of more importance to the farmers to have the repeal instantaneous, instead of gradual, than to any other class of the community. In fact, I observe, in the report of a recent Oxfordshire protection meeting, given in to-day's paper, that when Lord Norreys was alluding to the probability of Sir Robert Peel abolishing the Corn Laws gradually, a farmer by the name of Gillatt cried out, "We had better be drowned outright than ducked to death." Gentlemen, I used to employ another simile—a very humble one, I admit. I used to say that an old farmer had told me, that if he were going to cut off his sheep-dog's tail, it would be far more humane to cut it off all at once than a piece every day in the week. But now I think that the farmer's simile in Oxford is the newest and the best that we can use. Nothing could be more easy than to demonstrate that it is the true interest of the farmers, if the Corn Law is to be abolished, to have it abolished instantly. If the Corn Law were abolished to-morrow, my firm belief is, that instead of wheat falling, it would have a tendency to rise. That is my firm belief, because speculation has already anticipated Sir Robert Peel, and wheat has fallen in consequence of that apprehension. I believe that, owing to the scarcity everywhere,—I mean in all parts of Europe,—you could not, if you prayed for it, if you had your own wishing-cap on, and could make your own time and circumstances—I believe, I say, that you could never find such an opportunity for abolishing the Corn Laws totally and immediately as if it were done next week; for it so happens that the very countries from which, in ordinary times, we have been supplied, have been afflicted, like ourselves, with scarcity—that the countries of Europe are competing with us for the very small surplus existing in America. They have, in fact, anticipated us in that market, and they have left the world's markets so bare of corn, that, whatever your necessities may be, I defy you to have other than high prices of corn during the next twelve months, though the Corn Law was abolished to-morrow.

European countries are suffering as we are from the same evil. They are suffering from scarcity now, owing to the absurd legislation respecting the article of corn. Europe altogether has been corrupted by the vicious example of England in her commercial legislation. There they are, throughout the continent of Europe, with a population increasing at the rate of four or five millions a year; yet they make it their business, like ourselves, to put barriers in the way of a sufficiency of food to meet the demand of an increasing population.

I believe that if you abolish the Corn Law honestly, and adopt Free Trade in its simplicity, there will not be a tariff in Europe that will not be changed in less than five years to follow your example. Well, gentlemen, suppose the Corn Law be not abolished immediately, but that Sir Robert Peel bring in a measure giving you a duty of five shillings, six shillings, or seven shillings, and going down one shilling a year for four or five years, till the whole duty is abolished, what would be the effect on foreign countries? They will then exaggerate the importance of this market when the duty is wholly off. They will go on raising supplies, calculating that, when the duty is wholly off, they will have a market for their produce, and high prices to remunerate them; and if, as is very likely and consistent with our experience, we should have a return to abundant seasons, these vast importations will be poured upon our markets, probably just at the time when our prices are low; and they would come here, because they would have no other market, to swamp our markets, and deprive the farmer of the sale of his produce at a remunerating price. But, on the contrary, let the Corn Law be abolished instantly; let foreigners see what the English market is in its natural state, and then they will be able to judge from year to year and from season to season what will be the future demand from this country for foreign corn. There will be no extravagant estimate of what we want—no contingency of bad harvests to speculate upon. The supply will be regulated by the demand, and will reach that state which will be the best security against both gluts and famine. Therefore, for the farmer's sake, I plead for the immediate abolition of this law. A farmer never can have a fair and equitable understanding or adjustment with his landlord, whether as respects rent, tenure, or game, until this law is wholly removed out of his way. Let the repeal be gradual, and the landlord will say to the farmer, through the land-agent, "Oh, the duty will be seven shillings next year; you have not had more than twelvemonths' experience of the workings of the system yet"; and the farmer goes away without any settlement having been come to. Another year passes over, and when the farmer presents himself, he is told, "Oh, the duty will be five shillings this year; I cannot yet tell what the effect will be; you must stop awhile." The next year the same thing is repeated, and the end is, that there is no adjustment of any kind between the landlord and tenant. But put it at once on a natural footing, abolish all restrictions, and the landlord and tenant will be brought to a prompt settlement; they will be placed precisely on the same footing as you are in your manufactures.

Well, I have now spoken on what may be done. I have told you, too, what I should advocate; but I must say, that whatever is proposed by Sir Robert Peel, we, as Free Traders, have but one course to pursue. If he propose a total and immediate and unconditional repeal, we shall throw up our caps for Sir Robert Peel. If he propose anything else, then Mr. Villiers will be ready, as he has been on former occasions, to move his amendment for a total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws. We are not responsible for what ministers may do; we are but responsible for the performance of our duty. We don't offer to do impossibilities; but we will do our utmost to carry out our principles. But, gentlemen, I tell you honestly, I think less of what this Parliament may do—I care less for their opinions, less for the intentions of the Prime Minister and the Cabinet, than what may be the opinion of a meeting like this and of the people out of doors. This question will not be carried by ministers or by the present Parliament; it will be carried, when it is carried, by the will of the nation. We will do nothing that can remove us a hair's breadth from the rock which we have stood upon with so much safety for the last seven years. All other parties have been on a quicksand, and floated about by every wave, by every tide, and by every wind—some floating to us; others, like fragments scattered over the ocean, without rudder or compass; whilst we are upon solid ground, and no temptation, whether of parties or of ministers, shall ever make us swerve a hair's breadth. I am anxious to hear now, at the last meeting before we go to Parliament—before we enter that arena to which all men's minds will be turned during the next week—I am anxious, not merely that we should all of us understand each other on this question, but that we should be considered as occupying as independent and isolated a position as we did at the first moment of the formation of this League. We have nothing to do with Whigs or Tories ; we are stronger than either of them ; if we stick to our principles, we can, if necessary, beat both. And I hope we perfectly understand now, that we have not, in the advocacy of this great question, a single object in view but that which we have honestly avowed from the beginning. Our opponents may charge us with designs to do other things. No, gentlemen, I have never encouraged that. Some of my friends have said, "When this work is done you will have some influence in the country ; you must do so and so." I said then, as I say now, "Every new political principle must have its special advocates, just as every new faith has its martyrs." It is a mistake to suppose that this organization can be turned to other purposes. It is a mistake to suppose that men, prominent in the advocacy of the principle of Free Trade, can with the same force and effect identify themselves with any other principle hereafter. It will be enough if the League accomplish the triumph of the principle we have before us. I have never taken a limited view of the object or scope of this great principle. I have never advocated this question very much as a trader.

But I have been accused of looking too much to material interests. Nevertheless, I can say that I have taken as large and great a view of the effects of this mighty principle as ever did any man who dreamt over it in his own study. I believe that the physical gain will be the smallest gain to humanity from the success of this principle. I look farther ; I see in the Free Trade principle that which shall act on the moral world as the principle of gravitation in the universe,—drawing men together, thrusting aside the antagonism of race and creed and language, and uniting us in the bonds of eternal peace. I have looked even farther. I have speculated, and probably dreamt, in the dim future —aye, a thousand years hence—I have speculated on what the effect of the triumph of this principle may be. I believe that the effect will be to change the face of the world, so as to introduce a system of government entirely distinct from that which now prevails. I believe that the desire and the motive for large and mighty empires—for gigantic armies and great navies—for those materials which are used for the destruction of life and the desolation of the rewards of labour—will die away ; I believe that such things will cease to be necessary, or to be used, when man becomes one family and freely exchanges the fruits of his labour with his brother man. I believe that, if we could be allowed to reappear on this sublunary scene, we should see, at a far distant period, the governing system of this world revert to something like the municipal system ;

and I believe that the speculative philosopher of a thousand years hence will date the greatest revolution that ever happened in the world's history from the triumph of the principle which we have met here to advocate. I believe these things; but, whatever may have been my dreams and speculations, I have never obtruded them upon others. I have never acted upon personal or interested motives in this question; I seek no alliance with parties or favour from parties, and I will take none—but, having the feeling I have of the sacredness of the principle, I say that I can never agree to tamper with it. I, at least, will never be suspected of doing otherwise than pursuing it disinterestedly, honestly, and resolutely.

SMALL STATES AND GREAT ACHIEVEMENTS

(Delivered at Rochdale, October 29th, 1862).

NOW, gentlemen, coupled with this question is another upon which I must say a few words. We are placed in this tremendous embarrassment in consequence of the civil war that is going on in America. Don't expect me to be going to venture upon ground which other politicians have trodden, with, I think, doubtful success or advantage to themselves! Don't think that I am going to predict what is going to happen in America, or that I am going to set myself up as a judge of the Americans! What I wish to do is to say a few words to throw light upon our relations as a nation with the American people. I have no doubt whatever that, if I had been an American, I should have been true to my peace principles, and that I should have been amongst, perhaps, a very small number who had voted against, or raised my protest, in some shape or other, against this civil war in America. There is nothing in the course of this war that reconciles me to the brutality and havoc of such a mode of settling human disputes. But the question we have to ask ourselves is this: What is the position which, as a nation, we ought to take with reference to the Americans in this dispute? That is the question which concerns us. It is no use our arguing as to what is the origin of the war, or any use whatever to advise these disputants. From the moment the first shot is fired, or the first blow is struck, in a dispute, then farewell to all reason and argument; you might as well attempt to reason with mad dogs as with men when they have begun to spill each other's blood in mortal combat. I was so convinced of the fact during the Crimean War,—which you know I opposed,—I was so convinced of the utter uselessness of raising one's voice in opposition to war when it has once begun, that I made up my mind that as long as I was in political life, should a war again break out between England and a great power, I would never open my mouth upon the subject from the time the first gun was fired until the peace was made, because, when a war is once commenced it will only be by the exhaustion of one party that a termination will be arrived at. If you look back at our history, what did eloquence, in the persons of Chatham or Burke, do to prevent a war with our first American colonies? What did eloquence, in the persons of Fox and his friends, do to prevent the French Revolution or bring it to a close? And there was a man who at the commencement of the Crimean War, protested in terms of eloquence, in power and pathos and argument equal—in terms, I believe, fit to compare with any thing that fell from the lips of Chatham and Burke—I mean your distinguished townsman, my friend Mr. Bright—and what was his success? Why, they burnt him in effigy for his pains!

Well, if we are here powerless as politicians to check a war at home, how useless and unavailing must it be for me to presume to affect in the slightest degree the results of the contest in America! I may say I regret this dreadful and sanguinary war; we all regret it; but to attempt to scold them for fighting, to attempt to argue the case with either, and to reach them with any arguments, while they are standing in mortal combat, a million of them standing in arms and fighting to the death; to think that, by any arguments here, we are to influence or be heard by the combatants engaged on the other side of the Atlantic, is utterly vain. I have travelled twice through almost every free State in America. I know most of the principals engaged in this dreadful contest on both sides. I have kept myself pretty well informed of all that is going on in that country; and yet, though I think I ought to be as well informed on this subject as most of my countrymen,—Cabinet ministers included,—yet, if you were to ask me how this contest is to end, I confess I should find myself totally at a loss to offer an opinion worth the slightest attention on the part of my hearers. But this I will say: If I were put to the torture, and compelled to offer a guess, I should not make the guess which Mr. Gladstone and Earl Russell have made on this subject. I don't believe that if the war in America is to be brought to a termination, it will be brought to an end by the separation of the North and South. There are great motives at work amongst the large majority of the people in America, which seem to me to drive them to this dreadful contest rather than see their country broken in two. Now, I don't speak of it as having a great interest in it myself. I speak as to a fact. It may seem Utopian; but I don't feel sympathy for a great nation, or for those who desire the greatness of a people by the vast extension of empire. What I like to see is the growth, development, and elevation of the individual man. But we have had great empires at all times—Syria, Persia, and the rest. What trace have they left of the individual man? Nebuchadnezzar, and the countless millions under his sway,—there is no more trace of them than of herds of buffaloes, or flocks of sheep. But look at your little States; look at Greece, with its small territories, some not larger than an English county! Italy, over some of those States a man on horseback could ride in a day,—they have left traces of individual man, where civilization has flourished, and humanity has been elevated. It may appear Utopian, but we can never expect the individual elevated until a practical and better code of moral law prevails among nations, and until the small States obtain justice at the hands of the great.

JOHN DUKE COLERIDGE

(1820-1894).

JOHN DUKE COLERIDGE, Baron Coleridge, and Lord Chief-Justice of England, was born December 3rd, 1820. His father, Sir John Taylor Coleridge, a nephew of the poet, was a justice of the King's Bench and the editor of Blackstone's "Commentaries." The son, John Duke Coleridge, soon rose to eminence at the bar. After becoming Queen's Counsel he was appointed Chief-Justice of the Court of Common Pleas in 1873, and in 1880 Lord Chief-Justice of England. In 1865 he appeared as counsel for the defendant in what was, at the time, a celebrated breach-of-promise case, tried before Lord Chief-Justice Cockburn in the Court of Queen's Bench, at Westminster. The position in which he was placed was difficult, not to say impossible, as after making an attack on the character of the lady plaintiff, the defendant had found himself unable to maintain it, and had been obliged to recede from it. It was in this connection that the future Lord Chief-Justice made the eloquent address on the Sacredness of Matrimony—which, however, did not prevent the jury from giving the injured lady, whom he condemned for taking advantage of the weakness of his client, a verdict of two thousand pounds. It is possible that even Curran, whose eloquence in similar cases was frequently at its best, might have fared no better had he been rash enough to appeal to a British jury against a woman in the case. Lord Chief-Justice Coleridge died June 14th, 1894.

IS MARRIAGE A SACRAMENT?

(Delivered in the Court of Queen's Bench, Westminster, 1865).

MAY it please your Lordship and Gentlemen of the Jury, the advocate of the defendant, in which character I appear before you to-day, has no doubt cast upon him a hard task. He has to defend a gentleman from the result of a breach of a contract which he, no doubt, deliberately entered into, and he has to do that after a very strong attack made upon his client by one of the ablest counsel in Westminster Hall. I am only giving you credit for the ordinary feelings of our common humanity, in supposing that you will not consider that a trivial or commonplace consideration would justify the defendant as a man of sense and a man of honour in not fulfilling his hasty and unnatural promise. These thoughts, no doubt, have already suggested themselves to your mind, if they have not been driven away by the somewhat vigorous vituperations to which my friend has subjected the defendant; but I cannot help thinking that if you bring to the consideration of this case, as I am sure you will, a calm and impartial understanding, you will see that the damages are of a very trivial character—that they are even nominal in amount, and that a nominal sum, at the most, is all the defendant ought to pay for having unquestionably broken a promise which he unquestionably made. The facts of this case are singularly few, undisputed, and simple, and I will try to make my comments on them correspondingly brief. It is idle to put before you considerations in the soundness of which I do not believe, and the fallacy of which your understandings would immediately detect. I am not going to say for one moment that there has not been a most deliberate promise of marriage made by the defendant. I am not here to contend before you that the promise so deliberately made has not, with a full view of all the circumstances attendant on it, been resolutely and deliberately broken; and therefore the question is, What damages, if any, has the defendant to pay for having brought himself within the perils of the law? Gentlemen, the questions really to consider in this case are: What is the contract made? Who were the parties to the contract? How came it to be made? and, under what circumstances was it departed from? Those are the simple and plain issues in the case. First of all, to begin with, What was the contract? The contract, as you will hear by and by, was a contract to assume the most solemn, the most touching, the most intimate relations in which one human being can possibly stand to another, so that they are "no more twain, but one flesh." Respect, esteem, and love on both sides, are its true foundation. And, gentlemen, you will give me leave to say that those disgrace themselves and profane the sacred ordinance of marriage who enter upon it from bad motives or in an unworthy temper; and you will give me leave to say further, that those who seek to do so are not to be heard when they come into a court to claim damages which, from their own conduct, they are not entitled to. *Ex turpi causa non oritur actio*, or to use the beautiful paraphrase of Lord Mansfield, "Justice must be drawn from pure fountains." Who are the parties to the contract? One of them is a Colonel, not old in years, if you count by the calendar, but aged and enfeebled by a wasting disease,—crippled from the middle downwards, one leg entirely and the other partially, so that he is like the king in the 'Arabian Nights,' "half flesh and half marble"—heavily embarrassed in circumstances, but able to settle five hundred pounds a year on his wife. If I am not entitled to say he was intemperate in habits, he had habits which one of the witnesses said "he had not been weaned from," and which it was desirable he should be weaned from. Weakened and afflicted by the cruel and repeated assaults of his disorder, he was a person who could have had, in the eyes of a lady like the plaintiff, one recommendation and one only, namely, the fact that he could charge his estates in her favour.

Gentlemen, who is the other party to the contract? A woman in mature life also; only recently brought into the close and intimate relation in which you have heard she stood to the defendant. She was fully aware of his infirmities, and was trading in them, taking advantage of his weakness and of his temporary removal from all those friends who had surrounded him,—except the friends of her own immediate connection,—that she might drive with him her hard and disgusting bargain, and failing which she seeks to carry away the *spolia opima* of the diamond ring and the £5,000 damages. Not for her the pure sacred abandonment of self, which is the young virginity of affection. Not for her those loving and bright inspirations which lift us up above ourselves; which for a time hallow the worst of us, and elevate the most degraded. Nor for her those visions of a happy home, enlivened with bright children, circled in with its own sacred fence of love and joy, which is alike the brightest prospect of the bride and the dearest consolation of the widow. She was prepared to go to God's altar with totally different feelings—to assume the defendant's name and position to the injury of his family. For this purpose she was willing to subject herself to his caresses, and to undergo his paralytic embraces, setting herself up for sale in market overt like any other piece of merchandise; and for all these degrading compliances, money, and money only, was the miserable compensation. Gentlemen, in other countries, where men are despots because women are slaves, women are treated as brute beasts, sold in the market like any other animal or chattel; and in such countries little is thought of the degradation, because it is the common lot. But in free and happy England where a woman can marry for affection when she will,—marry on equal terms, marry with Christian dignity,—such a marriage contract as is sought to be here enforced is an indecency, an outrage, and a crime; and I trust you will not forget, when you look at the circumstances of this case, what was the contract the plaintiff strove to enter into with her intended husband. The defendant is a gentleman living in Wales, having a large place called Nant Eos, and also estates in other parts of the country. He had two other shooting boxes, which I suppose he reserved for his friends, as I presume he cannot himself shoot much out of his chair, in which it seems he is wheeled about. The defendant, early in this year, had a number of friends staying with him, among others the family of the plaintiff. A joke passed about leap year, the woman asking the man to marry her; and she appears to have asked him. I suppose the defendant's position may have been one that some women would desire to share, for it appears three women asked him, and amongst them was the plaintiff; and it appears that what passed at the time as a joke was considered as a serious matter in the mind of the defendant. . .

At the same time, recollect who the defendant is, what the state of his mind and body has been proved to be. He is a man who has had nine or ten paralytic attacks, in London, since the last time he contested the county, which was in 1859; and that was known to Doctor King. Now, suppose for a moment he, having determined to break off this engagement, stated to a person perfectly unconnected with him, and perfectly trustworthy, the facts which he afterwards imported into the plea, and which he repeats. If it is a thing that can be proved, the way most people do is to state things when others have got to prove them, —they state them with a degree of confidence which, if they had to prove them themselves, and were responsible, they would not think of doing. Supposing a charge was made in the most perfect good faith, and the very nature of the charge would satisfy you that it was believed at the time, and under those circumstances the charge was first made, and afterwards persevered in, when it really comes to be looked into, it turns out there is not a pretence for it, and that it never should have been suggested; what can a gentleman do more than what he has done—to write to the other attorney; take out a summons, to strike off the plea, and pay the expenses attending it, and to desire me to express his regret that it ever was pleaded? Gentlemen, although I am the defendant's advocate, I can see two sides to this question. As far as the plaintiff is concerned, she was not injured by it, if she is the person I believe her to be, and which I now state on the part of the defendant he believed her to be; stating such a charge as that and persevering in it might, no doubt, wound and distress some women, but, gentlemen, do forgive me for observing, we are not trying that. The question here to-day is whether the defendant broke his word, and if he broke it, what ought he to pay for having broken it. If he pleaded a plea for which there was no foundation, and put the plaintiff for some weeks to anxiety and inconvenience, still that is a matter now removed from your consideration. We have done all we can possibly do, we have withdrawn the plea, apologized for the plea, and have said there was no foundation for the plea, and that we were extremely sorry that ever the plea had found its way into the record. What further can a man do beyond saying he has made a mistake? As far as human language can go to rectify it, I express to you the most sincere regret that the mistake should have occurred. Any man may be subject to false information, and may make statements which he meant to prove. If he find he cannot prove them he ought to say so, and apologize, and make every reparation to the person whom he has unwittingly injured. Do not, when you come by and by to see what is the real issue in the case, and the real loss which the plaintiff has sustained, punish the defendant for a mistake which arose before the cause of action in this case of which she now complains, and for which the defendant has abundantly apologized. That seems to me nearly to exhaust the whole of the observations I have to make. You have got the case before you, and you have seen what the contract really was, the circumstances under which it was made, and how it was broken off. The question is, What are the real damages that the plaintiff has sustained in this case? Has she lost a marriage? It certainly can scarcely be called a marriage, to marry a man who could but be a husband in one sense. My friend does not suggest that there was anything like a shock or distress to her feelings on that account. He does not pretend that there was anything like affection, esteem, or love to the defendant, or that the plaintiff's heart was wounded, in respect of which she is entitled to compensation. It is said that this is a monetary action for a money loss, as she might have had a settlement upon her; for monetary loss she is entitled to ask the jury for compensation. Putting aside the accusation which has been atoned for, it is quite true this is a monetary action, but an action in which, most justly and rightly, the character of the parties is always taken into account; and there is no general rule by which damages in a matter of this kind can be estimated. There was a case before my lord the other day when we were refreshed by hearing some of the tones of that great eloquence which used to ring high and clear not so very long ago from these same benches. In that case a girl had given herself up for life to be the affianced wife of a gentleman who had thrown her aside and discarded her, without reason and without redress. There the jury meted out damages with no niggard hand. But this is not that case: the plaintiff in this case is not that sort of plaintiff; you cannot give her special damages in this case, without, to some extent, approving of the conduct she pursued, and encouraging women in a like situation to follow in her steps; and, apart from idle declamation, and according to plain common sense, if you agree with me in the view of her conduct which I have endeavoured to put before you, it will follow that you will agree with me when I say that she has forgotten the dignity of her sex, and by her conduct lowered our ideas of that which we most esteem, reverence, and admire in the character of woman. I sincerely trust that you twelve English gentlemen will pause before you do anything that will give the faintest shadow of countenance to conduct such as the plaintiff has pursued; and that, if you think a promise was made, and a promise broken, and that it must be followed by some damages, you will say they ought to be most trivial if not nominal in amount.

VICTOR COUSIN

(1792-1867).

VICTOR COUSIN, celebrated both as a statesman and a philosopher, ranks with Guizot among the most eminent of the great platform orators of the nineteenth century. It is as a lecturer rather than as a political speaker that he is celebrated, and among his addresses delivered from the lecture platform are to be found most admirable examples of that class of oratory which has characterized the intellectual movement of the nineteenth century, as in another way it did that of the golden age of intellect at Athens and at Rome. The orations of Cicero and of Demosthenes were prepared in advance of delivery with the same care shown in the preparation of such addresses as those of Cousin and Guizot in France, Schlegel in Germany, Ruskin in England, Emerson in America, and the other great orators of the lecture platform who have forced issues for progress in every line during the nineteenth century, in advance of the great orators of the Forum and the Senate. Cousin's style is most attractive. While the tendencies of his mind are metaphysical and his reasoning abstract, he has what among philosophical thinkers is the rare faculty of clothing abstract thought in beauty of expression. His argument on some points of psychology frequently blossoms out into eloquent metaphors, which are never forced and never florid. His statement is always sustained and he is always master of his subject, of himself, and of the language in which he undertakes to give himself and his subject expression. He was born at Paris, November 28th, 1792; and at a time when the "fierce democracy" of France was attempting to stamp out every vestige of the Middle Ages, he won his first honours by a Latin oration, for which he was crowned in the Mediæval Hall of the Sorbonne, "in the presence of the general concourse of his school competitors." In 1815 he began at the Sorbonne those lectures for which he is so justly celebrated, but in 1820 he was proscribed by the Reactionist party under Louis XVIII, as was also Guizot. Leaving France for Germany, he was arrested and imprisoned at Berlin as a result of the same influence which had driven him from France. Released, and in 1828 restored to his position as teacher, he became a member of the Council of Public Instruction in 1830, peer of France in 1832, and Minister of Public Instruction in

1840, under Thiers. It is said that during the three years of his lectures after his return in 1828, "the Hall of the Sorbonne was crowded with auditors as the hall of no philosophical teacher in Paris had been since the days of Abélard." He died at Cannes, January 13th, 1867.

LIBERTY AN INALIENABLE RIGHT

PASSIONS abandoning themselves to their caprices are anarchy. Passions concentrated upon a dominant passion are tyranny. Liberty consists in the struggle of will against this tyranny and this anarchy. But this combat must have an aim, and this aim is the duty of obeying reason, which is our true sovereign, and justice, which reason reveals to us and prescribes for us. The duty of obeying reason is the law of will, and will is never more itself that when it submits to its law. We do not possess ourselves as long as to the domination of desire, of passion, of interest, reason does not oppose the counterpoise of justice. Reason and justice free us from the yoke of passions, without imposing upon us another yoke. For, once more, to obey them is not to abdicate liberty, but to save it, to apply it to its legitimate use.

It is in liberty and in the agreement of liberty with reason and justice that man belongs to himself, to speak properly. He is a person only because he is a free being enlightened by reason.

What distinguishes a person from a simple thing is especially the difference between liberty and its opposite. A thing is that which is not free, consequently that which does not belong to itself, that which has no self, which has only a numerical individuality, a perfect effigy of true individuality, which is that of person.

A thing not belonging to itself belongs to the first person that takes possession of it and puts his mark on it.

A thing is not responsible for the movements which it has not willed, of which it is even ignorant. Person alone is responsible, for it is intelligent and free; and it is responsible for the use of its intelligence and freedom.

A thing has no dignity; dignity is only attached to person.

A thing has no value by itself; it has only that which person confers on it. It is purely an instrument whose whole value consists in the use that the person using it derives from it.

Obligation implies liberty; where liberty is not, duty is wanting, and with duty right is wanting also.

It is because there is in me a being worthy of respect, that I have the duty of respecting it, and the right to make it respected by you.

My duty is the exact measure of my right. The one is in direct ratio with the other. If I had no sacred duty to respect what makes my person, that is to say, my intelligence and my liberty, I should not have the right to defend it against your injuries. But as my person is inviolable and sacred in itself, it follows that, considered in relation to me, it imposes on me a duty, and, considered in relation to you, it confers on me a right.

I am not myself permitted to degrade the person that I am by abandoning myself to passion, to vice, and to crime, and I am not permitted to let it be degraded by you.

The person is inviolable ; and it alone is inviolable.

It is inviolable not only in the intimate sanctuary of consciousness, but in all its legitimate manifestations, in its acts, in the product of its acts, even in the instruments that it makes its own by using them.

Therein is the foundation of the sanctity of property. The first property is the person. All other properties are derived from that. Think of it well. It is not property in itself that has rights, it is the proprietor, it is the person that stamps upon it, with its own character, its right and its title.

The person cannot cease to belong to itself, without degrading itself,—it is to itself inalienable. The person has no right over itself ; it cannot treat itself as a thing, cannot sell itself, cannot destroy itself, cannot in any way abolish its free will and its liberty, which are its constituent elements.

Why has the child already some rights ? Because it will be a free being. Why has the old man, returned to infancy, and the insane man still some rights ? Because they have been free beings. We even respect liberty in its first glimmerings or its last vestiges. Why, on the other hand, have the insane man and the imbecile old man no longer all their rights ? Because they have lost liberty. Why do we enchain the furious madman ? Because he has lost knowledge and liberty. Why is slavery an abominable institution ? Because it is an outrage upon what constitutes humanity. This is the reason why, in fine, certain extreme devotions are sometimes sublime faults, and no one is permitted to offer them, much less to demand them. There is no legitimate devotion against the very essence of right, against liberty, against justice, against the dignity of the human person.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF LAW

THERE is an education of liberty as well as our other faculties. It is sometimes in subduing the body, sometimes in governing our intelligence, especially in resisting our passions, that we learn to be free. We encounter opposition at each step—the only question is not to shun it. In this constant struggle liberty is formed and augmented, until it becomes a habit.

Finally, there is a culture of sensibility itself. Fortunate are those who have received from nature the sacred fire of enthusiasm! They ought religiously to preserve it. But there is no soul that does not conceal some fortunate vein of it. It is necessary to watch it and pursue, to avoid what restrains it, to seek what favours it, and, by an assiduous culture, draw from it, little by little, some treasures. If we cannot give ourselves sensibility, we can at least develop what we have. We can do this by giving ourselves up to it, by seizing all the occasions of giving ourselves up to it, by calling to its aid intelligence itself; for the more we know of the beautiful and the good, the more we love it. Sentiment thereby only borrows from intelligence what it returns with usury. Intelligence in its turn finds, in the heart, a rampart against sophism. Noble sentiments, nourished and developed, preserve from those sad systems that please certain spirits so much only because their hearts are so small.

Man would still have duties, should he cease to be in relation with other men. As long as he preserves any intelligence and any liberty, the idea of the good dwells in him, and with it duty. Were we cast upon a desert island, duty would follow us thither. It would be beyond belief strange that it should be in the power of certain external circumstances to affranchise an intelligent and free being from all obligation towards his liberty and his intelligence. In the deepest solitude he is always and consciously under the empire of a law attached to the person itself, which, by obligating him to keep continual watch over himself, makes at once his torment and his grandeur.

If the moral person is sacred to me, it is not because it is in me—it is because it is the moral person. It is in itself respectable; it will be so, then, wherever we meet it.

It is in you as in me, and for the same reason. In relation to me it imposes on me a duty; in you it becomes the foundation of a right, and thereby imposes on me a new duty in relation to you.

I owe to you truth as I owe it to myself; for truth is the law of your reason as of mine. Without doubt there ought to be measure in the communication of truth,—all are not capable of it at the same moment and in the same degree. It is necessary to portion it out to them in order that they may be able to receive it; but, in fine, the truth is the proper good of the intelligence; and it is for me a strict duty to respect the development of your mind, not to arrest, and even to favour its progress towards truth.

I ought also to respect your liberty. I have not even always the right to hinder you from committing a fault. Liberty is so sacred that, even when it goes astray, it still deserves, up to a certain point, to be managed. We are often wrong in wishing to prevent too much the evil that God himself permits. Souls may be corrupted by an attempt to purify them.

I ought to respect you in your affections, which make part of yourself; and of all the affections there are none more holy than those of the family. There is in us a need of expanding ourselves beyond ourselves, yet without dispelling ourselves, of establishing ourselves in some souls by a regular and consecrated affection,—to this need the family responds. The love of men is something of the general good. The family is still almost the individual, and not merely the individual,—it only requires us to love as much as ourselves what is almost ourselves. It attaches one to the other, by the sweetest and strongest of all ties—father, mother, child; it gives to this sure succour in the love of its parents—to these hope, joy, new life, in their child. To violate the conjugal or paternal right is to violate the person in what is perhaps its most sacred possession.

I ought to respect your body, inasmuch as it belongs to you, inasmuch as it is the necessary instrument of your person. I have neither the right to kill you, nor to wound you, unless I am attacked and threatened; then my violated liberty is armed with a new right, the right of defence and even constraint.

I owe respect to your goods, for they are the product of your labour; I owe respect to your labour, which is your liberty itself in exercise; and, if your goods come from an inheritance, I still owe respect to the free will that has transmitted them to you.

Respect for the rights of others is called justice; every violation of a right is an injustice.

Every injustice is an encroachment upon our person,—to retrench the least of our rights is to diminish our moral person, is, at least, so far as that retrenchment goes, to abase us to the condition of a thing.

The greatest of all injustices, because it comprises all others, is slavery. Slavery is the subjecting of all the faculties of one man to the profit of another man. The slave develops his intelligence a little only in the interest of another,—it is not for the purpose of enlightening him, but to render him more useful, that some exercise of mind is allowed him. The slave has not the liberty of his movements; he is attached to the soil, is sold with it, or he is chained to the person of a master. The slave should have no affection, he has no family, no wife, no children, —he has a female and little ones. His activity does not belong to him, for the product of his labour is another's. But, that nothing may be wanting to slavery, it is necessary to go further,—in the slave must be destroyed the inborn sentiment of liberty; in him must be extinguished all idea of right; for, as long as this idea subsists, slavery is uncertain, and to an odious power may respond the terrible right of insurrection, that last resort of the oppressed against the abuse of force.

Justice, respect for the person in every thing that constitutes the person, is the first duty of man towards his fellow-man. Is this duty the only one?

When we have respected the person of others, when we have neither restrained their liberty, nor smothered their intelligence, nor maltreated their body, nor outraged their family, nor injured their goods, are we able to say that we have fulfilled the whole law in regard to them? One who is unfortunate is suffering before us. Is our conscience satisfied, if we are able to bear witness to ourselves that we have not contributed to his sufferings? No; something tells us that it is still good to give him bread, succour, consolation.

There is here an important distinction to be made. If you have remained hard and insensible at the sight of another's misery, conscience cries out against you; and yet this man who is suffering, who perhaps, is ready to die, has not the least right over the least part of your fortune, were it immense; and, if he used violence for the purpose of wresting from you a single penny, he would commit a crime. We here meet a new order of duties that do not correspond to rights. Man may resort to force in order to make his rights respected; he cannot impose on another any sacrifice whatever. Justice respects or restores; charity gives, and gives freely.

Charity takes from us something in order to give it to our fellow-men. If it go so far as to inspire us to renounce our dearest interests, it is called devotedness.

It certainly cannot be said that to be charitable is not obligatory. But this obligation must not be regarded as precise, as inflexible as the obligation to be just. Charity is a sacrifice; and who can find the rule of sacrifice, the formula of self-renunciation? For justice, the formula is clear,—to respect the rights of another. But charity knows neither rule nor limit. It transcends all obligation. Its beauty is precisely in its liberty.

SIR JOHN CULPEPER

(? -1660).

AMONG the remarkable speeches reported by John Nalson in his 'Impartial Collection of Great Affairs of State' (London 1682) perhaps the most remarkable is that in which Sir John Culpeper (afterwards Lord Colepeper) denounced monopolies. Sir John Culpeper was elected to represent Kent in the Parliament of 1640, at a time when English eloquence was just beginning to develop its full powers under the stimulus of passion provoked by Charles the First's abuse of what he claimed as his divine right. In a speech delivered on the same day on which Culpeper spoke, Lord Digby defined the chief of these abuses as follows:—

1. The great and intolerable burthen of ship-money, touching the legality whereof they are unsatisfied.
2. The many great abuses in pressing the soldiers, and raising moneys concerning the same.
3. The multitude of monopolies.
4. The new canon, and the oath to be taken by lawyers, divines, etc.
5. The oath required to be taken by church officers according to articles new and unusual.

Culpeper's celebrated characterization of the monopolies under Charles I. has not had general currency as a quotation in later discussions of the same subject, but it is doubtful if it has been equalled, or even closely approached by the greater orators who have spoken since under the inspiration of the same ideas.

The fact that the "Sir John Culpeper" familiar to readers of Nalson appears in later history as "Colepeper" is significant. Elected to the Long Parliament in 1640, his speech against monopolies was probably the strongest of its kind delivered during the session. It marked Culpeper as a man capable of popular leadership, with force of character enough to direct the revolution. He figures in later history, however, on the side of the King. Leaving the opposition to monopoly to take care of itself, he became a member of the Privy Council and Chancellor of the Exchequer. The King made him "Lord Colepeper of Thoresway."

After many vicissitudes in following Charles I. to his downfall, he went into exile and on the death of Cromwell was materially instrumental in winning over Monk and bringing about the restoration. He died June 11th, 1660.

AGAINST MONOPOLIES

(Delivered in the Parliament, November 9th, 1640).

I STAND not up with a petition in my hand, I have it in my mouth, and have it in charge from them that sent me hither, humbly to present to the consideration of this House the grievances of the county of Kent; I shall only sum them up. They are these:—

First, the great increase of Papists by the remiss execution of those laws which were made to suppress them; the life of the law is execution; without this they become but a dead letter; this is wanting and a great grievance.

The second is the obtruding and countenancing of divers new ceremonies in matters of religion, as placing the Communion table Altar wise, and bowing and cringing towards it, and refusing the Holy Sacrament to such as refuse to come up to the rails,—these carry with them some scandal and much offence.

The third is military charges, and therein first coat and conduct money, required as a loan, or pressed as a due, and in each respect equally a grievance. The second is the enhancing the price of powder, whereby the trained bands are much discouraged in their exercising; however this may appear *prima facie,* upon due examination it will appear a great grievance. The third is more particular to our county; it is this: the last summer was twelve-month, ten thousand of our best arms were taken from the owners, and sent into Scotland; the compulsory way was this: "If you will not send your arms you shall go yourselves." Mr. Speaker, the train band is a militia of great strength and honour, without charges to the King, and deserves all due encouragement.

The fourth is the canons, I assign these to be a grievance; first, in respect of the matter, besides the oath. Secondly, in respect of the makers: they were chosen to serve in a convocation; that falling with the Parliament, the scene was altered; and the same men without any new election were shuffled into a sacred synod. Thirdly, in respect of the consequence, which in this age, when the second ill precedent becomes a law, is full of danger. The clergy, without confirmation of a Parliament, have assumed unto themselves power to make laws to grant relief by the name of benevolence, and to intermeddle with our freehold by suspensions and deprivation. This is a grievance of a high nature.

The next grievance is the ship-money; this cries aloud. I may say, I hope without offence, this strikes the firstborn of every family; I mean our inheritance; if the laws give the King power, in any danger of the kingdom, whereof he is judge, to impose what and when he please, we owe all that is left to the goodness of the King, not to the law, Mr. Speaker. This makes the farmers faint, and the plough go heavy.

The next is the great decay of clothing and fall of our wools; these are the golden mines of England which give a foundation to that trade which we drive with all the world. I know there are many stars concur in this constellation, I will not trouble you with more than one cause of it, which I dare affirm to be the greatest. It is the great custom and impositions laid upon our cloth and new draperies; I speak not this with a wish to lessen the King's revenues, so it be done by Parliament; I shall give my voice to lay more charge upon the superfluities, due regard being had to trade, which we import from all other nations; sure I am that all those impositions upon our native commodities are dangerous and give liberty to our neighbours to undersell; and I take it for a rule that besides our loss in trade, which is five times as much as the King receiveth, which is imposed upon our cloths, this is taken from the rent of our lands. I have but one grievance more to offer you; but this one compriseth many; it is a nest of wasps, or swarm of vermin, which have overcrept the land,—I mean the monopolies and polers of the people; these, like the frogs of Egypt, have gotten possession of our dwellings, and we have a room scarce free from them; they sup in our cup, they dip in our dish, they sit by our fire, we find them in the dye-vat, washbowl, and powdering tub. They share with the butler in his box; they have marked and sealed us from head to foot. Mr. Speaker, they will not bate us a pin; we may not buy our own clothes without their brokage; these are the leeches that have sucked the Commonwealth so hard that it is almost become hectical; and, Mr. Speaker, some of these are ashamed of their right names; they have a vizard to hide the brand made by that good law in the last Parliament of King James; they shelter themselves under the name of a Corporation; they make by-laws which serve their turns to squeeze us and fill their purses. Unface these and they will prove as bad cards as any in the pack; these are not petty chapmen, but wholesale men. Mr. Speaker, I have echoed to you the cries of the Kingdom, I will tell you their hopes: they look to heaven for a blessing upon this Parliament, they hang upon his Majesty's exemplary piety and great justice, which renders his ears open to the just complaints of his subjects; we have had lately a gracious assurance of it; it is the wise conduct of this, whereby the other great affairs of the kingdom and this our grievance of no less importance may go hand in hand in preparation and resolution; then, by the blessing of God, we shall return home with an olive branch in our mouths, and a full confirmation of the privileges which we received from our ancestors and owe to our posterity, and which every free-born Englishman hath received with the air he breathed in.

JOHN PHILPOT CURRAN

(1750-1817).

CURRAN was born at Newmarket, County Cork, July 24th, 1750, and educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and the Middle Temple, London. He was admitted to the Irish bar in 1775, and although after his election to the Irish Parliament in 1783 he made many speeches supporting the patriotic party of which Grattan was the leader, it is only as a lawyer defending his countrymen against charges of libel, sedition, and treason preferred against them because of their determination to establish Irish nationality, that he is at his best. He defended the leaders of the Insurrection of 1798, and although he managed to remain sufficiently loyal to the English administration to be appointed Master of the Rolls under Fox in 1806, a position from which, at the expiration of eight years, he retired with a pension of £3,000, his sympathy with Irish struggles for national individuality was so intense that the Union caused him the bitterest disappointment and made him contemplate voluntary exile from his country. A romantic incident of his biography was the attachment between his daughter and the celebrated Robert Emmet, at whose arrest Curran himself was examined before the privy council, which discharged him, as it appears, on his own evidence. After his retirement as Master of the Rolls he spent several years in London in the society of such men as Sheridan, Erskine, Thomas Moore, and William Godwin. He died at Brompton, near London, October 14th, 1817. It was during his residence in London that Byron, speaking of Curran as "Longbow," made this famous comparison between him and "Strongbow," by whom Erskine is meant :—

"There also were two wits, by acclamation,
  Longbow from Ireland, Strongbow from the Tweed,
Both lawyers, and both men of education ;
  Longbow was rich in an imagination,
But Strongbow's wit was of more polished breed.
  As beautiful and bounding as a steed,
But sometimes stumbling over a potato,
While Strongbow's best things might have come from Cato.

' Strongbow was like a new tuned harpsichord,
  But Longbow wild as an Æolian harp,
With which the winds of heaven can claim accord,
  And make a music either flat or sharp.
Of Strongbow's talk you would not change a word;
  At Longbow's phrases you would sometimes carp;
Both wits—one born so, and the other bred—
This by the heart, his rival by the head."

FOR FREE SPEECH

(Speech at the Trial of Finnerty for Libel, December 22nd, 1797).

I TELL you, therefore, gentlemen of the jury, it is not with respect to Mr. Orr, or Mr. Finnerty, that your verdict is now sought.

You are called upon, on your oaths, to say that the government is wise and merciful—the people prosperous and happy; that military law ought to be continued; that the constitution could not with safety be restored to Ireland; and that the statements of a contrary import by your advocates, in either country, are libellous and false.

I tell you these are the questions; and I ask you, if you can have the front to give the expected answer in the face of a community who know the country as well as you do. Let me ask you how you could reconcile with such a verdict, the gaols, the tenders, the gibbets, the conflagrations, the murders, the proclamations that we hear of every day in the streets, and see every day in the country. What are the prosecutions of the learned counsel himself, circuit after circuit? Merciful God! what is the estate of Ireland, and where shall you find the wretched inhabitant of this land? You may find him, perhaps, in a gaol, the only place of security—I had almost said of ordinary habitation! If you do not find him there, you may see him flying with his family from the flames of his own dwelling—lighted to his dungeon by the conflagration of his hovel; or you may find his bones bleaching on the green fields of his country; or you may find him tossing on the surface of the ocean, and mingling his groans with those tempests, less savage than his persecutors, that drift him to a returnless distance from his family and his home, without charge, or trial, or sentence. Is this a foul misrepresentation? Or can you, with these facts ringing in your ears, and staring in your face, say, upon your oaths, they do not exist?

You are called upon, in defiance of shame, of truth, or honour, to deny the sufferings under which you groan, and to flatter the persecution that tramples you under foot.

Gentlemen, I am not accustomed to speak of circumstances of this kind; and though familiarized as I have been to them, when I come to speak of them, my power fails me—my voice dies within me. I am not able to call upon you. It is now I ought to have strength; it is now I ought to have energy and voice. But I have none; I am like the unfortunate state of the country,—perhaps like you. This is the time in which I ought to speak, if I can, or be dumb forever; in which, if you do not speak as you ought, you ought to be dumb forever.

But the learned gentleman is further pleased to say that the traverse has charged the Government with the encouragement of informers. This, gentlemen, is another small fact that you are to deny at the hazard of your souls and upon the solemnity of your oaths. You are upon your oaths to say to the sister country that the government of Ireland uses no such abominable instruments of destruction as informers. Let me ask you honestly, What do you feel when, in my hearing, when, in the face of this audience, you are called upon to give a verdict that every man of us, and every man of you, know, by the testimony of your own eyes, to be utterly and absolutely false? I speak not now of the public proclamation for informers, with a promise of secrecy and of extravagant reward; I speak not of the fate of those horrid wretches who have been so often transferred from the table to the dock, and from the dock to the pillory; I speak of what your own eyes have seen, day after day, during the course of this commission, from the box where you are now sitting; the number of horrid miscreants who acknowledged upon their oaths that they had come from the seat of government—from the very chambers of the Castle—where they had been worked upon by the fear of death and the hope of compensation, to give evidence against their fellows; that the mild, the wholesome, and merciful councils of this government are holden over these catacombs of living death, where the wretch that is buried a man lies till his heart has time to fester and dissolve, and is then dug up a witness!

Is this a picture created by a hag-ridden fancy, or is it a fact? Have you not seen him, after his resurrection from that region of death and corruption, make his appearance upon the table, the living image of life in death, and the supreme arbiter of both? Have you not marked when he entered how the stormy wave of the multitude retired at his approach? Have you not seen how the human heart bowed to the supremacy of his power, in the undissembled homage of deferential horror? how his glance, like the lightning of heaven, seemed to rive the body of the accused and mark it for the grave, while his voice warned the devoted wretch of woe and death—a death which no innocence can escape, no art elude, no force resist, no antidote prevent? There was an antidote—a juror's oath!—but even that adamantine chain that bound the integrity of man to the throne of eternal justice is solved and molten in the breath that issues from the informer's mouth; conscience swings from her moorings, and the appalled and affrighted juror consults his own safety in the surrender of the victim.

Informers are worshipped in the temple of justice; even as the devil has been worshipped by Pagans and savages, even so in this wicked country is the informer an object of judicial idolatry; even so is he soothed by the music of human groans; even so is he placated and incensed by the fumes and by the blood of human sacrifices.

AGAINST PENSIONS

(Delivered in the Irish Parliament, March 13th, 1786, in Support of a Bill Limiting Pensions).

I OBJECT to adjourning this bill to the first of August, because I perceive in the present disposition of the House that a proper decision will be made upon it this night. We have set out upon our inquiry in a manner so honourable, and so consistent, that we have reason to expect the happiest success, which I would not wish to see baffled by delay.

We began with giving the full affirmative of this House, that no grievance exists at all; we considered a simple matter of fact, and adjourned our opinion; or rather, we gave sentence on the conclusion, after having adjourned the premises. But I do begin to see a great deal of argument in what the learned baronet has said, and I beg gentlemen will acquit me of apostasy, if I offer some reasons why the bill should not be admitted to a second reading.

I am surprised that gentlemen have taken up such a foolish opinion as that our Constitution is maintained by its different component parts, mutually checking and controlling each other; they seem to think, with Hobbes, that a state of nature is a state of warfare, and that, like Mahomet's coffin, the Constitution is suspended between the attraction of different powers. My friends seem to think that the Crown should be restrained from doing wrong by a physical necessity, forgetting that if you take away from man all power to do wrong, you, at the same time, take away from him all merit of doing right; and, by making it impossible for men to run into slavery, you enslave them most effectually. But if, instead of the three different parts of our Constitution drawing forcibly in right lines, in different directions, they were to unite their power, and draw all one way, in one right line, how great would be the effect of their force, how happy the direction of this union! The present system is not only contrary to mathematical rectitude, but to public harmony; but if, instead of Privilege setting up his back to oppose Prerogative, he were to saddle his back and invite Prerogative to ride, how comfortably they might both jog along! and therefore it delights me to hear the advocates for the royal bounty flowing freely and spontaneously and abundantly as Holywell in Wales. If the Crown grant double the amount of the revenue in pensions, they approve of their royal master, for he is the breath of their nostrils.

But we shall find that this complaisance, this gentleness between the Crown and its true servants, is not confined at home; it extends its influence to foreign powers. Our merchants have been insulted in Portugal, our commerce interdicted; what did the British lion do? Did he whet his tusks? Did he bristle up, and shake his mane? Did he roar? No; no such thing; the gentle creature wagged his tail for six years at the court of Lisbon; and now we hear from the Delphic Oracle on the treasury bench, that he is wagging his tail in London to Chevalier Pinto, who, he hopes soon to be able to tell us, will allow his lady to entertain him as a lapdog; and when she does, no doubt the British factory will furnish some of their softest woollens to make a cushion for him to lie upon. But though the gentle beast has continued so long fawning and couching, I believe his vengeance will be great as it is slow, and that posterity, whose ancestors are yet unborn, will be surprised at the vengeance he will take!

This polyglot of wealth, this museum of curiosities, the pension list, embraces every link in the human chain, every description of men, women, and children, from the exalted excellence of a Hawke or a Rodney, to the debased situation of the lady who humbleth herself that she may be exalted. But the lessons it inculcates form its greatest perfection; it teaches that sloth and vice may eat that bread which virtue and honesty may starve for after they have earned it. It teaches the idle and dissolute to look up for that support which they are too proud to stoop and earn. It directs the minds of men to an entire reliance on the ruling power of the State, who feed the ravens of the royal aviary that continually cry for food. It teaches them to imitate those saints on the pension list that are like the lilies of the field,—they toil not, neither do they spin, and yet are arrayed like Solomon in his glory. In fine, it teaches a lesson which, indeed, they might have learned from Epictetus, that it is sometimes good not to be over-virtuous; it shows that in proportion as our distresses increase the munificence of the Crown increases also; in proportion as our clothes are rent, the royal mantle is extended over us.

Notwithstanding that the pension list, like charity, covers a multitude of sins, give me leave to consider it as coming home to the Members of this House,—give me leave to say that the Crown in extending its charity, its liberality, its profusion, is laying a foundation for the independence of Parliament; for hereafter, instead of orators or patriots accounting for their conduct to such mean and unworthy persons as freeholders, they will learn to despise them, and look to the first man in the State; and they will, by so doing, have this security for their independence, that while any man in the kingdom has a shilling, they will not want one.

Suppose at any future period of time the boroughs of Ireland should decline from their present flourishing and prosperous state—suppose they should fall into the hands of men who would wish to drive a profitable commerce, by having Members of Parliament to hire or let; in such a case a secretary would find great difficulty, if the proprietors of Members should enter into a combination to form a monopoly; to prevent which, in time, the wisest way is to purchase up the raw material, young Members of Parliament, just rough from the grass; and when they are a little bitted, and he has got a pretty stud, perhaps of seventy, he may laugh at the slave merchant; some of them he may teach to sound through the nose, like a barrel organ; some, in the course of a few months, might be taught to cry, "Hear! hear!" some, "Chair! chair!" upon occasion, —though those latter might create a little confusion, if they were to forget whether they were calling inside or outside of those doors. Again he might have some so trained that he need only pull a string, and up gets a repeating Member; and if they were so dull that they could neither speak nor make orations (for they are different things), he might have taught them to dance, *pedibus ire in sententiam.* This improvement might be extended; he might have them dressed in coats and shirts all of one colour; and, of a Sunday, he might march them to church two by two, to the great edification of the people and the honour of the Christian religion; afterwards, like ancient Spartans, or the fraternity of Kilmainham, they might dine altogether in a large hall. Good heaven! what a sight to see them feeding in public, upon public viands, and talking of public subjects, for the benefit of the public! It is a pity they are not immortal; but I hope they will flourish as a corporation, and that pensioners will beget pensioners, to the end of the chapter.

ENGLAND AND ENGLISH LIBERTIES

(Speech on behalf of Archibald Hamilton Rowan, Esq., for a Libel in the Court of King's Bench, Ireland, on January 29th, 1794).

I KNOW no case in which a jury ought to be more severe than where personal calumny is conveyed through a vehicle, which ought to be consecrated to public information; neither, on the other hand, can I conceive any case in which the firmness and the caution of a jury should be more exerted than when a subject is prosecuted for a libel on the State. The peculiarity of the British Constitution (to which in its fullest extent we have an undoubted right, however distant we may be from the actual enjoyment), and in which it surpasses every known government in Europe, is this: that its only professed object is the general good, and its only foundation the general will; hence the people have a right acknowledged from time immemorial, fortified by a pile of statutes, and authenticated by a revolution that speaks louder than them all, to see whether abuses have been committed, and whether their properties and their liberties have been attended to as they ought to be.

This is a kind of subject on which I feel myself overawed when I approach; there are certain fundamental principles which nothing but necessity should expose to public examination; they are pillars, the depth of whose foundation you cannot explore without endangering their strength; but let it be recollected that the discussion of such topics should not be condemned in me, nor visited upon my client: the blame, if any there be, should rest only with those who have forced them into discussion. I say, therefore, it is the right of the people to keep an eternal watch upon the conduct of their rulers; and in order to do that, the freedom of the press has been cherished by the law of England. In private defamation let it never be tolerated; in wicked and wanton aspersion upon a good and honest administration let it never be supported. Not that a good government can be exposed to danger by groundless accusation, but because a bad government is sure to find in the detected falsehood of a licentious press a security and a credit, which it could never otherwise obtain.

I said a good government cannot be endangered; I say so again, for whether it is good or bad it can never depend upon assertion; the question is decided by simple inspection; to try the tree, look at its fruit; to judge of the government, look at the people. What is the fruit of a good government? The virtue and happiness of the people. Do four millions of people in this country gather those fruits from that government, to whose injured purity, to whose spotless virtue and violated honour, this seditious and atrocious libeller is to be immolated upon the altar of the Constitution? To you, gentlemen of the jury, who are bound by the most sacred obligation to your country and your God, to speak nothing but the truth, I put the question, Do the people of this country gather those fruits? Are they orderly, industrious, religious, and contented? Do you find them free from bigotry and ignorance, those inseparable concomitants of systematic oppression? . . .

This paper, gentlemen, insists upon the necessity of emancipating the Catholics of Ireland, and that is charged as a part of the libel. If they had waited another year, if they had kept this prosecution impending for another year, how much would remain for a jury to decide upon, I should be at a loss to discover. It seems as if the progress of public information was eating away the ground of the prosecution. Since the commencement of the prosecution, this part of the libel has unluckily received the sanction of the legislature. In that interval our Catholic brethren have obtained that admission, which it seems it was a libel to propose; in what way to account for this I am really at a loss. Have any alarms been occasioned by the emancipation of our Catholic brethren? Has the bigoted malignity of any individuals been crushed, or has the stability of the government, or that of the country been weakened? Or is one million of subjects stronger than four millions? Do you think that the benefit they received should be poisoned by the sting of vengeance? If you think so, you must say to them, "you have demanded emancipation and you have got it; but we abhor your persons, we are outraged at your success, and we will stigmatize by a criminal prosecution the adviser of that relief which you have obtained from the voice of your country." I ask you, do you think, as honest men, anxious for the public tranquillity, conscious that there are wounds not yet completely cicatrized, that you ought to speak this language at this time, to men who are too much disposed to think that in this very emancipation they have been saved from their own Parliament by the humanity of their sovereign? Or do you wish to prepare them for the revocation of these improvident concessions? Do you think it wise or humane at this moment to insult them, by sticking up in a pillory the man who dared to stand forth as their advocate? I put it to your oaths; do you think that a blessing of that kind, that a victory obtained by justice over bigotry and oppression, should have a stigma cast upon it by an ignominious sentence upon men bold and honest enough to propose that measure? To propose the redeeming of religion from the abuses of the church, the reclaiming of three millions of men from bondage, and giving liberty to all who had a right to demand it; giving, I say, in the so much censured words of this paper, giving "Universal Emancipation!"

I speak in the spirit of the British law, which makes liberty commensurate with and inseparable from British soil; which proclaims even to the stranger and the sojourner, the moment he sets his foot upon British earth, that the ground on which he treads is holy, and consecrated by the genius of universal emancipation. No matter in what language his doom may have been pronounced; no matter what complexion incompatible with freedom an Indian or an African sun may have burnt upon him; no matter in what disastrous battle his liberty may have been cloven down; no matter with what solemnities he may have been devoted upon the altar of slavery,—the first moment he touches the sacred soil of Britain the altar and the god sink together in the dust; his soul walks abroad in her own majesty; his body swells beyond the measure of his chains that burst from around him, and he stands redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled by the irresistible genius of universal emancipation.

Gentlemen, I am not such a fool as to ascribe any effusion of this sort to any merits of mine. It is the mighty theme, and not the inconsiderable advocate, that can excite interest in the hearer. What you hear is but the testimony which nature bears to her own character; it is the effusion of her gratitude to that power which stamped that character upon her.

And, permit me to say, that if my client had occasion to defend his cause by any mad or drunken appeals to extravagance or licentiousness, I trust in God I stand in that situation, that, humble as I am, he would not have resorted to me to be his advocate. I was not recommended to his choice by any connection of principle or party, or even private friendship; and saying this, I cannot but add that I consider not to be acquainted with such a man as Mr. Rowan a want of personal good fortune. But upon this great subject of reform and emancipation there is a latitude and a boldness of remark, justifiable in the people, and necessary to the defence of Mr. Rowan, for which the habits of professional studies and technical adherence to established forms have rendered me unfit. It is, however, my duty, standing here as his advocate, to make some few observations to you, which I conceive to be material.

Gentlemen, you are sitting in a country which has a right to the British Constitution, and which is bound by an indissoluble union with the British nation. If you were now even at liberty to debate upon that subject; if you even were not by the most solemn compacts, founded upon the authority of your ancestors and of yourselves, bound to that alliance, and had an election now to make; in the present unhappy state of Europe, if you had been heretofore a stranger to Great Britain, you would now say we will enter into society and union with you.

But to accomplish that union, let me tell you, you must learn to become like the English people. It is in vain to say you will protect their freedom, if you abandon your own. The pillar whose base has no foundation can give no support to the dome under which its head is placed; and if you profess to give England that assistance which you refuse to yourselves, she will laugh at your folly, and despise your meanness and insincerity. Let us follow this a little further; I know you will interpret what I say with the candour in which it is spoken. England is marked by a natural avarice of freedom, which she is studious to engross and accumulate, but most unwilling to impart; whether from any necessity of her policy, or from her weakness, or from her pride, I will not presume to say; but so is the fact. You need not look to the east, nor to the west, you need only look to yourselves.

In order to confirm this observation I would appeal to what fell from the learned counsel for the Crown, "that notwithstanding the alliance subsisting for two centuries past between the two countries, the date of liberty in one goes no further back than the year 1784."

If it required additional confirmation I should state the case of the invaded American, and the subjugated Indian, to prove that the policy of England has ever been to govern her connections more as colonies than as allies; and it must be owing to the great spirit, indeed, of Ireland if she shall continue free. Rely upon it, she will ever have to hold her course against an adverse current; rely upon it, if the popular spring does not continue strong and elastic, a short interval of debilitated nerve and broken force will send you down the stream again, and reconsign you to the condition of a province.

FAREWELL TO THE IRISH PARLIAMENT

(Speech delivered May 15th, 1797, in Support of the Ponsonby Reform Resolution).

I CONSIDER this as a measure of justice, with respect to the Catholics and the people at large. The Catholics in former times groaned under the malignant folly of penal laws--wandered like herds upon the earth, or gathered under some threadbare grandee who came to Dublin, danced attendance at the Castle, was smiled on by the Secretary, and carried back to his miserable countrymen the gracious promise of favour and protection. They are no longer mean dependants but owners of their country, and claiming simply and boldly, as Irishmen, the national privileges of men and natives of their country. . . .

I now proceed to answer the objections to the measure. I was extremely shocked to see the agent of a foreign cabinet rise up in the assembly that ought to represent the Irish nation and oppose a motion that was made on the acknowledged and deplored corruption which has been imported from his country. Such an opposition is a proof of the charge, which I am astonished he could venture upon at so awful a crisis. I doubt whether the charge, or this proof of it, would appear most odious. However, I will examine the objections. It is said—It is not the time. This argument has become a jest in Ireland, for it has been used in all times ; in war, in peace, in quiet, and in disturbance. It is the miserable, dilatory plea of persevering and stupid corruption, that wishes to postpone its fate by a promise of amendment, which it is resolved never to perform. Reform has become an exception to the proverb that says there is a time for all things ; but for reform there is no time, because at all times corruption is more profitable to its authors than public virtue and propriety, which they know must be fatal to their views. As to the present time, the objections to it are a compound of the most unblushing impudence and folly. Forsooth it would seem as if the house had yielded through fear. Personal bravery or fear are inapplicable to a public assembly. I know no cowardice so despicable as the fear of seeming to be afraid. To be afraid of danger is not an unnatural sensation ; but to be brave in absurdity and injustice, merely from fear of having your sense of honesty imputed to your own apprehension, is a stretch of folly which I have never heard of before. But the time is pregnant with arguments very different, indeed, from those I have heard ; I mean the report of the Secret Committee and the dreadful state of the country.

The allegation is that the people are not to have justice, because a rebellion exists within, and because we have an enemy at our gates—because, forsooth, reform is only a pretext, and separation is the object of the leaders. If a rebellion exist, every good subject ought to be detached from it. But if an enemy threaten to invade us, it is only common sense to detach every subject from the hostile standard and bring him back to his duty and his country.

The present miserable state of Ireland—its distractions, its distresses, its bankruptcy—are the effects of the war, and it is the duty of the authors of that war to reconcile the people by the most timely and liberal justice; the utmost physical strength should be called forth, and that can be done only by union. This is a subject so tremendous I do not wish to dwell on it; I will therefore leave it; I will support a Reform on its own merits, and as a measure of internal peace at this momentous juncture. Its merits are admitted by the objection to the time, because the objection admits that at any other time it would be proper. For twenty years past there was no man of any note in England or Ireland who did not consider the necessity of it as a maxim; they all saw and confessed that the people are not represented, and that they have not the benefit of a mixed monarchy. They have a monarchy which absorbs the two other estates, and, therefore, they have the insupportable expense of a monarchy, an aristocracy, and a democracy, without the simplicity or energy of any one of those forms of government. In Ireland this is peculiarly fatal, because the honest representation of the people is swallowed in the corruption and intrigue of a cabinet of another country. From this may be deduced the low estate of the Irish people; their honest labour is wasted in pampering their betrayers, instead of being employed, as it ought to be, in accommodating themselves and their children. On these miserable consequences of corruption, which are all the fatal effects of inadequate representation, I do not wish to dwell. To expatiate too much on them might be unfair, but to suppress them might be treason to the public. It is said that reform is only a pretence, and that separation is the real object of leaders; if this be so, confound the leaders by destroying the pretext, and take the followers to yourselves. You say there are one hundred thousand; I firmly believe there are three times the number. So much the better for you; if these seducers can attach so many followers to rebellion by the hope of reform through blood, how much more readily will you engage them, not by the promise, but the possession, and without blood? You allude to the British fleet; learn from it to avoid the fatal consequence that may follow even a few days' delay of justice. It is said to be only a pretext; I am convinced of the contrary—I am convinced the people are sincere, and would be satisfied by it. I think so from the perseverance in petitioning for it for a number of years; I think so, because I think a monarchy, properly balanced by a fair representation of the people, gives as perfect liberty as the most celebrated republics of old. But, of the real attraction of this object of reform, you have a proof almost miraculous; the desire of reform has annihilated religious antipathy and united the country. In the history of mankind it is the only instance of so fatal a religious fanaticism being discarded by the good sense of mankind, instead of dying slowly by the development of its folly. And I am persuaded the hints thrown out this night to make the different sects jealous of each other will be a detected trick and will only unite them still more closely. The Catholics have given a pledge to their countrymen of their sincerity and their zeal, which cannot fail of producing the most firm reliance; they have solemnly disclaimed all idea of what is called emancipation, except as a part of that reform without which their Presbyterian brethren could not be free. Reform is a necessary change of mildness for coercion. The latter has been tried; what is its success? The convention bill was passed to punish the meetings at Dungannon and those of the Catholics; the Government considered the Catholic concessions as defeats that called for vengeance, and cruelly have they avenged them. But did that act, or those which followed it, put down those meetings? The contrary was the fact. It concealed them most foolishly. When popular discontents are abroad, a wise government should put them into a hive of glass. You hid them. The association at first was small; the earth seemed to drink it as a rivulet, but it only disappeared for a season. A thousand streams, through the secret windings of the earth, found their way to one course, and swelled its waters, until at last, too mighty to be contained, it burst out a great river, fertilizing by its exudations or terrifying by its cataracts. This is the effect of our penal code; it swelled sedition into rebellion. What else could be hoped from a system of terrorism? Fear is the most transient of all the passions; it is the warning that nature gives for self-preservation. But when safety is unattainable the warning must be useless, and nature does not, therefore, give it. Administration, therefore, mistook the quality of penal laws; they were sent out to abolish conventions, but they did not pass the threshold; they stood sentinels at the gates. You think that penal laws, like great dogs, will wag their tails to their masters and bark only at their enemies. You are mistaken; they turn and devour those they are meant to protect, and are harmless where they are intended to destroy.

SIR CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE,
BART.

(1843-1911).

THE distinguished author of " Greater Britain " was born at Chelsea, September 4th, 1843. His father, Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, was prominent in the intellectual life of his day, and his " Papers of a Critic," edited by his son, keep their place in the libraries of England and America.

After his graduation from Trinity Hall, Cambridge, in January, 1866, as " Senior Legalist," Sir Charles was called to the bar at the Middle Temple. Soon afterwards he made the celebrated tour of the world which resulted in the production of " Greater Britain "—a work which is believed to have had a larger sale than any other " first book " of its class ever printed in English. Sir Charles travelled in the United States, Canada, Australia, India, and other countries which either acknowledge English authority or represent the " Anglo-Saxon " tradition. Studying the influence of race on institutions, and of climatic and geographical conditions on race, he presented new problems for consideration, and forced his work on public attention as one which showed marked originality and great intellectual activity.

Returning to England, Sir Charles, who had always been a Radical in politics, was elected to Parliament for the new borough of Chelsea, which he continued to represent until his defeat in 1886. When re-elected, it was for the Forest of Dean in Gloucestershire.

Among the numerous achievements of his parliamentary career was the abolition of " drawing and quartering," which still remained a legal method of punishment in England until he compelled the attention of the House of Commons to it. In May, 1880, he became Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the Gladstone ministry. In 1881-82 he was chairman of the Royal Commission for Negotiating a Commercial Treaty with France; in December, 1882, he was appointed President of the Local Government Board with a seat in the Cabinet, and the following year he took charge of and carried the Unreformed Corporation Bill. In 1884 he was chairman of the Royal Commission for Housing the Poor, and in 1885 he took charge of and carried the Diseases Prevention Act.

At the beginning of his parliamentary career he openly declared that he preferred a republic to a constitutional monarchy, and one of his speeches on the expense of monarchy prompted a celebrated response in favour of aristocracy from Disraeli. Few men in English public life have spoken more effectively, but since it is as the author of "Greater Britain" and works on related subjects that he first made his international reputation, a rule of this work is suspended in his case, and the example of his style here given is from his "Greater Britain" rather than from his speeches, which he made it a rule not to commit to writing. He is the author of other notable works besides "Greater Britain"—among them "The Present Position of European Politics" (1887); "The British Army"; "Problems of Greater Britain"; and "The Fall of Prince Florestan of Monaco," a satire which, when published anonymously, had a great run in England, and was translated into French.

AMERICA IN THE CRUCIBLE

WE are coasting again, gliding through calm, blue waters, watching the dolphins as they play, and the boobies as they fly, stroke and stroke, with the paddles of the ship. On the right, mountains rise through the warm, misty air, and form a long towering line upon the upper skies. Hanging high above us are the volcano of fire and that of water—twin menacers of Guatemala city. In the sixteenth century the water-mountain drowned it; in the eighteenth it was burnt by the fire-hill. Since then the city has been shaken to pieces by earthquakes, and of sixty thousand men and women, hardly one escaped. Down the valley, between the peaks, we have through the mahogany groves an exquisite distant view toward the city. Once more passing on, we get peeps, now of West Honduras, and now of the island coffee plantations of Costa Rica. The heat is terrible. It was just here, if we are to believe Drake, that he fell in with a shower so hot and scalding that each drop burnt its hole through his men's clothes as they hung up to dry. "Steep stories," it is clear, were known before the plantation of America.

Now that the time has come for a leave-taking of the continent, we can begin to reflect upon facts gleaned during visits to twenty-nine of the forty-five Territories and States—twenty-nine empires the size of Spain.

A man may see American countries, from the pine wastes of Maine to the slopes of Sierra; may talk with American men and women, from the sober citizens of Boston to Digger Indians in California; may eat of American dishes, from jerked buffalo in Colorado to clambakes on the shores near Salem ; and yet, from the time he first " smells the molasses " at Nantucket light-ship to the moment when the pilot quits him at the Golden Gate, may have no idea of an America. You may have seen the East, the South, the West, the Pacific States, and yet have failed to find America. It is not till you have left her shores that her image grows up in the mind.

The first thing that strikes the Englishman just landed in New York is the apparent Latinization of the English in America ; but before he leaves the country he comes to see that this is at most a local fact, and that the true moral of America is the vigour of the English race —the defeat of the cheaper by the dearer peoples, the victory of the man whose food costs four shillings a day over the man whose food costs four pence. Excluding the Atlantic cities, the English in America are absorbing the Germans and the Celts, destroying the Red Indians, and checking the advance of the Chinese.

The Saxon is the only extirpating race on earth. Up to the commencement of the now inevitable destruction of the Red Indians of Central North America, of the Maoris, and of the Australians by the English colonists, no numerous race had ever been blotted out by an invader. The Danes and Saxons amalgamated with the Britons, the Goths and Burgundians with the Gauls ; the Spaniards not only never annihilated a people, but have themselves been all but completely expelled by the Indians in Mexico and South America. The Portuguese in Ceylon, the Dutch in Java, the French in Canada and Algeria, have conquered but not killed off the native peoples. Hitherto it has been nature's rule that the race that peopled a country in the earliest historic days should people it to the end of time. The American problem is this : Does the law, in a modified shape, hold good, in spite of the destruction of the native population ? Is it true that the negroes, now that they are free, are commencing slowly to die out—that the New Englanders are dying fast, and their places being supplied by immigrants ? Can the English in America, in the long run, survive the common fate of all migrating races ? Is it true that, if the American settlers continue to exist, it will be at the price of being no longer English, but Red Indian ? It is certain that the English families long in the land have the features of the extirpated race ; on the other hand, in the negroes there is at present no trace of any change, save in their becoming dark brown instead of black.

The Maoris—an immigrant race—were dying off in New Zealand when we landed there. The Red Indians of Mexico—another immigrant people—had themselves undergone decline, numerical and moral, when we first became acquainted with them. Are we English in turn to degenerate abroad, under pressure of a great natural law forbidding change? It is easy to say that the English in Old England are not a native, but an immigrant race; that they show no symptoms of decline. There, however, the change was slight, the distance short, the difference of climate small.

The rapidity of the disappearance of physical type is equalled at least, if not exceeded, by that of the total alteration of the moral characteristics of the immigrant races—the entire destruction of eccentricity, in short. The change that comes over those among the Irish who do not remain in the great towns is not greater than that which overtakes the English hand-workers, of whom some thousands reach America each year. Gradually settling down on land, and finding themselves lost in a sea of intelligence, and freed from the inspiring obstacles of antiquated institutions and class prejudice, the English handicraftsman, ceasing to be roused to aggressive Radicalism by the opposition of sinister interests, merges into the contented homestead settler or adventurous backwoodsman. Greater even than this revolution of character is that which falls upon the Celt. Not only is it a fact known alike to physiologists and statisticians that the children of Irish parents born in America are, physically, not Irish, but Americans, but the like is true of the moral type; the change in this is at least as sweeping. The son of Fenian Pat and bright-eyed Biddy is the normal, gaunt American, quick of thought, but slow of speech, whom we have begun to recognize as the latest production of the Saxon race, when housed upon the Western prairies, or in the pine woods of New England.

For the moral change in the British workman it is not difficult to account; the man who will leave country, home, and friends to seek new fortunes in America, is essentially not an ordinary man. As a rule, he is above the average in intelligence, or, if defective in this point, he makes up for lack of wit by the possession of concentrativeness and energy. Such a man will have pushed himself to the front in his club, his union, or his shop, before he emigrates. In England he is somebody; in America he finds all hands contented, or, if not this, at all events, too busy to complain of such ills as they profess to labour under. Among contented men, his equals both in intelligence and ambition, in a country of perfect freedom of speech, of manners, of laws, and of society, the occupation of his mind is gone, and he comes to think himself what others seem to think him—a nobody; a man who no longer is a living force. He settles upon land; and when the world knows him no more, his children are happy corn-growers in his stead.

The shape of North America makes the existence of distinct peoples within her limits almost impossible. An upturned bowl, with a mountain rim, from which the streams run inward toward the centre, she must fuse together all the races that settle within her borders, and the fusion must now be in an English mould.

There are homogeneous foreign populations in several portions of the United States; not only the Irish and Chinese, at whose prospects we have already glanced, but also Germans in Pennsylvania, Spanish in Florida, French in Louisiana and at Sault de Ste. Marie. In Wisconsin there is a Norwegian population of over a hundred thousand, retaining their own language and their own architecture, and presenting the appearance of a tough morsel for the English to digest; at the same time, the Swedes were the first settlers of Delaware and New Jersey, and there they have disappeared.

Milwaukee is a Norwegian town. The houses are narrow and high, the windows many, with circular tops ornamented in wood or dark-brown stone, and a heavy wooden cornice crowns the front. The churches have the wooden bulb and spire which are characteristic of the Scandinavian public buildings. The Norwegians will not mix with other races, and invariably flock to spots where there is already a large population speaking their own tongue. Those who enter Canada generally become dissatisfied with the country, and pass on into Wisconsin or Minnesota, but the Canadian Government has now under its consideration a plan for founding a Norwegian colony on Lake Huron. The numbers of this people are not so great as to make it important to inquire whether they will ever merge into the general population. Analogy would lead us to expect that they will be absorbed; their existence is not historical, like that of the French in Lower Canada.

From Burlington, in Iowa, I had visited a spot the history of which is typical of the development of America—Nauvoo. Founded in 1840 by Joe Smith, the Mormon city stood upon a bluff overhanging the Des Moines Rapids of the Mississippi, presenting on the land-side the aspect of a gentle, graceful slope surmounted by a plain. After the fanatical pioneers of English civilization had been driven from the city and their temple burned, there came Cabet's Icarian band, who tried to found a new France in the desert; but in 1856 the leader died, and his people dispersed themselves about the States of Iowa and Missouri. Next came the English settlers, active, thriving, regardless of tradition, and Nauvoo is entering on a new life as the capital of a wine-growing country. I found Cabet and the Mormons alike forgotten. The ruins of the temple have disappeared, and the huge stones have been used up in cellars, built to contain the Hock—a pleasant wine, like Zeltinger.

The bearing upon religion of the gradual destruction of race is of great moment to the world. Christianity will gain by the change; but which of its many branches will receive support is a question which only admits of an imperfect answer. Arguing *a priori*, we should expect to find that, on the one hand, a tendency toward unity would manifest itself, taking the shape, perhaps, of a gain of strength by the Catholic and Anglican Churches; on the other hand, there would be a contrary and still stronger tendency toward an infinite multiplication of beliefs till millions of men and women would become each of them his own church. Coming to the actual cases in which we can trace the tendencies that commence to manifest themselves, we find that in America the Anglican Church is gaining ground, especially on the Pacific side, and that the Catholics do not seem to meet with any such success as we should have looked for; retaining, indeed, their hold over the Irish women and a portion of the men, and having their historic French branches in Louisiana and in Canada, but not, unless it be in the cities of New York and Philadelphia, making much way among the English.

Between San Francisco and Chicago, for religious purposes the most cosmopolitan of cities, we have to draw distinctions. In the Pacific city, the disturbing cause is the presence of New Yorkers; in the metropolis of the North-Western States, it is the dominance of New England ideas; still, we shall find no two cities so free from local colour, and from the influence of race. The result of an examination is not encouraging; in both cities there is much external show in the shape of Church attendance; in neither does religion strike its roots deeply into the hearts of its citizens, except so far as it is alien and imported.

The Spiritualist and Unitarian Churches are both of them in Chicago extremely strong; they support newspapers and periodicals of their own, and are led by men of remarkable ability and energy, but they are not the less Cambridge Unitarianism, Boston Spiritualism; there is nothing of the North West about them. In San Francisco, on the other hand, Anglicanism is prospering, but it is New York Episcopalianism, sustained by immigrants and money from the East; in no sense is it a Californian Church.

Throughout America the multiplication of churches is rapid, but, among the native-born Americans, Supernaturalism is advancing with great strides. The Shakers are strong in thought, the Spiritualists in wealth and numbers; Communism gains ground, but not Polygamy—the Mormon is a purely European Church.

There is just now progressing in America a great movement, headed by the "Radical Unitarians," toward "free religion," or Church without creed. The leaders deny that there is sufficient security for the spread of religion in each man's individual action; they desire collective work by all free-thinkers and liberal religionists in the direction of truth and purity of life. Christianity is higher than dogma, we are told; there is no way out of infinite multiplication of creeds but by their total extirpation. Oneness of purpose and a common love for truth form the members' only tie. Elder Frederick Evans said to me, "All truth forms part of Shakerism"; but these free religionists assure us that in all truth consists their sole religion.

The distinctive feature of these American philosophical and religious systems is their gigantic width; for instance, every human being who admits that disembodied spirits may in any way hold intercourse with dwellers upon earth, whatever else he may believe or disbelieve, is claimed by the Spiritualists as a member of their Church. They tell us that by "Spiritualism they understand whatever bears relation to spirit"; their system embraces all existence, brute, human, and divine; in fact, "the real man is a spirit." According to these ardent proselytizers, every poet, every man with a grain of imagination in his nature, is a "Spiritualist." They claim Plato, Socrates, Milton, Shakespeare, Washington Irving, Charles Dickens, Luther, Melanchthon, Paul, Stephen, the whole of the Hebrew prophets, Homer, and John Wesley, among the members of their Church. They have lately canonized new saints; St. Confucius, St. Theodore (Parker), St. Ralph (Waldo Emerson), St. Emma (Hardings), all figure in their calendar. It is a noteworthy fact that the saints are mostly resident in New England.

The tracts published at the *Spiritual Clarion* Office, Auburn, New York, put forward Spiritualism as a religion, which is to stand toward existing churches as did Christianity toward Judaism, and announce a new dispensation to the people of the earth "who have sown their wild oats in Christianity." But they spell "supersede" with a "c."

This strange religion has long since left behind the rappings and table-turnings in which it took its birth. The secret of its success is that it supplies to every man the satisfaction of the universal craving for the supernatural in any form in which he will receive it. The Spiritualists claim two millions of active believers and five million "favourers" in America.

The presence of a large German population is thought by some to have an important bearing on the religious future of America, but the Germans have hitherto kept themselves apart from the intellectual progress of the nation. They for the most part withdraw from towns, and, retaining their language and supporting local papers of their own, live out of the world of American literature, politics, and thought, taking, however, at rare intervals, a patriotic part in national affairs, as was notably the case at the time of the last rebellion. Living thus by themselves, they have even less influence upon American religious thought than have the Irish, who, speaking the English tongue, and dwelling almost exclusively in towns, are brought more in contact with the daily life of the republic. The Germans in America are in the main pure materialists under a certain show of deism; but hitherto there has been no alliance between them and the powerful Chicago Radical Unitarians—difference of language having thus far proved a bar to the formation of a league which would otherwise have been inevitable.

On the whole, it would seem that for the moment religious prospects are not bright; the tendency is rather toward intense and unhealthily developed feeling in the few, and subscription to some one of the Episcopalian Churches—Catholic, Anglican, or Methodist—among the many, coupled with real indifference. Neither the tendency to unity of creeds nor that toward infinite multiplication of beliefs has yet made that progress which abstract speculation would have led us to expect. So far as we can judge from the few facts before us, there is much likelihood that multiplication will in the future prove too strong for unity.

After all, there is not in America a greater wonder than the Englishman himself, for it is to this continent that you must come to find him in full possession of his powers. Two hundred and fifty millions of people speak or are ruled by those who speak the English tongue and inhabit a third of the habitable globe; but at the present rate of increase, in sixty years there will be two hundred and fifty millions of Englishmen dwelling in the United States alone. America has somewhat grown since the time when it was gravely proposed to call her "Alleghania," after a chain of mountains which, looking from this western side, may be said to skirt her eastern border, and the loftiest peaks of which are but half the height of the very passes of the Rocky Mountains.

America is becoming, not English merely, but world-embracing in the variety of its type; and as the English element has given language and history to that land, America offers the English race the moral directorship of the globe, by ruling mankind through Saxon institutions and the English tongue. Through America, England is speaking to the world.

OMPHALISM

DASHING through a grove of cottonwood trees draped in bignonia and ivy, we came out suddenly upon a charming scene; a range of huts and forts crowning a long, low hill seamed with many a timber-clothed ravine, while the clear stream of the Republican Fork wreathed itself about the woods and bluffs. The blockhouse over which floated the Stars and Stripes was Fort Riley, the Hyde Park Corner from which continents are to measure all their miles; the "capital of the universe," or "centre of the world." Not that it has always been so. Geographers will be glad to learn that not only does the earth gyrate, but that the centre of its crust also moves; within the last ten years it has removed westward into Kansas from Missouri, from Independence to Fort Riley. The contest for centreship is no new thing. Herodotus held that Greece was the very middle of the world, and that the unhappy Orientals were frozen, and the yet more unfortunate Atlantic Indians baked every afternoon of their poor lives in order that the sun might shine on Greece at noon; London plumes herself on being the "centre of the terrestrial globe"; Boston is the "hub of the hull universe," though the latter claim is less physical than moral, I believe. In Fort Riley, the Western men seem to have found the physical centre of the United States, but they claim for the Great Plains as well the intellectual as the political leadership of the whole continent. These hitherto untrodden tracts, they tell you, form the heart of the empire, from which the lifeblood must be driven to the extremities. Geographical and political centres must ultimately coincide.

Connected with this belief is another Western theory—that the powers of the future must be "Continental." Germany, or else Russia, is to absorb all Asia and Europe except Britain. North America is already cared for, as the gradual extinction of the Mexicans and absorption of the Canadian they consider certain. As for South America, the Californians are already planning an occupation of western Brazil, on the ground that the continental power of South America must start from the head waters of the great rivers and spread seaward down the streams. Even in the Brazilian climate they believe that the Anglo-Saxon is destined to become the dominant race.

The success of this omphalism, this government from the centre, will be brought about, in the Western belief, by the necessity under which the natives on the head waters of all streams will find themselves of having the outlets in their hands. Even if it be true that railways are beating rivers, still the railways must also lead seaward to the ports, and the need for their control is still felt by the producers in the centre countries of the continent. The Upper States must everywhere command the Lower, and salt-water despotism find its end.

The Americans of the Valley States, who fought all the more heartily in the Federal cause from the fact that they were battling for the freedom of the Mississippi against the men who held its mouth, look forward to the time when they will have to assert, peaceably but with firmness, their right to the freedom of their railways through the North Atlantic

States. Whatever their respect for New England, it cannot be expected that they are forever to permit Illinois and Ohio to be neutralized in the Senate by Rhode Island and Vermont. If it go hard with New England, it will go still harder with New York, and the Western men look forward to the day when Washington will be removed, Congress and all, to Columbus or Fort Riley.

The singular wideness of Western thought, always verging on extravagance, is traceable to the width of Western land. The immensity of the continent produces a kind of intoxication; there is moral dram-drinking in the contemplation of the map. No Fourth of July oration can come up to the plain facts contained in the land commissioner's report. The public domain of the United States still consists of one thousand five hundred millions of acres; there are two hundred thousand square miles of coal-lands in the country, ten times as much as in all the remaining world. In the Western Territories not yet States, there is land sufficient to bear, at the English population rate, five hundred and fifty millions of human beings.

It is strange to see how the Western country dwarfs the Eastern States. Buffalo is called a "Western city"; yet from New York to Buffalo is only three hundred and fifty miles, and Buffalo is but seven hundred miles to the west of the most eastern point in all the United States. On the other hand, from Buffalo we can go two thousand five hundred miles westward without quitting the United States. "The West" is eight times as wide as the Atlantic States, and will soon be eight times as strong.

The conformation of North America is widely different from that of any other continent on the globe. In Europe the glaciers of the Alps occupy the centre point, and shed the waters toward each of the surrounding seas; confluence is almost unknown. So it is in Asia; there the Indus flowing into the Arabian Gulf, the Oxus into the Sea of Aral, the Ganges into the Bay of Bengal, the Yangtse Kiang into the Pacific, and the Yenesei into the Arctic Ocean, all take their rise in the central table-land. In South America the mountains form a wall upon the West, whence the rivers flow eastward in parallel lines. In North America alone there are mountains on each coast, and a trough between, into which the rivers flow together, giving in a single valley twenty-three thousand miles of navigable stream to be ploughed by steamships. The map proclaims the essential unity of North America. Political geography might be a more interesting study than it has yet been made.

SIR JOHN ELIOT

(1592-1632).

THE "Petition of Right" adopted by the English Parliament in 1628 is one of the great landmarks of modern history. It declared the sovereignty of the people represented in Parliament as against the King, and as a logical result of it, Charles I., resisting popular supremacy, was impeached for treason, and executed. The fundamental question involved in the "Petition of Right" is that of the right of the producer to own and control his product. In adopting the bill, Parliament declared that "no freeman shall be required to give any gift, loan, benevolence, or tax, without common consent, by act of Parliament." Other declarations of the Petition were that "no freeman be imprisoned or detained contrary to the law of the land"; that soldiers or mariners be not billeted on private houses; and that "commissions to punish soldiers and sailors by martial law be revoked and no more issued."

Sir John Eliot, one of the most eloquent men of his day, gave his full power to the support of the Petition, which was drawn by the celebrated Coke. Born April 20th, 1592, Eliot, after graduating at Oxford and studying law in London, entered Parliament in 1625. He became one of the leaders of an Opposition which boasts such great names as Coke, Pym, and Hampden. In 1626, in company with Sir Dudley Digges, he was seized by Charles I. and hurried to the Tower, but Parliament asserted its prerogative with such vigour that the King was compelled to surrender his prisoners. The "Petition of Right," adopted in the third Parliament under Charles I., though drawn in the form of a petition to the throne, was really so bold an assertion of popular rights that Eliot's share in it was never forgiven. On the dissolution of Parliament in 1629, he was arrested, sentenced to pay a fine of £2,000 and to remain in prison until he should acknowledge himself guilty of conspiracy against the King. He died in the Tower, November 27, 1632.

ON THE PETITION OF RIGHT

(Delivered in the House of Commons, June 3rd, 1628).

WE sit here as the great Council of the King, and in that company it is our duty to take into consideration that state and affairs of the kingdom, and when there is occasion to give a true representation of them by way of counsel and advice, with what we conceive necessary or expedient to be done.

In this consideration I confess many a sad thought hath affrighted me, and that not only in respect of our dangers from abroad (which yet I know are great, as they have been often pressed and dilated to us), but in respect of our disorders here at home, which do enforce those dangers and by which they are occasioned. For I believe I shall make it clear to you that both at first the cause of these dangers were our disorders, and our disorders now are yet our greatest dangers; that not so much the potency of our enemies as the weakness of ourselves doth threaten us; so that the saying of one of the Fathers may be presumed by us, "*Non tam potentia sua quam negligentia nostra*" ("Not so much by their power as by our neglect.") Our want of true devotion to Heaven; our insincerity and doubting in religion; our want of counsels; our precipitate actions; the insufficiency or unfaithfulness of our generals abroad; the ignorance or corruption of our ministers at home; the impoverishing of the sovereign; the oppression and depression of the subject; the exhausting of our treasures; the waste of our provisions; consumption of our ships; destruction of our men;—these make the advantage to our enemies, not the reputation of their arms; and if in these there be not reformation, we need no foes abroad; time itself will ruin us.

To show this more fully, I believe you will all hold it necessary that what I say should not seem an aspersion on the state or imputation on the government, as I have known such motions misinterpreted. But far is this from me to propose, who have none but clear thoughts of the excellency of the King; nor can I have other ends but the advancement of his Majesty's glory. I shall desire a little of your patience extraordinary, as I lay open the particulars, which I shall do with what brevity I may, answerable to the importance of the cause and the necessity now upon us; yet with such respect and observation to the time, as I hope it shall not be thought troublesome.

1. For the first, then, our insincerity and doubting in religion is the greatest and most dangerous disorder of all others. This hath

never been unpunished; and of this we have many strong examples of all states and in all times to awe us. What testimony doth it want? Will you have authority of books? Look on the collections of the Committee for Religion; there is too clear an evidence. See there the commission procured for composition with the Papists of the North! Mark the proceedings thereupon, and you will find them amounting to little less than a toleration in effect; the slight payments, and the easiness of them, will likewise show the favour that is intended. Will you have proofs of men? Witness the hopes, witness the presumptions, witness the reports of all the Papists generally. Observe the dispositions of commanders, the trust of officers, the confidence in secretaries to employments in this kingdom, in Ireland, and elsewhere. These will all show that it hath too great a certainty. And to this add but the incontrovertible evidence of that All-Powerful Hand, which we have felt so sorely, that gave it full assurance; for as the heavens oppose themselves to our impiety, so it is we that first opposed the heavens.

2. For the second, our want of counsels, that great disorder in a state under which there cannot be stability. If effects may show their causes (as they are often a perfect demonstration of them), our misfortunes, our disasters, serve to prove our deficiencies in counsel, and the consequences they draw with them. If reason be allowed in this dark age, the judgment of dependencies and foresight of contingencies in affairs do confirm my position. For, if we view ourselves at home, are we in strength, are we in reputation, equal to our ancestors? If we view ourselves abroad, are our friends as many? Are our enemies no more? Do our friends retain their safety and possessions? Do not our enemies enlarge themselves, and gain from them and us? To what counsel owe we the loss of the Palatinate, where we sacrificed both our honour and our men sent thither, stopping those greater powers appointed for the service, by which it might have been defended? What counsel gave direction to the late action, whose wounds are yet bleeding? I mean the expedition to Rhé, of which there is yet so sad a memory in all men. What design for us or advantage to our state could that impart?

You know the wisdom of your ancestors, and the practice of their times, how they preserved their safeties. We all know, and have as much cause to doubt (*i.e.*, distrust or guard against) as they had, the greatness and ambition of that kingdom, which the Old World could not satisfy. Against this greatness and ambition we likewise know the proceedings of that princess, that never-to-be-forgotten, excellent Queen Elizabeth, whose name, without admiration, falls not into mention even with her enemies. You know how she advanced herself, and how she advanced the nation in glory and in state ; how she depressed her enemies, and how she upheld her friends ; how she enjoyed a full security, and made those our scorn who now are made our terror.

Some of the principles she built on were these, and if I mistake, let reason and our statesmen contradict me :—

First, to maintain, in what she might, a unity in France, that the kingdom, being at peace within itself, might be a bulwark to keep back the power of Spain by land.

Next, to preserve an amity and league between that State and us, that so we might come in aid of the Low Countries (Holland), and by that means receive their ships, and help them by sea.

This triple cord, so working between France, the States (Holland) and England, might enable us, as occasion should require, to give assistance unto others. And by this means, as the experience of that time doth tell us, we were not only free from those fears that now possess and trouble us, but then our names were fearful to our enemies. See now what correspondency our action had with this. Try our conduct by these rules. It did induce, as a necessary consequence, a division in France between Protestants and their King, of which there is too woeful and lamentable experience. It hath made an absolute breach between that state and us, and so entertains us against France, and France in preparation against us, that we have nothing to promise to our neighbours, nay, hardly to ourselves. Next, observe the time in which it was attempted, and you shall find it not only varying from those principles, but directly contrary and opposite to those ends ; and such, as from the issue and success, rather might be thought a conception of Spain than begotten here with us.

You know the dangers of Denmark, and how much they concern us ; what in respect of our alliance and the country ; what in the importance of the Sound ; what an advantage to our enemies the gain thereof would be ! What loss, what prejudice, to us by this disunion ; we breaking in upon France, France enraged by us, and the Netherlands at amazement between both ! Neither could we intend to aid that luckless King (Christian IV., of Denmark), whose loss is our disaster.

Can those (the King's ministers) that express their trouble at the hearing of these things, and have so often told us in this place of their knowledge in the conjunctures and disjunctures of affairs—can they say they advised in this ? Was this an act of counsel, Mr. Speaker ? I have more charity than to think it ; and, unless they make confession of it themselves, I cannot believe it.

3. For the next, the insufficiency and unfaithfulness of our generals (that great disorder abroad), what shall I say ? I wish there were not cause

to mention it; and but for the apprehension of the danger that is to come, if the like choice hereafter be not prevented, I could willingly be silent. But my duty to my sovereign, my service to this House, and the safety and honour of my country, are above all respects; and what so nearly trenches to the prejudice of these must not, shall not, be forborne.

At Cadiz, when in that first expedition we made, when we arrived and found a conquest ready—the Spanish ships, I mean—fit for the satisfaction of a voyage, and of which some of the chiefest then there themselves have since assured me that the satisfaction would have been sufficient, either in point of honour or in point of profit—why was it neglected? Why was it not achieved, it being granted on all hands how feasible it was?

Afterwards when, with the destruction of some of our men and the exposure of others, who (though their fortune since has not been such), by chance, came off safe—when, I say, with the loss of our serviceable men, that unserviceable fort was gained, and the whole army landed, why was there nothing done? Why was there nothing attempted? If nothing was intended, wherefore did they land? If there was a service, wherefore were they shipped again? Mr. Speaker, it satisfies me too much (*i.e.*, I am over-satisfied) in this case—when I think of their dry and hungry march into that drunken quarter (for so the soldiers termed it) which was the period of their journey—that divers of our men being left as a sacrifice to the enemy, that labour was at end.

For the next understanding at Rhé, I will not trouble you with much, only this in short. Was not that whole action carried against the judgment and opinion of those officers that were of the council? Was not the first, was not the last, was not all in the landing, in the entrenching, in the continuance there, in the assault, in the retreat, without their assent? Did any advice take place of such as were of the council? If there should be made a particular inquisition thereof, these things will be manifest and more. I will not instance the manifest that was made, giving the reason of these arms; nor by whom, nor in what manner nor on what grounds it was published, nor what effects it hath wrought, drawing, as it were, almost the whole world into league against us. Nor will I mention the leaving of the wines, the leaving of the salt, which were in our possession, and of a value, as it is said, to answer much of our expense. Nor will I dwell on that great wonder (which no Alexander or Cæsar ever did), the enriching of the enemy by courtesies when our soldiers wanted help; nor the private intercourse and parleys with the fort, which were continually held. What they intended may be read in the success; and upon due examination thereof, they would not want their proofs.

For the last voyage to Rochelle there need be no observations; it is so fresh in memory; nor will I make an inference or corollary on all. Your own knowledge shall judge what truth or what sufficiency they express.

4. For the next, the ignorance and corruption of our ministers, where can you miss of instances? If you survey the court, if you survey the country; if the Church, if the city be examined; if you observe the bar, if the bench, if the ports, if the shipping, if the land, if the seas, —all these will render you variety of proofs, and that in such measure and proportion as shows the greatness of our disease to be such that if there be not some speedy application for remedy, our case is almost desperate.

5. Mr. Speaker, I fear I have been too long in these particulars that are past, and am unwilling to offend you; therefore in the rest I shall be shorter; and as to that which concerns the impoverishing of the King, no other arguments will I use than such as all men grant.

The exchequer, you know, is empty, and the reputation thereof gone; the ancient lands are sold; the jewels pawned; the plate engaged; the debt still great; almost all charges, both ordinary and extraordinary, borne up by projects! What poverty can be greater? What necessity so great? What perfect English heart is not almost dissolved into sorrow for this truth?

6. For the oppression of the subject, which, as I remember, is the next particular I proposed, it needs no demonstration. The whole kingdom is proof; and, for the exhausting of our treasures, that very oppression speaks it. What waste of our provisions, what consumption of our ships, what destruction of our men there hath been! Witness that expedition to Algiers; witness that with Mansfeldt; witness that to Cadiz; witness the next—witness that to Rhé; witness the last (I pray God we may never have more such witnesses!)—witness, likewise, the Palatinate; witness Denmark, witness the Turks, witness the Dunkirkers, witness all! What losses we have sustained! How we are impaired in munitions, in ships, in men!

It is beyond contradiction that we were never so weakened, nor ever had less hope how to be restored.

These, Mr. Speaker, are our dangers, these are they who do threaten us, and these are, like the Trojan horse, brought in cunningly to surprise us. In these do lurk the strongest of our enemies, ready to issue on us, and if we do not speedily expel them, these are the signs, these are the invitations to others! These will so prepare their entrance that we shall have no means left of refuge or defence; for if we have these enemies at home, how can we strive with those that are abroad? If we be free from these no other can impeach us. Our ancient English virtue (like the old Spartan valour) cleared from these disorders—our being in sincerity of religion and once made friends with heaven; having maturity of counsels, sufficiency of generals, incorruption of officers, opulency in the King, liberty in the people, repletion in treasure, plenty of provisions, reparation of ships, preservation of men—our ancient English virtue, I say, thus rectified, will secure us; and unless there be a speedy reformation in these, I know not what hopes or expectations we can have.

These are the things, sir, I shall desire to have taken into consideration; that as we are the great council of the kingdom, and have the apprehension of these dangers, we may truly represent them unto the King, which I conceive we are bound to do by a triple obligation—of duty to God, of duty to his Majesty, and of duty to our country.

And therefore I wish it may so stand with the wisdom and judgment of the House that these things may be drawn into the body of remonstrance, and in all humility expressed, with a prayer to his Majesty that, for the safety of himself, for the safety of the kingdom, for the safety of religion, he will be pleased to give us time to make perfect inquisition thereof, or to take them into his own wisdom, and there give them such timely reformation as the necessity and justice of the case doth import.

And thus, sir, with a large affection and loyalty to his Majesty, and with a firm duty and service to my country, I have suddenly (and it may be with some disorder) expressed the weak apprehensions I have; wherein, if I have erred, I humbly crave your pardon, and so submit myself to the censure of the House.

SIR ROBERT A. FALCONER

(1867-).

SIR ROBERT FALCONER was born at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. As a boy he spent eight years in Trinidad and was educated at the Queen's Royal College School, whence he proceeded, with the Gilchrist Scholarship, 1885, to London and graduated there in 1888. His M.A., B.D. and D. Litt. he received from Edinburgh. From 1892 to 1907 he was lecturer and then Professor of New Testament Greek in Pine Hill College, Halifax, N.S., and Principal from 1904-1907. His publications are chiefly articles in professional journals, encyclopædias and dictionaries in England and America. He has written also "The German Tragedy and its Meaning for Canada," 1915, and "Idealism in National Character," 1920. He was made a K.C.M.G. in 1917.

REACTIONS ON CANADIAN NATIONALISM

THE Constitution of the Dominion of Canada, and the present national spirit of the people owe their character in part to the experience of the United States and to the propinquity of a powerful and often aggressive neighbour. Almost from the beginning the New England colonist looked upon the French in Canada as their natural enemies, and later there was an opinion expressed by Jefferson in 1808 that it was one of the objects of the American Government "to exclude all European influence from their hemisphere," the existence of the British colonies being resented as a challenge to their supremacy. Canada had often felt the repercussion of American dislike for Britain, but in the war of 1812-14, a deadly blow was aimed at herself and the iron then entered her soul. The campaigns of those years were almost forgotten in England and were of inglorious memory for the United States, but by Canadians they were held to be the second most important event in their national career. It was a war that should not have been fought. The American aggressors expected a comparatively easy task, because they hoped that their old friends, who in recent years had settled in Canada, would rise and paralyse the activities of the loyalists. In this they were disappointed. French and English rallied to repel a common foe who had invaded their homes. They were united for the first time in a common cause, and the fields of victory had become centres of tradition for both. Undefeated, they emerged with a new spirit; Canadian sentiment was greatly strengthened, and the provinces were to remain a part of the British Empire.

The victory of the North in the Civil War left Canada in a state of conscious weakness, and if she had been persuaded that Britain would not make vigorous opposition to aggressive action from the United States, the heart might have gone out of her entirely. Her fears of the American did not die down. In 1866 the Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated, for which, however, Canada was partly to blame, and there were many suggestions of annexation. To these the reply of the British provinces was confederation. Had the provinces not been united in 1867, they would possibly by this time have been absorbed one by one into the United States. It could not be denied that the Americans were unpleasantly surprised at the consummation of confederation, and did not take kindly to the new Dominion of Canada. In it a new Imperial problem was supplied for them on their northern border. They were slow to recognize the large measure of autonomy with which Britain had equipped the new State for her voyage. In fairness to the United States, it had to be borne in mind that she was then not yet sure of herself. The effects of the Civil War had not worn off; people of all sorts had fled to Canada for refuge, and were nursing their discontents against Europe, and the outside world was not friendly towards her. At such a time it was natural that she should look askance upon the appearance on her borders of a new confederacy which might in the future dispute her omnipotence on the American Continent.

The growth of friendliness between the Dominion and the United States corresponded with a better feeling between the United States and Great Britain after the Spanish War of 1898. Coming down to the present period, over against the United States there now stands in friendly intercourse the Britannic Commonwealth with rapidly developing members on the American continents in Canada, the British West Indies, and British Guiana. It might be that a second federation would be brought into existence consisting of the latter two sections, and if so this federation would in all probability be closely connected with Canada in commerce and in other most friendly relations. They could not fail to play an important part in Canada's future. If a dispute were to arise with one of the Caribbean Republics of such proportions as to demand the intervention of Great Britain as the head of the Commonwealth of Nations, would the United States step in and assert her sole right to settle it? This was what she did in the Venezuelan matter, but in the future Canada might have very great interest in the solution.

Foreign policy was rapidly becoming an affair, not of Britain alone, but of the Britannic Commonwealth. In so far as the Monroe Doctrine referred to Brazil, the Argentine, Chile and Peru, Canada would probably stand aside; it was the future of the West Indies that concerned her.

A century of unbroken peace between America and Britain was celebrated in 1915. The Great War interfered with those celebrations, but did far more than any commemorations could have effected in changing the attitude of each country to the other. To-day the American of Anglo-Saxon stock did not talk to his Canadian neighbour about annexation. He had discovered that Canada had a real individuality; he admired her action in the war, and he was pondering as never before what her destiny might be. That was not, however, to say that he yet understood her position. He had hardly grasped the meaning of autonomy within the Empire.

When President Harding, a few days before his death, visited British Columbia he was the first American President to pay an official visit to the Dominion, and he was received, as the Press said, "with a welcome that no other ruler than King George himself would have been given," as the representative of a people with virtually the same ideals and institutions. His speech, therefore, had peculiar significance, and of all his friendly words none touched the Canadian more than those in which he said "the bugaboo of annexation having become extinct long ago let us go our own gait along parallel roads, you helping us and we helping you." In accounting for the change the remarkable economic development of both countries during the last generation must not be overlooked. The United States had grown to be the richest and most powerful nation in the world. No longer was she sensitive lest she did not get recognition, nor did she desire to extend her Imperial obligations. She did not challenge the place of the British Commonwealth in the world; in fact she was being criticized for having fastened her gaze too completely upon her own domestic interests. Moreover, Canada had made a success of her great experiment, she had even assumed a place in the World's Council Chamber where the United States had so far refused to take a seat. Canada was not drifting on the tide, to be cast helplessly upon her neighbour's shores, but was directing her own course as one of a fleet of vessels keeping together on a great expedition.

LORD FALKLAND

(1610-1643).

IN 1636, when Sir John Finch was Chief-Justice of the English Court of Common Pleas, he and other judges of the high courts of the realm received from King Charles I. this question—most momentous in its results, involving, as it did, the loss of the King's head: "When the good and safety of the kingdom are concerned, whether may not the King, by writ, under the Great Seal of England, command all the subjects in his kingdom at their charge, to provide and furnish such number of ships with men, victuals, and munitions, and for such time as he shall think fit for the defence and safeguard of the kingdom from such danger and peril, and by law compel the doing thereof in case of refusal or refractoriness. And whether in such case is not the King sole judge of the danger and of when and how the same is to be prevented and avoided."

Thus was presented the question of "Ship-Money," involving that of the King's absolutism. The judges answered that the King was "in such case sole judge of the danger and when and how the same is to be prevented and avoided," and that he might lay such taxes at his pleasure, punishing those who should refuse to pay them. It was on such advice that Hampden, denying the right of the King to tax the people without their consent expressed by act of Parliament, was prosecuted for refusing to pay his "Ship-Money." When the conduct of the judges in giving the King their extrajudicial sanction was discussed in Parliament, it was determined to impeach them, and, accordingly, on December 5th, 1640, Lord Falkland made his speech against Finch. When actually impeached by the Commons, Finch, who had been promoted to Lord Keeper by the King, went to Holland. Falkland himself afterwards changed sides, abandoning Parliament for the King, in whose service he fell at Newbury, September 20th, 1643. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin (his father being Lord Deputy of Ireland), and, as Sir Lucius Cary, was the friend of Ben Jonson and Suckling. One of his modern biographers says that when he entered Parliament in 1640, "he quickly assumed prominence on the side of the King," but it is evident from the testimony of his contemporaries and his own speeches that in the great question at issue he was strongly against the King's position. One of his contemporaries calls him "Lord Falkland, that excellent man, one of the wonders of his age, who afterwards made a dear atonement for his mistakes by losing his life in his Majesty's service." After leaving Parliament, he became one of the King's Secretaries of State and an active opponent of the popular cause.

SHIP-MONEY—IMPEACHING LORD KEEPER FINCH

(Delivered in Parliament, December 5th, 1640).

I REJOICE very much to see this day; and the want hath not lain in my affections, but my lungs, if to all that hath been past I have not been as loud with my voice as any man in the House; yet truly my opinion is, we have yet done nothing if we do no more; I shall add what I humbly conceive ought to be added, as soon as I have said something with reference to him that says it.

I will first desire the forgiveness of the House if aught I say seem to intrench upon another profession and enter upon the work of another robe. Since I have been intrusted by the report of a learned committee, and confirmed by the uncontradicted rule of the House; since I shall say nothing of this kind but in order to something further, which moves me most to venture my opinion, and to expect your pardon; since I am confident that history alone is sufficient to show this judgment contrary to our laws, and logic alone sufficient to prove it destructive to our propriety, which every free and noble person values more than his possession—I will not profess I know of myself, but all those who know me, know that my natural disposition is to decline from severity—much more from cruelty.

That I have no particular provocation from their persons, and have particular obligations to their calling against whom I am to speak; and though I have not so much, yet far more than I have, so I hope it will be believed that only public interest hath extorted this from me, and that which I would not say, if I conceived it not so true, and so necessary, that no undigested meat can lie heavier upon the stomach than this unsaid would have lain upon my conscience.

The Constitution of the Commonwealth hath established, or rather endeavoured to establish, to us the security of our goods, and the security of those laws which would secure us and our goods, by appointing for us judges so settled, so sworn, that there can be no oppression, but they of necessity must be accessory, since if they neither deny nor delay us justice, which neither for the great nor little seal, they ought to do, the greatest person in this kingdom cannot continue the least violence upon the meanest; but this security hath been almost our ruin, for it hath been turned, or rather turned itself into a battery against us; and those persons who should have been as dogs to defend the sheep, have been as wolves, to worry them.

These judges, to instance not them only, but their greatest crime, have delivered an opinion and judgment in an extrajudicial matter, that is, such as come not within their cognizance, they being judges, and neither philosophers, nor politicians; in which, when that is so absolute and evident, the law of the land ceases, and of general reason and equity, by which particular laws at first were framed, returns to his throne and government, where *salus populi* becomes not only *suprema* but *sola lex*; at which, and to which end, whatsoever should dispense with the King, to make use of any money, dispenses with us to make use of his, and one another's. In this judgment they contradicted both many and learned acts and declarations of Parliament; and those in this very case, in this very reign, so that for them they needed to have consulted with no other record, but with their memories.

They have contradicted apparent evidences by supposing mighty and eminent dangers, in the most serene, quiet, and halcyon days that could possibly be imagined, a few contemptible pirates being our most formidable enemies, and there being neither prince nor state with whom we had not either alliance, or amity, or both.

They contradicted the writ itself, by supposing that supposed danger to be so sudden that it would not stay for a Parliament, which required but forty days' stay, and the writ being in no such haste, but being content to stay seven times over.

It seemed generally strange that they saw not the law, which all men else saw, but themselves. Yet though this begot the more general wonder, three other particulars begot the more general indignation.

The first of all the reasons for this judgment was such that they needed not any from the adverse party to help them to convert those few, who before the last suspicion of the legality of that most illegal writ, there being fewer that approved of the judgment than there were that judged it, for I am confident they did not that themselves.

Secondly, when they had allowed to the King the sole power in necessity, the sole judgment of necessity, and by that enabled him to take both from us, what he would, when he would, they yet continued to persuade us that they had left us our liberties and properties.

The third and last is, and which I confess moved most, that by the transformation of us from the state of free subjects (a good phrase, under Doctor Heylen's favour) unto that of villeins, they disable us by legal and voluntary supplies to express our affections to his Majesty, and by that to cherish his to us,—that is by Parliaments.

The cause of all the miseries we have suffered, and the cause of all our jealousies we have had that we should yet suffer is that a most excellent prince hath been most infinitely abused by his judges, telling him that by policy he might do what he pleased ; with the first of these we are now to deal, which may be a leading to the rest. And since in providing of these laws, upon which these men have trampled, our ancestors have showed their utmost care and wisdom, for our undoubted security, words having done nothing, and yet have done all that words can do, we must now be forced to think of abolishing our grievances, and of taking away this judgment, and these judges together, and of regulating their successors by their exemplary punishment.

I will not speak much ; I will only say we have accused a great person of high treason, for intending to subvert our fundamental laws and to introduce arbitrary government, which we suppose he meant to do. We are sure these have done it, there being no laws more fundamental than that they have already subverted, and no government more absolute than they have really introduced. Not only the severe punishment, but the sudden removal of these men, will have a sudden effect in one considerable consideration.

We only accuse, and the House of Lords condemn ; in which condemnation they usually receive advice (though not direction) from the judges, and I leave it to every man to imagine how prejudicial to us, that is, to the Commonwealth, and how partial to their fellow-malefactors, the advice of such judges is like to be. How undoubtedly for their own sakes, they will conduce to their power, that every action be judged to be a less fault, and every person to be less faulty, than in justice they ought to do; among these, there is one I must not lose in the crowd, whom I doubt not but we shall find, when we examine the rest of them, with what hopes they have been tempted, by what fears they have been afraid, and by what, and by whose importunity they have been pursued, before they consented to what they did. I doubt not, I say, but we shall then find him to have been a most admirable solicitor, but a most abominable judge ; he it is who not only gave away with his breath what our ancestors purchased for us by so large an expense of their time, their care, their treasure, their blood, and employed their industry, as great as his injustice, to persuade others to join with him in that deed of gift, but strove to root up those liberties which they had cut down, and to make our grievances immortal and our slavery irreparable. Lest any part of our posterity might want occasion to curse him, he declared that power to be so inherent to the Crown, as that it was not in the power even of Parliaments to divide them.

I have heard, and I think here that common fame is ground enough for this House to accuse upon; and then, undoubtedly, there is enough to be accused upon in this House; he hath reported this so generally, that I expect not that you shall bid me name him whom you all know, nor do I look to tell you news when I tell you it is my Lord Keeper. But this I think fit to put you in mind that his place admits him to his Majesty, and trusts him with his Majesty's conscience. And how pernicious every moment, whilst one gives him means to infuse such unjust opinions of this House, as are expressed in a libel, rather than a declaration, of which many believe him to be the principal secretary! And the other puts the most vast and unlimited power of the Chancery into his hands, the safest of which will be dangerous! For my part, I think no man secure that he shall think himself worth anything when he rises, whilst our estates are in his breast, who hath sacrificed his country to his ambition, whilst he who hath prostrated his own conscience hath the keeping of the King's, and he who hath undone us already by wholesale hath a power left in him by retail.

In the beginning of Parliament he told us,—and I am confident every man here believes it before he told it, and never the more for his telling, though a sorry witness is a good testimony against himself,—that his Majesty never required anything from his ministers but justice and integrity. Against which, if any of them have transgressed upon their heads, and that deservedly, it ought to fall; it was full and truly, but he hath in this saying pronounced his own condemnation; we shall be more partial to him than he is to himself if we be slow to pursue it. It is, therefore, my just and humble motion that we may choose a select committee to draw up his and their charge, and to examine their carriage in this particular, to make use of it in the charge, and if he shall be found guilty of tampering with judges against the public security, who thought tampering with witnesses in a private cause worthy of so great a fine, if he should be found to have gone before the rest to this judgment, and to have gone beyond the rest in this judgment, that in the punishment of it the justice of this House may not deny him the due honour both to proceed and exceed the rest.

DAVID LLOYD GEORGE

(*For Biographical Note see Section* ii.).

CITADEL OF PEACE AND LIBERTY

(Delivered at Queen's Hall, London, 1924).

IN proposing the toast of "The Press of the Empire," I welcome the visitors, not as strangers within our gates, but as comrades and kinsmen to the old hearthstone. They represent the Press of the greatest Empire in the world—it is safe to say the greatest Empire the world has ever seen—greatest in the extent and expanse of its Dominions and dependencies; greatest in the population dwelling within its vast bounds; greatest in the richness and variety of its resources, and, I may add, in the variety of its climate; greatest beyond everything in the quality of the service it has rendered mankind.

Of no other Empire that ever existed can it be claimed that for centuries it has used its might and strength to rescue human liberty from peril, and to establish human right where it was assailed. Within four centuries the British Empire has four times risked its existence in order to protect menaced right and freedom beyond its own frontiers. It is the great Empire of fair play in world affairs.

The Press constitutes the tribunes of this great Empire, and, I may add, its lictors. They carry the big sticks. Their steadiness and their steadfastness inspired and sustained the greatest effort this Empire has yet put forth. In the great world war, without their unwearying support, even the indomitable spirit of the brave peoples who constitute this mighty Commonwealth might have flagged and failed. In no part of the Empire is their power and devotion more helpful than in the great Dominions.

No, we have not forgotten what our partners in Empire meant to us and did for us in the day of trial, when, in the sacred cause of humanity and honour, we accepted a challenge, the most formidable ever hurled at our heads in the whole history of this fateful land. We have not forgotten. We are not a demonstrative people. We are commonly reputed to be phlegmatic. We are certainly not as effusive as the nations who forgot as soon as danger was driven from their doors—no, from their very hearths—those without whose help they would have perished. We are mindful; we are grateful.

I remember the anxious time when the armies of three of the Allies were completely broken and dispersed, the fourth overwhelmed with a great disaster ; France thoroughly exhausted, and her army forced to rest ; Britain almost at the end of her man-power, and America without a regiment in the trenches. What could we have done if the hundreds of thousands of brave men from Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand and Newfoundland had not been with us in France, or available to reinforce those who were already there ; and the hundreds of thousands of gallant sons of India had not been there to help us in the East ?

Europe is not as satisfactory as it might be even now, but it is steadily improving. Let those who are discontented with the progress made just imagine what the condition of Europe would have been like to-day if the Allies had been overthrown and Prussian militarism had been enthroned on that Continent. The ground covered by democracy in its notable advance in the nineteenth century towards the era of enlightened freedom would have been lost, and we should have been flung back bruised and broken into the age of selfish force. It has happened before in the history of the world, when violence and barbarism triumphed over ordered progress.

The British Empire made it possible for humanity to avert that catastrophe. The title of the Dominions to nationhood was won in rendering the greatest service to mankind ever achieved by any young people in history, and on that record the old nations of the earth assembled at Versailles gladly admitted these heroic young nations into their ancient and honourable fraternity. The Great War was a revelation of the infinite possibilities of the British Empire. It forced eyes that had barely glanced at its vastness to dwell upon it with amazement, with understanding, and with hope.

The prospect in front of the British Empire staggers the imagination. It is not a dream ; it is a purely arithmetical calculation. In order to understand what this gigantic commonwealth of nations has before it, you need not take the pen of the poet or the brush of the painter ; the humble pencil of the reckoner is enough. What its capabilities are to-day the world has been taught in the sternest of all schools—that of war. What its possibilities are for to-morrow any man can calculate for himself. But to realise all these possibilities one must also study and comprehend thoroughly, candidly, and fearlessly its limitations and dangers.

They consist in the immense distances which have to be traversed by the bonds of union, for apart from the immensity of its territories there is the further fact that they are scattered in every continent, every ocean, every hemisphere, and every zone. They consist also in the variety of its races, creeds, traditions, and interests. The task of the true believer in the policy of consolidation is to assist in minimising all these difficulties so as to knit the Empire more closely together.

On a recent occasion I went to the extent of voting against my own party on an Imperial issue submitted to the British Parliament. That does not blind me to the danger of seeking unity on the basis of a controversial issue, and my fervent appeal to all loyal sons of the Empire is this: That unity between the various parts of the Empire should be sought along lines which do not promote discord inside a single province of the Empire. There are in all the provinces of the Empire, including Britain, internal issues which provoke controversy, some economic, some historical, some racial or religious. If possible, unity must not be sought along lines which rouse any of these controversies, traverse any of these issues, or offend any of these susceptibilities.

The British Empire is worthy of our best, our most sustained, and our most chivalrous endeavour. The Press can secure the triumph of this noble ideal of a United Empire of free nations, which shall be the watch-tower and citadel of peace, liberty, and fair play in the world.

JOHN HAMPDEN

(1594-1643).

BY refusing to pay an unlawfully levied tax, amounting in his case only to a few shillings, John Hampden forced the dethronement of Charles I. and the repudiation by the modern world of the theory of Royal Infallibility and the Divine Right of Kings. He was born in London in 1594, and in his twenty-seventh year entered Parliament as one of the leaders of the Popular party. In 1637, when the King attempted to collect the "Ship-Money" tax, levied by him without an act of Parliament, under the plea of urgent necessity, Hampden refused to pay, and the result was the celebrated "Ship-Money" case, in which he was defendant before the Court of Exchequer. The adverse verdict given by that court was cancelled by the House of Lords in 1641. Hampden took the field for Parliament when the appeal was made to arms, and on June 18th, 1643, he fell at Chalgrove Field. England has produced no greater patriot.

After the "Grand Remonstrance," Hampden was one of the five parliamentary leaders whom the King ineffectually attempted to impeach. Hampden's protest, delivered in Parliament just before the King left London, is a model of self-restraint. In explaining why he attempted the impeachment, the King declared that "those men and their adherents were looked upon by the affrighted vulgar as greater protectors of their laws and liberties than myself, and so worthier of their protection."

A PATRIOT'S DUTY DEFINED

(Delivered in the English Parliament, against his own Impeachment, January 4th, 1641).

IT is a true saying of a wise man, that all things happen alike to all men, as well to the good man as to the bad; there is no state or condition whatsoever, either of prosperity or adversity, but all sorts of men are sharers in the same; no man can be discerned truly by the outward appearance, whether he be a good subject either to his God, his prince,

or his country, until he be tried by the touchstone of loyalty: give me leave, I beseech you, to parallel the lives of either sort, that we may, in some measure, discern truth from falsehood, and in speaking I shall similize their lives.

1. In religion towards God. 2. In loyalty and true subjection to their sovereign; in their affection towards the safety of their country.

1. Concerning religion, the best means to discern between true and false religion is by searching the sacred writing of the Old and New Testaments, which is of itself pure, indited by the spirit of God, and written by holy men, unspotted in their lives and conversations; and by this sacred word may we prove whether our religion be of God or not; and by looking in this glass, we may discern whether we are in the right way or not.

And looking into the same, I find that by this truth of God, that there is but one God, one Christ, one faith, one religion, which is the Gospel of Christ, and the Doctrine of the Prophets and the Apostles.

In these two Testaments are contained all things necessary to salvation; if that our religion doth hang up this doctrine and no other secondary means, then it is true; to which comes nearest the Protestant religion which we profess, as I really and verily believe; and consequently that religion which joineth with this doctrine of Christ and his Apostles the traditions and inventions of men, prayers to the Virgin Mary, angels, saints, that are used in the exercise of their religion, strange and superstitious worshipping, cringing, bowing, creeping to the altar, using pictures, dirges, and such like, cannot be true, but erroneous, nay devilish; and all this is used and maintained in the Church of Rome as necessary as the Scripture, to salvation; therefore it is a false and erroneous church, both in doctrine and discipline, and all other sects and schisms that lean not only on the Scripture, though never so contrary to the Church of Rome, are a false worshipping of God, and not the true religion. And thus much concerning religion, to discern the truth and falsehood thereof.

2. I come now to the second thing intimated unto you, which was how to discern in a state between good subjects and bad, by their loyalty and due subjection to their lawful sovereign, in which I shall, under favour, observe two things.

First, lawful subjection to a king in his own person, and the commands, edicts, and proclamations of the prince and his privy council.

Second, lawful obedience to the laws, statutes, and ordinances made and enacted by the king and the lords, with the free consent of his great council of state assembled in Parliament.

For the first; to deny a willing and dutiful obedience to a lawful sovereign and his privy council (for as Cambden truly saith, the commands of the lords, privy counsellors, and the edicts of the prince are all one, for they are inseparable, the one never without the other), either to defend his royal person and kingdoms against the enemies of the same, either public or private ; or to defend the ancient privileges and prerogatives of the king, pertaining and belonging of right to his royal crown, and the maintenance of his honour and dignity ; or to defend and maintain true religion established in the land, according to the truth of God, is one sign of an evil and bad subject.

Second, to yield obedience to the commands of a king, if against the true religion, against the ancient and fundamental laws of the land, is another sign of an ill subject.

Third, to resist the lawful power of the king, to raise insurrection against the king, admit him adverse in his religion, to conspire against his sacred person, or any ways to rebel, though commanding things against our consciences in exercising religion, or against the rights and privileges of the subject, is an absolute sign of a disaffected and traitorous subject.

And now having given the signs of discerning evil and disloyal subjects, I shall only give you, in a word or two, the signs of discerning which are loyal and good subjects, only by turning these three signs already shown on the contrary side.

1. He that willingly and cheerfully endeavoureth himself to obey his sovereign's commands for the defence of his own person and kingdoms, for the defence of true religion, for the defence of the laws of his country, is a loyal and good subject.

2. To deny obedience to a king commanding anything against God's true worship and religion, against the ancient and fundamental laws of the land, in endeavouring to perform the same, is a good subject.

3. Not to resist the lawful and royal power of the king, to raise sedition or insurrection against his person, or to set division between the king and his good subjects by rebellion, although commanding things against conscience in the exercise of religion, or against the rights and privileges of the subject, but patiently for the same to undergo his prince's displeasure, whether it be to his imprisonment, confiscation of goods, banishment, or any other punishment whatsoever, without murmuring, grudging, or reviling against his sovereign or his proceedings, but submitting willingly and cheerfully himself and his cause to Almighty God, is the only sign of an obedient and loyal subject.

I come now to the second means to know the difference between a good subject and a bad, by their obedience to the laws, statutes, and ordinances made by the king with the whole consent of his Parliament. And in this I observe a two-fold subjection in the particular members thereof, dissenting from the general votes of the whole Parliament. And, secondly, the whole state of the kingdom to a full Parliament.

First, I confess, if any particular member of a Parliament, although his judgment and vote be contrary, do not willingly submit to the rest, he is an ill subject to the king and country.

Second, to resist the ordinance of the whole state of the kingdom, either by stirring up a dislike in the heart of his Majesty's subjects of the proceedings of Parliament; to endeavour by levying of arms to compel the king and Parliament to make such laws as seem best to them; to deny the power, authority, and privileges of Parliament; to call aspersions upon the same, and proceedings, thereby inducing the king to think ill of the same, and to be incensed against the same; to procure the untimely dissolution and breaking off of the Parliament before all things be settled by the same, for the safety and tranquillity both of king and state, is an apparent sign of a traitorous and disloyal subject against his king and country.

And having thus troubled your patience, in showing the difference between true Protestants and false, loyal subjects and traitors, in a state or kingdom, and the means how to discern them, I humbly desire my actions may be compared with either, both as I am a subject, Protestant, and native in this country, and as I am a member of this present and happy Parliament; and as I shall be found guilty upon these articles exhibited against myself and the other gentlemen, either a bad or a good subject, to my gracious sovereign and native country, I am ready to receive such sentence upon the same as by this honourable House shall be conceived to agree with law and justice.

KING HENRY VIII.

(1491-1547).

HENRY VIII. was born in 1491, as the third child and second son of Henry VII. He became Prince of Wales by the death of his elder brother in 1502, and succeeded to the throne in 1509 amid universal acclamations called forth by his outstanding merits, both mental and physical. He died in 1547.

The reader may be referred to his text-book of English history for the mere facts of Henry's reign—the wars with France and Scotland, the breach with Rome, the six marriages, and so forth. But in weighing them he is advised to keep well before his mind the following eminently just appreciation of Henry's importance, from the pen of Mr. H. A. L. Fisher: "Gross, cruel, crafty, hypocritical, avaricious, he was nevertheless a great ruler of men. His grasp of affairs was firm and comprehensive; his devotion to public duty was, at least after Wolsey's fall, constant and sustained by a high and kingly sense of his own virtues and responsibilities. Before the judgment seat of his watchful, exacting, and imperious conscience, he at least was never found wanting. The fragments of his eloquence which have been preserved are superb; his state papers are rich with the glow of a powerful and impetuous intellect. Despite violent oscillations of mood he saw the large objects of policy with a certain steadfast intensity, the preservation of the dynasty, the unity of the state, the subjection of Scotland. In a sense he may be said to have created the navy, founding a guild, now known as Trinity House, for the supply of trained pilots, organising in 1546 the first regular naval board, and leaving at his death a fleet of 7 vessels. His government, which depreciated the coinage, flogged vagabonds, broke up the institutions which had provided relief to the poor, burned heretics at the stake, stamped out the old order with ruthless cruelty in many a Yorkshire and Lancashire village, was yet a government to which in all the ordinary concerns of life lowly men might look for even-handed justice; a despotism, furnished with an apparatus of resonant and edifying apologies, but not without enlightenment, conscience, and virtue."

LAST SPEECH IN PARLIAMENT

ON the 24th December, Henry for the last time in his life appeared in Parliament for the prorogation. When the business was over and the address was presented, the chancellor was beginning as usual to reply in the king's name, when Henry unexpectedly rose from his seat, and, with a half apology for the interruption, requested to be allowed to speak in his own person.

The address had contained the ordinary compliments to royalty. He commenced by saying :—

" I regard such expressions rather as a point of rhetoric, to put me in remembrance of qualities lacking in myself, which I would use my endeavour to obtain ; and I trust my hearers will help me with their prayers. If any point or iota of you is already in me, God is therefore to be thanked, and not me, from whom came all goodness and virtuous quality. I thank the House for their liberality in the grant of the subsidy, for which, however, considering it is to be employed not for my own use, but for the safety of the commonwealth, I feel not so much obliged, as for the permission which they have given me to dispose as I should think good of the chantries and colleges. This measure I accept as a proof of your confidence as well in my integrity as in my discretion ; and you will see in the disposition which I intend, that I desire to serve God faithfully, and to provide for the wants of the poor."

His manner was unusual, ' he spoke,' said Sir John Mason, ' so sententiously, so kingly, so rather fatherly ' that he was listened to with peculiar emotion.

He had spoken of the business of the session. He then paused—hesitated—his voice shook—he burst into tears.

" The present is not the first time that my subjects have allowed me to see their affection for me ; I trust that they know that, as their hearts are towards me, so is my heart towards them. One other thing there is, however, in which I must work alone ; and I must call upon you all to help me, in the name and for the honour of Almighty God.

" I hear that, the special foundation of our religion being charity between man and man, it is so refrigerate as there was never more dissension and lack of love between man and man, the occasions whereof are opinions only and names devised for the continuance of the same. Some are called Papists, some Lutherans, and some Anabaptists ; names devised of the devil, and yet not fully without ground, for the severing of one man's heart by conceit of opinion from the other. For the remedy whereof, I desire, first, every man of himself to travail first for his own amendment. Secondly, I exhort the bishops and clergy, who are noted to be the salt and lamps of the world, by amending of their diversions, to give example to the rest, and to agree especially in their teaching —which, seeing there is but one truth and verity, they may easily do, calling therein for the aid of God. Finally, I exhort the nobles and the people not to receive the grace of God in vain ; and albeit, by the instinct of God, the Scriptures have been permitted unto them in the English tongue, yet not to take upon them the judgment and exposition of the same, but reverently and humbly, with fear and dread, to receive and use the knowledge which it hath pleased God to show unto them, and in any doubt to resort unto the learned, or at best the higher powers. I am very sorry to know and hear how unreverently that precious jewel the Word of God is disputed, rhymed, sung, and jangled in every alehouse and tavern. This kind of man is depraved, and that kind of man : this ceremony and that ceremony. Of this I am sure, that charity was never so faint among you ; and God himself, amongst Christians, was never less reverenced, honoured, and served. Therefore, as I said before, be in the charity one with another, like brother and brother. Have respect to the pleasing of God, and then I doubt not that love I spake of shall never be dissolved betwixt us. Then may I justly rejoice that thus long I have lived to see this day, and you, by verity, conscience, and charity between yourselves, may in this point, as you be in divers others, accounted among the rest of the world as blessed men ! "

SIR ROBERT HOLBORNE

(*c.* 1594-1647).

SIR ROBERT HOLBORNE, whose claim to immortality rests on his service as attorney for John Hampden in resistance to the unlawfully levied tax of "Ship-Money," was the son of Sir Nicholas Holborne, of Chichester. He represented Southwark in the Short Parliament of 1640, and served for a time in the Long Parliament, in which, however, he did not distinguish himself, except by his endeavours to prevent the attainder of Strafford. This separated him from his party, and he finally joined the King at Oxford. Under royal favour he became Attorney-General to the Prince of Wales and received the honour of knighthood. He died in 1647, leaving a considerable number of works on law which might have been forgotten wholly but for his defence of Hampden.

His speech for Hampden was at all times a summing up of authorities rather than a discussion of principles.

IN DEFENCE OF JOHN HAMPDEN

(Delivered 1637, before the Judges in the Exchequer Chamber, in the Great Case of Ship-Money).

I HAVE gone over in a general way, as well as I can, and endeavoured to answer the practice; to have gone over all in particular would have required longer time than your lordships can spare.

The reasons now only rest to be examined; for if no full authority, nor sufficient practice, reason alone will not argue against a fundamental rule: for we are not now to examine on reason what is fit, and what not, but to see what is the truth.

The first is, *salus populi suprema lex*! The question is not what we are to do by necessity, but what is the positive law of the land. The question must now be as before; what power is in the king, and what did our forefathers in that time of peace and government leave in the crown, not in the case of necessity and public danger; when, with them, *salus populi* was *suprema lex*, and upon that they did ground the rule of government? In this case, whether or not, in their consideration, they did conceive for the public good, to leave the power in the king or not, to lay a charge on the people; there the rule came in, *salus reipublicæ suprema lex*: and that which they looked on most was the benefit of the multitude. So that now, my lords, it is not to dispute whether it be better or worse, but that it was. And to show there was no such great necessity as can countervail the possibility of prejudice the other way; if there do come such a danger, then the subject is at that time under a law of preservation of life; and all which makes the subject as willing to obey as to submit to government in the creation. This law is of a higher force than any positive law can be. But admit that this should cease in this case, and all positive laws of property yield to the law of necessity; yet I admit nothing, though I might admit much, and not prejudice the case.

Though no positive law doth charge it, yet in case of imminent danger, if I should say my private property is become public, it is no mischief, for so it is in some cases; for in this time of imminent danger, the king and subjects are under a law of absolute necessity and public safety. In all human reason, when the danger is *in proxima potentia*, we may prevent it; thus if another man's house be on fire, mine may be pulled down to stop it: so that we may see by what grounds we do go in case of absolute necessity. If the king doth command anything concerning the property of goods, in respect of danger; the execution may not be by any positive law merely, which in such cases do cease in *furore belli*; for those are acted by formalities, and *inter arma silent leges*. And in these cases, as the king may command my property, so may the subject command the property of another. The books are so (8th Ed. 4). For hindering the landing of an enemy, bulwarks may be built on my land without consent. So the power is not only in the king in these cases of necessity, but in the subject: and the books say not that the power is only in the king, but I can do it, and the law of necessity is the warrant.

Then, my lords, it resteth considerable in this case, what shall be said to be a time of necessity? I speak still by way of admittance, for I grant nothing. It must be in a danger now acting or *in proxima potentia*; as fire, though not burning, yet ready to burn: that is, there must be a war, *furor belli*. Note that when the king makes proclamation of war, or the king is in the field; and that, indeed, was not Mr. St. John's meaning, it was taken further than he meant it.

It must be in such a danger, when this power is of necessity to be used, as in case of fire; there must not only be fear of fire, for one house must be first actually on fire, before the house can be pulled down, but withal such a danger, that if this be not pulled down, the other will be lost; and as in case of an enemy, a subject, out of fear of an enemy, cannot build a bulwark on another man's land, but when he is a-coming. So that none of these cases will match ours. The property yieldeth not in fear of danger; but such a danger as help must come in *nunc aut nunquam*. This time is not when the king will think there is occasion to exert this power, as in the case of 1588. Though the queen and State did command the burning of those goods and provisions, if an enemy landed (which was a lawful command, and justifiable to be done); so they did land; but could not command them to burn their corn before an enemy did come.

Your lordships know the king may command in case of danger the destruction of all suburbs, rather than an enemy should come in them. But if there be a fear only of wars, if the king should command it, how far that is justifiable I leave it to your lordships' judgment. All this difference appears out of the case of the Gravesend barge. (Duffield's case, 12 Jac.) If there be a storm, or a leak in the ship, that the danger be actual, it is justifiable for the master to throw out the goods; but if he see a cloud arise, and out of fear of a storm he throw out the goods, I doubt on a jury which way this will go with the bargeman; but if a storm do come, or a leak spring, in that case the bargeman may do it. So you see upon what law my property yieldeth. That position generally taken, as it is said, may be of a good deal of consequence; for it doth not rest there, solely upon yielding of the laws of property: for all positive laws do cease in that danger; then the positive laws of my liberty and person also do cease.

Now, whether or not you conceive all laws of liberty and person to cease in this time of danger, when the danger was but conceived and not actual,—that I leave to your lordships' judgment. And if that rule be general, then why not the other? So we may see the difference from our case; for in that case there is no manner of loss to the subject, for he shall have allowance for his loss, or make suit to the Parliament, and they can recompense him; for what is taken for the public good is borrowed. As in the case of shipping, if my goods be cast out to save the ship, every one of the ship is to bear a share; so in our case, either the king must do it, or the Parliament: so there is no prejudice.

So upon the whole, my answer is: Admit the rule of *salus populi suprema lex*; yet the law of practice doth not yield till there be an actual enemy, or *flagrans bellum*. It is not enough that there be but an apprehension.

There were divers other reasons urged, but those two of *salus populi suprema lex*, and of private property must yield to public safety, were the two *rationes cogentes*; the other were but *a pari et a simili*; and all those I shall pass over which were only for convenience, as the granting of toll, or a corporation to make ordinance for the good of the corporation; all these will not come home in the manner. My lords, in all these cases, *a minore ad majus non valet*; *negativum valet.*

But there are only two reasons urged which require an answer. The trust that the laws put in the king in greater matters, namely, the shutting of the ports, and the Droit Royal of wars and peace. For the shutting of the ports there is more difference in point of prejudice of the king than the subject. The king cannot shut the ports but to his own prejudice. Again, the shutting of the ports without cause of necessity, the king hath the loss as well as we; for by that he loseth his customs, and by shutting them he can gain nothing at all. And, besides, there is no law at all that hinders him from that. But there is a law saith that he shall not tax the subject without consent in Parliament.

The next is the Droit Royal of wars and peace. It is one thing to say the king can make war and peace, another thing to say he can charge. In war and peace the king is equally charged with the subject, and no more; and for those things there are no great reasons, but that in the first form of government they might be well suffered. For that cause touching the king's power over coinage, there was a necessity to counterpoise the like thing in another State; in that case the king loseth, and we lose. The King may dispense with penal statutes and make them as none. Doth any law say he shall not do it? The reason differeth in that case; there is a common necessity that there should be a power in somebody, for acts of Parliament are but *leges temporis.* It is one thing for the king to have power in point of favour, and another thing in point of charge; so in case of pardon there is no hurt if he doth pardon: God forbid that he should not have power to show mercy.

My lords, there are in the case two points more which I shall move. Whether or not, admitting that the king could command the subjects to find ships, he can give power to the sheriffs to make the assessment as in the writ, the ground is upon this, that in all cases of politic charges the law takes an especial care to make an equality. In Parliaments of old they were always careful to make provision that way, as upon fifteenths and subsidies. And in Danegelt they went such a way as there could be no inequality; they went by "taxing the hides." Now if the law doth make this a legal way of charging, it allows the like way for assessment that is allowed in other cases, such as a way as wherein there can be no inconveniency. Now how a sheriff hath that knowledge to lay it on men's estates and lands I cannot tell.

My lords, is it well not to leave the power in the king to lay an arbitrary charge, but in the sheriff to lay more or less on any man? Though the law may trust the king, yet it is a question whether it will trust the sheriff. Nay, I ask if the sheriff be an officer of law in this case, yet the king may command any man as well. Assessments are usually made by others, and not so much by the sheriff. So I do conceive that this is a thing that doth properly belong not to the sheriff; he is not an officer sworn, and it resteth not only in the sheriff but the under-sheriff. So that if the law doth trust the king, yet whether or not this be the way to charge it, I leave it to your lordships' judgment. If a hundred charged, they have ways to lay it on themselves proportionately.

The next thing is this: admit a levy may be well made, whether the money thus paid may be brought into the exchequer by a *Sci. fa.* I do think that this is the first writ that ever was of this kind; I do not find it regularly.

My lords, I think it is hard to find where there is a writ that commands and prescribes the manner of levy. It not only gives you power to levy, but sets the way of levying, by imposition, by distress, by selling; for my part I know no case can match it.

DAVID HUME

(1711-1776).

THE life of Hume was very uneventful. He was of calm, phlegmatic temper, and his energies were devoted solely to philosophy. He was born on his father's small estate of Ninewells in Berwickshire, and probably belonged to a branch of the noble house of Home of Douglas. We do not know much about his early training and education, but he seems to have shown an early inclination to philosophical problems. He studied Cicero, Seneca, Butler, Locke and Berkeley; and the last two he read so intensely as to produce a state of complete physical exhaustion.

He was bent on making a name for himself in the world of literature. He had tried a few of the ordinary ways of making a living without success, and he now settled in France for three years for his health's sake. During this time he wrote his first book, a "Treatise of Human Nature," which was published in 1739. It did not have at all the effect its chagrined author had expected, but the failure only confirmed his determination to make a name by writing. Three years later the first volume of his Essays appeared and received a good share of recognition. The "Philosophical Essays" issued in 1748 were not at first so favourably received. In 1751 appeared "Political Discourses" and the "Inquiry concerning the Principles of Morals." Failing to gain the chair of moral philosophy at Edinburgh he obtained the librarianship of the Advocates' Library, in spite of charges of heresy. He now began his "History of England" which, though it greatly increased his fame, in time grew to be little but Tory propaganda. Of "Four Dissertations" that came out in 1757, two, "The Natural History of Religion" and "Of the Passions" are very good examples of his best work.

The last seven years of his life were passed in Edinburgh where he became the centre of the cultivated society of the city and a venerable patron of letters. And there in August, 1776, he died.

He was eminent as a historian and important as a political economist, but his fame rests upon his philosophical writings, especially the "Treatise of Human Nature," which distinctly mark an epoch in the development of modern thought.

THE SCEPTICAL PHILOSOPHY

IT may seem a very extravagant attempt of the sceptics to destroy reason by argument and ratiocination; yet is this the grand scope of all their enquiries and disputes. They endeavour to find objections, both to our abstract reasonings, and to those which regard matter of fact and existence.

The chief objection against all abstract reasonings is derived from the ideas of space and time; ideas, which, in common life and to a careless view, are very clear and intelligible, but when they pass through the scrutiny of the profound sciences (and they are the chief object of these sciences) afford principles, which seem full of absurdity and contradiction. No priestly dogmas, invented on purpose to tame and subdue the rebellious reason of mankind, ever shocked common sense more than the doctrine of the infinitive divisibility of extension, with its consequences; as they are pompously displayed by all geometricians and metaphysicians, with a kind of triumph and exultation. A real quantity, infinitely less than any finite quantity, containing quantities infinitely less than itself, and so on in infinitum; this is an edifice so bold and prodigious, that it is too weighty for any pretended demonstration to support, because it shocks the clearest and most natural principles of human reason. But what renders the matter more extraordinary, is, that these seemingly absurd opinions are supported by a chain of reasoning, the clearest and most natural; nor is it possible for us to allow the premises without admitting the consequences. Nothing can be more convincing and satisfactory than all the conclusions concerning the properties of circles and triangles; and yet, when these are once received, how can we deny, that the angle of contact between a circle and its tangent is infinitely less than any rectilineal angle, that as you may increase the diameter of the circle in infinitum, this angle of contact becomes still less, even in infinitum, and that the angle of contact between other curves and their tangents may be infinitely less than those between any circle and its tangent, and so on, in infinitum? The demonstration of these principles seems as unexceptionable as that which proves the three angles of a triangle to be equal to two right ones, though the latter opinion be natural and easy, and the former big with contradiction and absurdity. Reason here seems to be thrown into a kind of amazement and suspense, which, without the suggestion of any sceptic, gives her a diffidence of herself, and of the ground on which she treads. She sees a full light, which illuminates certain places; but that light borders upon the most profound darkness. And between these she is so dazzled and confounded, that she scarcely can pronounce with certainty and assurance concerning any one object.

The absurdity of these bold determinations of the abstract sciences seems to become, if possible, still more palpable with regard to time than extension. An infinite number of real parts of time, passing in succession, and exhausted one after another, appears so evident a contradiction, that no man, one should think, whose judgment is not corrupted, instead of being improved, by the sciences, would ever be able to admit of it.

Yet still reason must remain restless, and unquiet, even with regard to that scepticism, to which she is driven by these seeming absurdities and contradictions. How any clear, distinct idea can contain circumstances, contradictory to itself, or to any other clear, distinct idea, is absolutely incomprehensible; and is, perhaps, as absurd as any proposition which can be formed. So that nothing can be more sceptical, or more full of doubt and hesitation, than this scepticism itself, which arises from some of the paradoxical conclusions of geometry or the science of quantity.

The sceptical objections to moral evidence, or to the reasonings concerning matter of fact, are either popular or philosophical. The popular objections are derived from the natural weakness of human understanding; the contradictory opinions, which have been entertained in different ages and nations; the variations of our judgment in sickness and health, youth and old age, prosperity and adversity; the perpetual contradiction of each particular man's opinions and sentiments; with many other topics of that kind. It is needless to insist farther on this head. These objections are but weak. For as, in common life, we reason every moment concerning fact and existence, and cannot possibly subsist, without continually employing this species of argument, any popular objections, derived from thence, must be insufficient to destroy that evidence. The great subverter of Pyrrhonism or the excessive principles of scepticism is action, and employment, and the occupations of common life. These principles may flourish and triumph in the schools; where it is, indeed, difficult, if not impossible, to refute them. But as soon as they leave the shade, and by the presence of the real objects, which actuate our passions and sentiments, are put in opposition to the more powerful principles of our nature, they vanish like smoke, and leave the most determined sceptic in the same condition as other mortals.

The sceptic, therefore, had better keep within his proper sphere, and display those philosophical objections, which arise from more profound researches. Here he seems to have ample matter of triumph;

while he justly insists, that all our evidence for any matter of fact, which lies beyond the testimony of sense or memory, is derived entirely from the relation of cause and effect; that we have no other idea of this relation than that of two objects, which have been frequently conjoined together; that we have no argument to convince us, that objects, which have, in our experience, been frequently conjoined, will likewise, in other instances, be conjoined in the same manner; and that nothing leads us to this inference but custom or a certain instinct of our nature; which it is indeed difficult to resist, but which, like other instincts, may be fallacious and deceitful. While the sceptic insists upon these topics, he shows his force, or rather, indeed, his own and our weakness; and seems, for the time at least, to destroy all assurance and conviction. These arguments might be displayed at greater length, if any durable good or benefit to society could ever be expected to result from them.

For here is the chief and most confounding objection to excessive scepticism, that no durable good can ever result from it; while it remains in its full force and vigour. We need only ask such a sceptic: What his meaning is? And what he proposes by all these curious researches? He is immediately at a loss, and knows not what to answer. A Copernican or Ptolemaic, who supports each his different system of astronomy, may hope to produce a conviction, which will remain constant and durable, with his audience. A Stoic or Epicurean displays principles, which may not be durable, but which have an effect on conduct and behaviour. But a Pyrrhonian cannot expect, that his philosophy will have any constant influence on the mind; or if it had, that its influence would be beneficial to society. On the contrary, he must acknowledge, if he will acknowledge anything, that all human life must perish, were his principles universally and steadily to prevail. All discourse, all action would immediately cease; and men remain in a total lethargy, till the necessities of nature, unsatisfied, put an end to their miserable existence. It is true, so fatal an event is very little to be dreaded. Nature is always too strong for principle. And though a Pyrrhonian may throw himself or others into a momentary amazement and confusion by his profound reasonings; the first and most trivial event in life will put to flight all his doubts and scruples, and leave him the same, in every point of action and speculation, with the philosophers of every other sect, or with those who never concerned themselves in any philosophical researches. When he awakes from his dream, he will be the first to join in the laugh against himself, and to confess, that all his objections are mere amusement, and can have no other tendency than to show the whimsical condition of mankind, who must act and reason and believe; though they are not able, by their most diligent enquiry, to satisfy themselves concerning the foundation of these operations, or to remove the objections, which may be raised against them.

There is, indeed, a more mitigated scepticism or academical philosophy, which may be both durable and useful, and which may, in part, be the result of this Pyrrhonism, or excessive scepticism, when its undistinguished doubts are, in some measure, corrected by common sense and reflection. The greater part of mankind are naturally apt to be affirmative and dogmatical in their opinions; and while they see objects only on one side, and have no idea of any counterpoising argument, they throw themselves precipitately into the principles, to which they are inclined; nor have they any indulgence for those who entertain opposite sentiments. To hesitate or balance perplexes their understanding, checks their passion, and suspends their action. They are, therefore, impatient till they escape from a state, which to them is so uneasy: and they think, that they could never remove themselves far enough from it, by the violence of their affirmations and obstinacy of their belief. But could such dogmatical reasoners become sensible of the strange infirmities of human understanding, even in its most perfect state, and when most accurate and cautious in its determinations; such a reflection would naturally inspire them with more modesty and reserve, and diminish their fond opinion of themselves, and their prejudice against antagonists. The illiterate may reflect on the disposition of the learned, who, amidst all the advantages of study and reflection, are commonly still diffident in their determinations: and if any of the learned be inclined, from their natural temper, to haughtiness and obstinacy, a small tincture of Pyrrhonism might abate their pride, by showing them, that the few advantages, which they may have attained over their fellows, are but inconsiderable, if compared with the universal perplexity and confusion, which is inherent in human nature. In general, there is a degree of doubt, and caution, and modesty, which, in all kinds of scrutiny and decision, ought for ever to accompany a just reasoner.

Another species of mitigated scepticism which may be of advantage to mankind, and which may be the natural result of the Pyrrhonian doubts and scruples, is the limitation of our enquiries to such subjects as are best adapted to the narrow capacity of human understanding. The imagination of man is naturally sublime, delighted with whatever is remote and extraordinary, and running, without control, into the most distant parts of space and time in order to avoid the objects, which custom has rendered too familiar to it. A correct judgment observes a contrary method, and avoiding all distant and high enquiries, confines itself to common life, and to such subjects as fall under daily practice and experience; leaving the more sublime topics to the embellishment of poets and orators, or to the arts of priests and politicians. To bring us to so salutary a determination, nothing can be more serviceable, than to be once thoroughly convinced of the force of the Pyrrhonian doubt, and of the impossibility, that anything, but the strong power of natural instinct, could free us from it. Those who have a propensity to philosophy, will still continue their researches; because they reflect, that, besides the immediate pleasure, attending such an occupation, philosophical decisions are nothing but the reflections of common life, methodized and corrected. But they will never be tempted to go beyond common life, so long as they consider the imperfection of those faculties which they employ, their narrow reach, and their inaccurate operations. While we cannot give a satisfactory reason, why we believe, after a thousand experiments, that a stone will fall, or fire burn; can we ever satisfy ourselves concerning any determination, which we may form, with regard to the origin of worlds, and the situation of nature, from, and to eternity?

This narrow limitation, indeed, of our enquiries, is, in every respect, so reasonable, that it suffices to make the slightest examination into the natural powers of the human mind and to compare them with their objects, in order to recommend it to us. We shall then find what are the proper subjects of science and enquiry.

It seems to me, that the only objects of the abstract sciences or of demonstration are quantity and number, and that all attempts to extend this more perfect species of knowledge beyond these bounds are mere sophistry and illusion. As the component parts of quantity and number are entirely similar, their relations become intricate and involved; and nothing can be more curious, as well as useful, than to trace, by a variety of mediums, their equality or inequality, through their different appearances. But as all other ideas are clearly distinct and different from each other, we can never advance farther, by our utmost scrutiny, than to observe this diversity, and, by an obvious reflection, pronounce one thing not to be another. Or if there be any difficulty in these decisions, it proceeds entirely from the undeterminate meaning of words, which is corrected by juster definitions. That the square of the hypotenuse is equal to the squares of the other two sides, cannot be known, let the terms be ever so exactly defined, without a train of reasoning and enquiry. But to convince us of this proposition, that where there is no property, there can be no injustice, it is only necessary to define the terms, and explain injustice to be a violation of property. This proposition is, indeed, nothing but a more imperfect definition. It is the same case with all those pretended syllogistical reasonings, which may be found in every other branch of learning, except the sciences of quantity and number; and these may safely, I think, be pronounced the only proper objects of knowledge and demonstration.

All other enquiries of men regard only matter of fact and existence; and these are evidently incapable of demonstration, whatever it may not be. No negation of a fact can involve a contradiction. The non-existence of any being, without exception, is as clear and distinct an idea as its existence. The proposition, which affirms it not to be, however false, is no less conceivable and intelligible, than that which affirms it to be. The case is different with the sciences, properly so called. Every proposition, which is not true, is there confused and unintelligible. That the cube root of 64 is equal to the half of 10, is a false proposition, and can never be distinctly conceived. But that Cæsar, or the angel Gabriel, or any being never existed may be a false proposition, but still is perfectly conceivable, and implies no contradiction.

The existence, therefore, of any being can only be proved by arguments from its cause or its effect; and these arguments are founded entirely on experience. If we reason *a priori*, anything may appear able to produce anything. The falling of a pebble may, for aught we know, extinguish the sun; or the wish of a man control the planets in their orbits. It is only experience which teaches us the nature and bounds of cause and effect, and enables us to infer the existence of one object from that of another. Such is the foundation of moral reasoning which forms the greater part of human knowledge, and is the source of all human action and behaviour.

Moral reasonings are either concerning particular or general facts. All deliberations in life regard the former; as also all disquisitions in history, chronology, geography, and astronomy.

The sciences, which treat of general facts, are politics, natural philosophy, physic, chemistry, etc., where the qualities, causes and effects of a whole species of objects are enquired into.

Divinity or Theology, as it proves the existence of a Deity, and the immortality of souls, is composed partly of reasonings concerning particular, partly concerning general facts. It has a foundation in reason, so far as it is supported by experience. But its best and most solid foundation is faith and divine revelation.

Morals and criticism are not so properly objects of the understanding as of taste and sentiment. Beauty, whether moral or natural, is felt, more properly than perceived. Or if we reason concerning it, and endeavour to fix its standard, we regard a new fact, to wit, the general tastes of mankind, or some such fact, which may be the object of reasoning and enquiry.

When we run over libraries, persuaded of these principles, what havoc must we make? If we take in our hand any volume; of divinity or school metaphysics, for instance; let us ask: Does it contain any abstract reasoning concerning quantity or number? No. Does it contain any experimental reasoning concerning matter of fact and existence? No. Commit it then to the flames: for it can contain nothing but sophistry and illusion.

CARL GUSTAV JUNG

(1875-).

PROFESSOR JUNG, the Swiss physician and psychologist, was born in Thurgau, one of the northern cantons of Switzerland. He studied medicine at Basle and psychopathology at Paris. From 1900 to 1909 he worked in the psychiatric clinic of Zurich, and was appointed lecturer on medical psychology in the University there. From his experiments in mental association he deduced his theory of complexes which has become the fundamental conception of psycho-analysis.

He founded in 1911 the International Psycho-analytical Society and became acquainted with his fellow worker in the same field, Sigmund Freud. But disagreeing with the emphasis the latter laid upon sex as a psychological factor he broke away from the Freudian school at Vienna, and established a school of his own at Zurich.

His publications include "Psychology of Dementia Præcox," 1907; "Psychology of the Unconscious," 1916; and "Theory of Psycho-analysis," 1915.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF BELIEF IN SPIRITS

(Read at a General Meeting of the Psychical Research Society, 1919).

IF we look back into the past of mankind, we find—among many other religious convictions—a universally spread belief in the existence of phantoms or ethereal beings dwelling in the neighbourhood of men, and influencing them invisibly, yet very powerfully. These beings are frequently supposed to be the spirits, or souls, of the dead. This belief is to be met with among most highly civilized men, as well as among Australian negroes who are still living at the level of the palæolithic age. Among Western peoples, however, belief in the influence of spirits has been counteracted by the development of natural science and intellectual criticism during the last hundred and fifty years, so that among the educated of to-day it has been almost completely suppressed together with other ultra-scientific convictions.

But just as these latter beliefs still exist among the masses, belief in spirits also is far from being entirely extinguished. The "haunted house," for instance, has not yet disappeared from the most business-like or intellectual cities, nor has the peasant yet ceased to believe in the bewitching of his cattle. On the contrary, a recrudescence of belief in spirits occurred even in an age of materialism, which is the inevitable consequence of intellectual enlightenment. It was not a recrudescence of obscure superstitions, but of an interest in its essence scientific, an intense desire to direct the searchlight of truth on to the dark chaos of facts. The illustrious names of Myers, Sidgwick, Gurney, Wallace, Crookes, Zoellner and many other prominent men, are associated with the rebirth and the rehabilitation of the ancient belief in spirits. Even if the real nature of the observed facts be disputed, even if the explorers may be accused of errors, and sometimes of self-deception, there still belongs to them the immortal merit of having thrown the whole of their authority on to the side of non-material facts, regardless of public disapproval. They faced academic prejudices, and did not shrink from the cheap derision of their contemporaries; even at a time when the intellect of the educated classes was spellbound by the new dogma of materialism, they drew public attention to phenomena of an irrational nature, contrary to accepted convictions.

These men typify the reaction of the human mind against the senseless and desolating materialistic view. Considered from the standpoint of history it is not to be wondered at that so-called "spiritual" phenomena should be used as an efficient weapon against the mere testimony of the senses, because belief in spirits has always been a defence against mere sensationalism. This is the case with the primitive man, whose complete dependence upon nature makes concrete circumstances of the greatest importance for him. One must remember the manifold distresses and needs of his life, placed amongst hostile neighbours and dangerous animals, and often harrowed by a merciless nature. His keen senses, his cupidity, his deficient self-control, all expose him to adverse experiences. Hence he is always in danger of losing that mystic and supernatural something which alone makes man a man. But his belief in spirits, or rather in the spiritual, delivers him from the fetters of a merely tangible and visible world again and again. It is this irrational function that forces on him the certainty of spiritual reality, whose laws and demands are to be followed as carefully and as conscientiously as those relating to physical nature. Primitive man really lives in two worlds. This concrete world is for him at the same time a spiritual world. The objective world is undeniable, and for him the spiritual world has an equally positive existence. This is not only his opinion, but rather a naïve perception of spiritual phenomena, projected from his unconscious on to the concrete object. Wherever such naïveté is lost through the disillusioning touch of contact with Western civilization and its disastrous " enlightenment," then also his feelings of awe in relation to the spiritual law disappear, and consequently he degenerates. Even Christianity cannot save him from degeneration, because in order to have a beneficial effect on man, such a highly developed religion demands a highly differentiated psyche.

Thus " spiritual " phenomena are for the primitive an immediate experience of an ideal or spiritual reality.

If it be asked, what are primitive " spirit " phenomena, we may answer that the seeing of apparitions is the most frequent phenomenon. It is generally assumed that this seeing of apparitions is commoner among primitives than among civilized people, and that it is due to nothing but superstition. It is generally held that educated people do not have such visions, unless they are ill. It is quite certain that civilized man makes use of the hypothesis of " spirits " incomparably less frequently than the primitive. In my view, however, and according to my experience as a physician, the psychological phenomenon which the primitive attributes to a spirit is quite as common among civilized men. The only difference is that where a primitive speaks of ghosts, the European speaks of dreams and phantasies and neurotic symptoms, and attributes less importance to them than the primitive does. He gives them too little weight, and on account of this undervaluation the European regards many things as morbid which, under another aspect, would be highly interesting and highly important. Therefore, owing to this rationalizing, what are living entities for the primitive become for him morbid symptoms. Men's perceptions are the same as they always were, but we interpret them in a different way, and the modern way enfeebles them, making an incomprehensible illness of them. But the psychological fact in itself is not invalidated by a modern interpretation. If, indeed, a highly civilized and enlightened European is obliged to live in primitive conditions for a long time, it often happens that he has some unusual experiences which defy a rationalistic interpretation.

One of the essential determinants of belief in spirits is the dream. Persons appear in most dreams, and the primitive believes them to be spirits or souls. The dream has for him an incomparably higher value than for a civilized man. He is usually a good deal taken up with his dreams; he talks much of them and attributes an extraordinary importance to them. When he talks of his dreams he is frequently unable to discriminate between them and actual facts. They are quite real to him. A competent explorer of primitive psychology says: "Le rêve est le vrai dieu des primitifs." To the civilized man as a rule dreams appear to be valueless; yet there are some individuals who attribute a high importance to them, at least to particularly weird and impressive dreams. Such impressive dreams make one understand why the primitive should suppose them to be inspirations. It is of the essence of an inspiration that there must be something that inspires, a spirit or a ghost, although the modern mind would not draw such a conclusion. The appearance of the dead in a dream seems a particularly strong argument for the primitive belief in spirits.

Further grounds for belief in spirits are found in psychogenic nervous diseases, especially those of a hysterical character, which are not rare among primitives. As such troubles arise out of psychological conflicts, mostly of an unconscious order, they appear to the naïve mentality as if caused by certain persons, living or dead, who are in some way connected with the individual's conflict. If the person is dead, the assumption that his spirit is persecuting the living is easily arrived at. As the origin of pathogenic conflicts frequently goes back to early childhood and is connected with memories of the parents, it naturally follows that the spirits of relatives are particularly revered or feared by primitives; hence ancestor worship is universally spread. Worship of the dead, in the first place, is undertaken as a protection against their malevolence. Experience in the psychological treatment of nervous patients shows again and again how great the influence of the parents is, even when they have been long dead. The psychological after-effects of the parents are so important for an individual's fate that one can easily understand the significance of ancestor worship.

Mental diseases have also great influence in causing belief in spirits, particularly those which are accompanied by hallucinations, either of a delirious or katatonic character, belonging chiefly to the Dementia Præcox class, which is the commonest form of mental disorder. Always and everywhere insane persons have been regarded as possessed by evil spirits, and this belief is supported by the patients' hallucinations. The patients are less tormented by their visions than by the voices they hear. The voices are often those of relatives or at least of people connected with the patient's psychological conflicts. It is also fairly common to hear the voice of God or of the devil. It appears, of course, to the naïve mentality that such voices come from spirits.

When speaking of belief in spirits of the dead reference must also be made to belief in souls of the living, the latter belief being a correlate of the former. In the primitive conviction the ghost is generally the spirit of a dead person, hence it must before have been the soul of a living person. This at least is held where the belief that man has only one soul prevails. But man is frequently supposed to have two or more souls, one of which is more or less independent and relatively immortal. In such a case the " spirit " of the dead is only one of the several " souls " of the living. Hence it is only a part of the psyche—a psychical fragment, as it were. Thus belief in souls is an almost necessary condition of belief in spirits, at least so far as the spirits of the dead are concerned. The primitive is convinced that there are not only such spirits, but also elementary demons, who are not believed to have ever been human souls or psychical fragments of them.

Before discussing the grounds for belief in souls I wish to sum up the facts already mentioned. I have pointed out three main sources of the belief in spirits which are accessible to science, viz.: the seeing of apparitions, the phenomenon of the dream, and the pathological disorders of the psyche.

The commonest of these grounds of belief is the dream. What does modern science know of the dream ? A dream is a psychological product originating in the sleeping state without conscious motivation. In a dream consciousness is neither fully awake nor fully extinguished; there is still a small amount of consciousness. There is, for instance, nearly always some consciousness of the ego, but rarely of the ego as it appears to a consciousness fully awake. It is rather a limited ego, sometimes peculiarly transformed or distorted. The dream-ego is, as a rule, a mere fragment of the conscious ego. The ego is a psychic complex of a particularly solid kind. As sleep is seldom dreamless, we may assume that the complex of the ego rarely ceases to be active. Its activity is but restricted by sleep. The psychic contents of the dream appear to the ego just like those external phenomena which appear to it in the waking state. Hence it happens that we find ourselves in situations like those in real life, but rarely exercise thought or reason about them. As in our waking state things and human beings enter our field of vision, so in the dream, psychic contents, images of different kinds, enter the field of consciousness of the dream-ego. We do not feel as if we were producing the dreams, but rather as if they came to us. They do not submit to our direction, but obey their own laws. Obviously they are autonomous complexes, which form themselves by their own methods. Their motivation is unconscious. We may therefore say that they come from the unconscious. Thus, we must admit the existence of independent psychic complexes, escaping the control of our consciousness and appearing and disappearing according to their own laws. From our waking experience we are convinced that we produce our thoughts and that we can produce them when we wish. We also think we know where our thoughts come from, and why, and to what end we have them. If it should happen that a thought takes possession of us against our will, or if it unexpectedly disappears against our will, we feel as if something exceptional or morbid had happened. It seems as if the difference between the waking and the sleeping states were extraordinary. In the waking state the psyche is apparently controlled by our conscious motivation, but in the sleeping state it seems to produce strange and incomprehensible ideas, which force themselves on us sometimes quite against our intention.

Similarly the vision comes like a dream, but in the waking state. It enters consciousness concurrently with the perception of real objects, being an emergence of unconscious ideas into the continuity of consciousness.

The same phenomenon takes place in mental disease. The ear does not only perceive the vibrations of sound, but it also seems to hear thoughts, which are not the immediate contents of the conscious mind.[1] Besides the judgments made by intellect and feeling, opinions and convictions arise forcing themselves upon the individual, apparently based upon perceptions, but in reality derived from unconscious ideas. Such are delusions.

These types of phenomena—dreams, waking visions and mental disease—depend on the fact that the psyche as a whole is not an indivisible unity, but a more or less divided totality. Although the separate parts are connected with each other, they yet are relatively independent of each other. Their independence extends so far that certain of the psychic fragments are very rarely, or perhaps never, associated with the ego. I have called those fragments autonomous complexes, and I founded my theory of complexes upon their empirical existence. According to this theory the ego-complex forms the centre of our individuality. But the ego-complex is but one among several complexes. The other complexes are more or less associated with the ego-complex and thus far they are conscious. But they also can exist for some time without being associated with the ego-complex.

A striking and well-known example thereof is the conversion of St. Paul. Although the moment of a conversion seems sometimes quite sudden and unexpected, yet we know from repeated experience that such a fundamental occurrence always has a long period of unconscious incubation. It is only when the preparation is complete, that is to say, when the individual is ready to be converted, that the new view breaks forth with great emotion. St. Paul had already been a Christian for a long time, but unconsciously; hence his fanatical resistance to the Christians, because fanaticism exists chiefly in individuals who are compensating for secret doubts. The incident of his hearing the voice of Christ on his way to Damascus marks the moment when the unconscious complex of Christianity became conscious. That the auditory phenomenon should represent Christ is explained by the already existing unconscious Christian complex. The complex, being unconscious, was projected by St. Paul on the external world as if it did not belong to him. Unable to conceive of himself as a Christian, and on account of his resistance to Christ, he became blind, and could only regain his sight through submission to a Christian, that is to say, through his complete submission to Christianity. Psychogenic blindness is, according to my experience, always due to an unwillingness to see, *i.e.*, to understand and to accept, what is incompatible with the conscious attitude. This was obviously the case with St. Paul. His unwillingness to see corresponds with his fanatical resistance to Christianity. This resistance was never wholly extinguished, a fact of which we have proof in the epistles. It broke forth at times in the fits he suffered from. It is certainly a great mistake to call his fits epileptic. There is no trace of epilepsy in them, on the contrary, St. Paul himself in his epistles gives hints enough as to the real nature of the illness. They are clearly psychogenic fits, which really mean a return of the old Saul-complex, repressed through conversion in the same way as there had previously been a repression of the complex of Christianity.

---

[1] There are also some exceptional cases where the voices loudly repeat the conscious thoughts of the individual.

Science does not allow us consistently with intellectual honesty to explain the case of St. Paul on supernatural grounds. We should be compelled to do the same with many similar cases within our medical experience, which would lead to conclusions antagonistic both to our reason and feeling.

Autonomous complexes appear in dreams and visions, in pathological hallucinations and delusions. Being strange to the ego they always appear as if externalized. In dreams, they are often represented as other persons; in visions, they are visibly projected into space; the same is the case with voices in insane people, in so far as they are not ascribed to persons in the patients' surroundings. Ideas of persecution are very often associated with persons to whom the patient attributes the qualities of certain of his unconscious complexes. The patient feels these persons to be hostile because his ego is hostile to the unconscious complex, just as Saul resented the complex of Christianity which he could not acknowledge. He persecuted the Christians as representatives of his unconscious complex.

"Spirits," viewed from this standpoint, are unconscious autonomous complexes which appear as projections because they are not associated with the ego.

JOHN KNOX

(1505-1572).

"IT is evident," said John Knox, "that the sword of God is not committed to the hand of man to use as it pleases him, but only to punish vice and maintain virtue." The speaker who made such assertions as this in the sixteenth century did it at the risk of his life. It is an assertion of the divine right of the subject to pass judgment on the exercise of the divine right claimed by kings. Knox is generally called "the greatest Reformer of Scotland." He was a Revolutionist as well as a Reformer, and the result of his protests against arbitrary power appeared unmistakably in the judgment passed on Charles I. He was born at Haddington, not far from Edinburgh, in 1505. His family belonged to the common people, but he obtained at Glasgow University and elsewhere an education far above that of the average churchman of the day. As a preacher, Knox became so celebrated that in 1551, after his removal to England, he was made one of the six Royal Chaplains, and in that capacity assisted in the revision of the prayer book under Edward VI. Leaving England for the Continent during the reign of Queen Mary, he made the acquaintance of Calvin and spent much time at Geneva. In 1559 he returned to Scotland, where, until his death in 1572, he was engaged in one hazardous contest after another with what he considered the "powers of darkness." As a result of his influence, his 'Confession of Faith' was adopted by Scotland on August 17th, 1560, and the Presbyterian Church, as he organized it, became the established Church of Scotland.

AGAINST TYRANTS

(Delivered in Edinburgh, 1565, from Isaiah xxvi., 13-16).

AS the skilful mariner, being master, having his ship tossed with a vehement tempest and contrary winds, is compelled oft to traverse, lest that, either by too much resisting to the violence of the waves, his vessel might be overwhelmed, or, by too much liberty granted, might be carried whither the fury of the tempest would, so that his ship should be driven upon the shore, and made shipwreck, even so doth our prophet Isaiah in this text, which now you have heard read. For he foreseeing the great desolation that was decreed in the council of the Eternal against Jerusalem and Judah, namely, that the whole people that bear the name of God should be dispersed ; that the holy city should be destroyed ; the temple wherein was the ark of the Covenant, and where God had promised to give his own presence, should be burned with fire ; and the king taken, his sons in his own presence murdered, his own eyes immediately after be put out ; the nobility, some cruelly murdered, some shamefully led away captives ; and finally the whole seed of Abraham razed, as it were, from the face of the earth—the prophet, I say, fearing these horrible calamities, doth, as it were, sometimes suffer himself, and the people committed to his charge, to be carried away with the violence of the tempest, without further resistance than by pouring forth his and their dolorous complaints before the majesty of God, as in the thirteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth verses of this present text we may read. At other times he valiantly resists the desperate tempest, and pronounces the fearful destruction of all such as trouble the Church of God ; which he pronounces that God will multiply, even when it appears utterly to be exterminated. But because there is no final rest to the whole body till the head return to judgment, he exhorts the afflicted to patience, and promises a visitation whereby the wickedness of the wicked shall be disclosed, and finally recompensed in their own bosoms.

These are the chief points of which, by the grace of God, we intend more largely at this present to speak :—

First, the prophet saith, " O Lord our God, other lords besides thee have ruled us."

This, no doubt, is the beginning of the dolorous complaint, in which he complains of the unjust tyranny that the poor afflicted Israelites sustained during the time of their captivity. True it is that the prophet was gathered to his fathers in peace, before this came upon the people : for a hundred years after his decease the people were not led away captive ; yet he, foreseeing the assurance of the calamity, did beforehand indite and dictate unto them the complaint, which afterward they should make. But at the first sight it appears that the complaint has but small weight ; for what new thing was it that other lords than God in his own person ruled them, seeing that such had been their government from the beginning ? For who knows not that Moses, Aaron, and Joshua, the judges Samuel, David, and other godly rulers, were men, and not God ; and so other lords than God ruled them in their greatest prosperity ?

For the better understanding of this complaint, and of the mind of the prophet, we must, first, observe from whence all authority flows; and second, to what end powers are appointed by God: which two points being discussed, we shall better understand what lords and what authority rule beside God, and who they are in whom God and his merciful presence rules.

The first is resolved to us by the words of the Apostle, saying: "There is no power but of God." David brings in the eternal God speaking to judges and rulers, saying: "I have said ye are gods, and sons of the Most High." And Solomon, in the person of God, affirmeth the same, saying: "By me kings reign, and princes discern the things that are just." From which place it is evident that it is neither birth, influence of stars, election of people, force of arms, nor, finally, whatsoever can be comprehended under the power of nature, that makes the distinction betwixt the superior power and the inferior, or that establishes the royal throne of kings; but it is the only and perfect ordinance of God, who willeth his terror, power, and majesty, partly to shine in the thrones of kings, and in the faces of judges, and that for the profit and comfort of man. So that whosoever would study to deface the order of government that God has established, and allowed by his holy word, and bring in such a confusion that no difference should be betwixt the upper powers and the subjects, does nothing but avert and turn upside down the very throne of God, which he wills to be fixed here upon earth; as in the end and cause of this ordinance more plainly shall appear: which is the second point we have to observe, for the better understanding of the prophet's words and mind.

The end and cause, then, why God imprints in the weak and feeble flesh of man this image of his own power and majesty, is not to puff up flesh in opinion of itself; neither yet that the heart of him that is exalted above others should be lifted up by presumption and pride, and so despise others, but that he should consider he is appointed lieutenant to One, whose eyes continually watch upon him, to see and examine how he behaves himself in his office. St. Paul, in few words, declares the end wherefore the sword is committed to the powers, saying: "It is to the punishment of the wicked doers, and unto the praise of such as do well."

Of which words it is evident that the sword of God is not committed to the hand of man to use as it pleases him, but only to punish vice and maintain virtue, that men may live in such society as is acceptable before God. And this is the true and only cause why God has appointed powers in this earth.

For such is the furious rage of man's corrupt nature that, unless severe punishment were appointed and put in execution upon malefactors, better it were that man should live among brutes and wild beasts than among men. But at this present I dare not enter into the descriptions of this common place; for so should I not satisfy the text, which by God's grace I purpose to explain. This only by the way—I would that such as are placed in authority should consider whether they reign and rule by God, so that God rules them; or if they rule without, besides, and against God, of whom our prophet here complains.

If any desire to take trial of this point, it is not hard; for Moses, in the election of judges, and of a king, describes not only what persons shall be chosen to that honour, but also gives to him that is elected and chosen the rule by which he shall try himself, whether God reign in him or not, saying: "When he shall sit upon the throne of his kingdom, he shall write to himself an exemplar of this law, in a book by the priests and Levites; it shall be with him, and he shall read therein, all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, and to keep all the words of his law, and these statutes, that he may do them; that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not from the commandment, to the right hand, or to the left."

The same is repeated to Joshua, in his inauguration to the government of the people, by God himself, saying: "Let not the book of this law depart from thy mouth, but meditate in it day and night, that thou mayest keep it, and do according to all that which is written in it. For then shall thy way be prosperous, and thou shalt do prudently."

The first thing, then, that God requires of him who is called to the honour of a king, is, the knowledge of his will revealed in his word.

The second is, an upright and willing mind, to put in execution such things as God commands in his law, without declining to the right, or to the left hand.

Kings, then, have not an absolute power to do in their government what pleases them, but their power is limited by God's word; so that if they strike where God has not commanded, they are but murderers; and if they spare where God has commanded to strike, they and their throne are criminal and guilty of the wickedness which abounds upon the face of the earth, for lack of punishment.

O that kings and princes would consider what account shall be craved of them, as well of their ignorance and misknowledge of God's will as for the neglecting of their office! But now to return to the words of the prophet. In the person of the whole people he complains unto God that the Babylonians (whom he calls "other lords besides God," both because of their ignorance of God and by reason of their cruelty and inhumanity) had long ruled over them in great rigour, without pity or compassion upon the ancient men and famous matrons; for they, being mortal enemies to the people of God, sought by all means to aggravate their yoke, yea, utterly to exterminate the memory of them, and of their religion, from the face of the earth. . . . .

Hereof it is evident that their disobedience unto God and unto the voices of the prophets was the source of their destruction. Now have we to take heed how we should use the good laws of God; that is, his will revealed unto us in his word; and that order of justice which, by him, for the comfort of man, is established among men. There is no doubt but that obedience is the most acceptable sacrifice unto God, and that which above all things he requires; so that when he manifests himself by his word, men should follow according to their vocation and commandment. Now so it is that God, by that great pastor our Lord Jesus, now manifestly in his word calls us from all impiety, as well of body as of mind, to holiness of life, and to his spiritual service; and for this purpose he has erected the throne of his mercy among us, the true preaching of his word, together with the right administration of his sacraments; but what our obedience is, let every man examine his own conscience and consider what statutes and laws we would have to be given unto her.

Wouldst thou, O Scotland! have a king to reign over thee in justice, equity, and mercy? Subject thou thyself to the Lord thy God, obey his commandments, and magnify thou the word that calleth unto thee, "This is the way, walk in it"; and if thou wilt not, flatter not thyself; the same justice remains this day in God to punish thee, Scotland, and thee, Edinburgh especially, which before punished the land of Judah and the city of Jerusalem. Every realm or nation, saith the prophet Jeremiah, that likewise offendeth shall be likewise punished but if thou shalt see impiety placed in the seat of justice above thee, so that in the throne of God (as Solomon complains) reigns nothing but fraud and violence, accuse thine own ingratitude and rebellion against God; for that is the only cause why God takes away "the strong man and the man of war, the judge and the prophet, the prudent and the aged, the captain and the honourable, the counsellor and the cunning artificer; and I will appoint, saith the Lord, children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them. Children are extortioners of my people, and women have rule over them."

If these calamities, I say, apprehend us, so that we see nothing but the oppression of good men and of all godliness, and that wicked men without God reign above us, let us accuse and condemn ourselves, as the only cause of our own miseries. For if we had heard the voice of the Lord our God, and given upright obedience unto the same, God would have multiplied our peace, and would have rewarded our obedience before the eyes of the world. But now let us hear what the prophet saith further: "The dead shall not live," saith he, "neither shall the tyrants, nor the dead arise, because thou hast visited and scattered them, and destroyed all their memory."

From this fourteenth verse unto the end of the nineteenth, it appears that the prophet observes no order; yea, that he speaks things directly repugning one to another; for, first, he saith: "The dead shall not live"; afterwards he affirms: "Thy dead men shall live." Secondly, he saith: "Thou hast visited and scattered them, and destroyed all their memory." Immediately after, he saith, "Thou hast increased thy nation, O Lord, thou hast increased thy nation. They have visited thee, and have poured forth a prayer before thee."

Who, I say, would not think that these are things not only spoken without good order and purpose, but also manifestly repugning one to another? For to live, and not to live, to be so destroyed that no memorial remains, and to be so increased that the coasts of the earth shall be replenished, seems to impart plain contradiction. For removing of this doubt, and for better understanding the prophet's mind, we must observe that the prophet had to do with divers sorts of men; he had to do with the conjured and manifest enemies of God's people, the Chaldeans or Babylonians; even so such as profess Christ Jesus have to do with the Turks and Saracens. He had to do with the seed of Abraham, whereof there were three sorts. The ten tribes were all degenerated from the true worshipping of God and corrupted with idolatry, as this day are our pestilent papists in all realms and nations; there rested only the tribe of Judah at Jerusalem, where the form of true religion was observed, the law taught, and the ordinances of God outwardly kept. But yet there were in that body, I mean in the body of the visible Church, a great number that were hypocrites, as this day yet are among us that profess the Lord Jesus, and have refused papistry; also not a few that were licentious livers; some that turned their backs to God, that is, had forsaken all true religion; and some that lived a most abominable life, as Ezekiel saith in his vision; and yet there were some godly, as a few wheat-corns oppressed and hid among the multitude of chaff: now, according to this diversity, the prophet keeps divers purposes, and yet in most perfect order.

And first, after the first part of the complaint of the afflicted, as we have heard, in vehemency of spirit he bursts forth against all the proud enemies of God's people, against all such as trouble them, and against all such as mock and forsake God, and saith: "The dead shall not live, the proud giants shall not rise; thou hast scattered them and destroyed their memorial." In which words he contends against the present temptation and dolorous state of God's people, and against the insolent pride of such as oppressed them ; as if the prophet should say : O ye troublers of God's people ! howsoever it appears to you in this your bloody rage that God regards not your cruelty, nor considers what violence you do to his poor afflicted, yet shall you be visited, yea, your carcasses shall fall and lie as stinking carrion upon the face of the earth, you shall fall without hope of life, or of a blessed resurrection ; yea, howsoever you gather your substance and augment your families, you shall be so scattered that you shall leave no memorial of you to the posterities to come, but that which shall be execrable and odious.

ALPHONSE MARIE LOUIS LAMARTINE

(1790-1869).

KNOWN outside of France chiefly by his "History of the Girondists" and similar historical works, Lamartine is ranked by his countrymen next to Hugo as a poet and orator. He shows the versatility which is illustrated better perhaps in the public life of Paris than it is anywhere else in the world. He was by turn poet, politician, essayist, orator, and writer of the history he had helped to make. He was born at Mâcon, October 21st, 1790. Going abroad at the age of twenty to complete his education, and spending much of the time in Italy, he published, ten years later, his "Méditations Poétiques," which greatly accelerated the impetus of France towards the Romantic school, afterwards developed by Victor Hugo. From 1820, when his first work appeared, until 1863, Lamartine published one successful volume after another. He was elected a member of the French Academy in 1830. During the Revolution of 1848 he was Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Provisional Government. Many of the speeches which he made during that period he has reported in the "History of the Revolution of 1848," among them the speech of May 7th, 1848, in which, as he says, "in the name and place of the President of the Provisional Government he gave an account of the acts of the Revolution." He died at Paris, March 1st, 1869.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1848

(Delivered May 7th, 1848, in the National Assembly at Paris).

AT the moment of your entrance on the exercise of your sovereignty—at the moment of our resigning into your hands the special powers with which the Revolution provisionally invested us—we wish, in the first place, to render you an account of the situation in which we found ourselves, and in which you also find the nation.

A revolution burst forth on the twenty-fourth of February. The people overthrew the throne. They swore upon its ruins thenceforth to reign alone, and entirely by themselves. They charged us to provide

temporarily for the necessity of the interregnum which they had to traverse to reach, without disorder or anarchy, their unanimous and final power. Our first thought was to abridge this interregnum by immediately convoking the national representation, in which alone reside right and force. Simply citizens, without any other summons than public peril, without any other title than our devotedness, trembling to accept, hastening to restore the deposit of national destinies, we have had but one ambition,—that of resigning the dictatorship to the bosom of popular sovereignty.

The throne overturned, the dynasty crumbling of itself, we did not proclaim the Republic ; it proclaimed itself, by the voice of an entire people ;—we did nothing but register the cry of the nation.

Our first thought, as well as the first requirement of the country, after the proclamation of the Republic, was the re-establishment of order and security in Paris. In this labour,—which would have been more difficult and more meritorious at another time and in another country,—we were aided by the concurrence of the citizens. While holding in one hand the musket which had just given the deathblow to royalty, this magnanimous people with the other raised up the vanquished and the wounded of the opposite party. They protected the life and property of the inhabitants. They preserved the public monuments. Each citizen of Paris was at once the soldier of liberty and the voluntary magistrate of order. History has recorded the innumerable acts of heroism, of probity and disinterestedness, which have characterized these first days of the Republic. Till this time the people had sometimes been flattered by allusions to their virtues ; posterity, which is no flatterer, will find all these expressions beneath the dignity of the people of Paris in this crisis.

It was they who inspired us with the first decree destined to give its true signification to victory,—the decree of the abolition of the penalty of death in political cases. They suggested, adopted, and ratified it, by the acclamation of two hundred thousand voices, on the square and quay of the Hôtel de Ville. Not a single exclamation of anger protested against it. France and Europe understood that God had his inspirations in the mass, and that a revolution inaugurated by grandeur of soul would be pure as an idea, magnanimous as a sentiment, and holy as a virtue.

The red flag, presented for a moment,—not as a symbol of menace and disorder, but as a temporary flag of victory,—was laid aside by the combatants themselves, to cover the Republic with that tricoloured flag which had shaded its cradle, and led the glory of our arms over every continent and every ocean.

After having established the authority of government in Paris, it was necessary to make the Republic recognized in the departments, the colonies, in Algeria, and the army. The telegraphic news and couriers were enough. France, her colonies and armies, recognized their own idea in the idea of the Republic. There was no resistance from a single hand or voice, nor from one free heart in France, to the installation of the new government.

Our second thought was for the exterior. Europe awaited, in doubt, the first word from France. This first word was the abolition, in fact and right, of the reactionary treaties of 1815 ; the restoration of liberty to our foreign policy ; the declaration of peace to the territories ; of sympathy to nations ; of justice, loyalty, and moderation, to governments. France, in this manifesto, laid aside her ambition, but did not lay aside her ideas. She permitted her principle to shine out. This was all her warfare. The special report of the minister of foreign affairs will show you the fruits of this noonday system of diplomacy, and the legitimate and great fruits it must yield to the influences of France.

This policy required the minister of war to employ measures in harmony with the system of armed negotiation. He energetically re-established a discipline scarcely shaken, and honourably recalled to Paris the army, removed temporarily from our walls, that the people might have an opportunity of arming themselves. The people, henceforth invincible, did not delay summoning with loud cries their brethren of the army, not only as the safeguard, but as the ornament, of the capital. In Paris the army was only an honorary garrison, designed to prove to our brave soldiers that the capital of the country belongs to all her children.

We decreed, moreover, the formation of four armies of observation : the army of the Alps, the army of the Rhine, the army of the North, and the army of the Pyrenees.

Our navy—confided to the hands of the same minister, as a second army of France—was rallied under its commanders, in a discipline governed by a confidence in its vigilance. The fleet of Toulon sailed to display our colours to nations friendly to France on the shores of the Mediterranean.

The army of Algiers had neither an hour nor a thought of hesitation. The Republic and the country were united in their view by a feeling of the same duty. A leader, whose republican name, sentiments, and talents, were at once pledges for the army and the revolution, General Cavaignac, received the command of Algeria.

The corruption which had penetrated the holiest institutions compelled the minister of war to adopt expurgations demanded by the public voice. It was necessary promptly to separate justice from policy. The minister made the separation with pain, but with inflexibility.

In proclaiming the Republic, the cry of France had not only proclaimed a form of government, but a principle. This principle was practical democracy, equality in rights, fraternity in institutions. The revolution accomplished by the people ought, according to us, to be organized for the profit of the people, by a series of fraternal and guardian institutions, proper to confer regularly on all the conditions of individual dignity, instruction, intelligence, wages, morality, the elements of labour, competence, aid, and advancement to property, which would suppress the servile name of proletary, and would elevate the labourer to the level of the rights, duties, and well-being of the firstborn of prosperity; to raise up and enrich the one, without debasing and degrading the other; to preserve property, and render it more prolific and sacred, by multiplying it and dividing it in the hands of the greatest number; distributing the taxes in such a manner as to make the burden fall heaviest on the strongest, by easing and succouring the weakest; to create by the state the labour which might accidentally fail, from the fact of the timidity of capital, so that there should not be a labourer in France whose bread and wages should fail him; and, finally, to study with the workmen themselves the practical and true phenomena of association, and the yet problematical theories of systems, and to seek conscientiously their applications, and to ascertain their errors;—such was the idea of the provisional government, in all the decrees; whose execution or examination it confided to the minister of finance, the minister of public works, and to the commissioner of the Luxemburg,—the laboratory of ideas, the preparatory and statistical congress of labour and employment, enlightened by studious and intelligent delegates from all the laborious professions, presided over by two members of the Government itself.

The sudden fall of the monarchy, the disorder of the finances, the momentary displacement of an immense mass of factory labourers, the shocks which these masses of unoccupied arms might have given society, if their reason, their patience, and their practical resignation, had not been a miracle of popular reason, and the admiration of the world; the recoverable debt of nearly a thousand millions, which the fallen Government had accumulated on the first two months of the Republic; the industrial and commercial crisis universal on the continent and in England, coinciding with the political crisis in Paris; the enormous accumulation of railway shares and other fictitious property thrown into the hands of agents and bankers by the panic of capital; finally, the imagination of the country, which is carried beyond the truth at moments of political convulsion and social terror, had exhausted active capital, caused the disappearance of specie, and suspended free and voluntary labour, the only labour sufficient for thirty-five millions of men. It was necessary to supply it temporarily, or be false to all the principles, all the precautions, and all the necessities of the Republic that can be relieved. The minister of finance will tell you how this prostration of labour and credit was provided for, while waiting for the moment now reached, when the restoration of confidence to men's minds would restore capital to the hands of manufacturers, and wages to labour; when your wisdom and national power will be equal to all difficulties.

The ministry of public instruction and worship, confided to the same hand, was for the Government a manifestation of intention, and for the country a presage of the new position which the Republic wished and ought to assume, under the twofold necessity of national enlightenment, and a more real independence of equal and free worship before conscience and the law.

The ministry of agriculture and commerce, a ministry foreign from its nature to politics, could only prepare with zeal, and sketch with sagacity, the new institutions summoned to fertilize the first of useful arts. It extended the hand of state over the suffering interests of commerce, which you alone can raise up by making them secure.

Such were our different and incessant cares. Thanks to that Providence, which has never more clearly manifested its intervention in the cause of nations and the human mind; thanks to the people themselves, who have never better shown the treasures of reason, civil virtue, generosity, patience, and morality,—the true civilization which fifty years of imperfect liberty have elaborated in their hearts,—we succeeded in accomplishing, very imperfectly without doubt, but yet not unhappily, a part of the immense and perilous task with which events had burdened us.

We have founded the Republic, a government declared impossible in France on any other conditions than foreign war, civil war, anarchy, prisons, and the scaffold. We have displayed a Republic, happily compatible with European peace, with internal security, with voluntary order, with individual liberty, with the sweetness and amenity of manners of a nation for whom hatred is a punishment, and harmony a national instinct.

We have promulgated the great principles of equality, fraternity, and unity, which must, in their daily development in our laws, enacted by all and for all, accomplish the unity of the people by the unity of representation.

We have rendered the right of citizenship universal, by rendering the right of election universal; and universal suffrage has responded to us.

We have armed the entire people in the National Guard, and the entire people has answered us by devoting the arms we confided to it to the unanimous defence of the nation, order, and law.

We have gone through the interregnum with no other executive force than the entirely unarmed moral authority, whose right the nation voluntarily recognized in us; and these people consented to suffer themselves to be governed by our words, our counsels, and their own generous inspirations.

We have passed more than two months of crisis, of cessation of labour, of misery, of elements of political agitation, of social sufferings and passions, accumulated in countless masses in a capital with a population of a million and a half, without property having been violated, without anger menacing a single life, without one repression, one proscription, one political imprisonment, without one drop of blood shed in our name, saddening the government in Paris. We can descend from this long dictatorship to the public square, and mingle with the people without one citizen being able to ask; "What hast thou done with a citizen?"

Before summoning the National Assembly to Paris, we completely assured its security and independence by arming and organizing the National Guard, and giving you an entire armed people for your protection. There is no longer a possibility of faction in a Republic where there is no longer a division between enfranchised and disfranchised citizens, between armed and unarmed citizens. All have their rights, all have their army. In such a State insurrection is no longer the extreme right of resistance to oppression; it would be a crime. He who separates himself from the people is no longer of the people. This is the unanimity we have created; perpetuate it, for it is the common safety.

Citizen-representatives! our work is accomplished; yours now begins. Even the presentation of a plan of government, or a project of constitution, on our part, would have been a rash prolongation of power, or an infringement on your sovereignty. We disappear the moment you rise to receive the Republic from the hands of the people. We will only permit ourselves a single counsel and a single wish, in the name of your citizenship, and not as members of the provisional government. This wish, citizens, France utters with us; it is the voice of circumstance. Do not waste time, that precious element of human crises. After having absorbed the sovereignty in yourselves, do not suffer a new interregnum to clog the wheels of the country. Let not a commission of

Government, springing from your body, allow power to fluctuate a single instant longer, precariously and provisionally, in a country which has need of power and security. Let a committee on a constitution, emanating from your suffrages, report, without delay, for your deliberation and vote, the simple, brief, and democratic mechanism of a constitution, whose organic and secondary laws you can afterwards discuss at your leisure.

In the meanwhile, as members of the Government, we restore to you our powers.

We also confidently submit all our acts to your judgment, only we pray you to take into consideration the period and the difficulties. Our conscience reproaches us with nothing intentionally wrong. Providence has favoured our efforts. Grant an amnesty to our involuntary dictatorship. We ask but to return to the ranks of good citizens.

THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY

(BARON MACAULAY)

(1800-1859).

IT was said of Macaulay's conversation that those who heard him never had the need—and seldom had the time—to think twice in order to understand him.

That he deserved this compliment—one of the highest which could be paid him as a writer—he shows alike in his essays, his history, his speeches, and his poems. Since the time of Cicero, he is the greatest master of lucid and exhaustive statement. Indeed, it may be said of him without great risk of exaggeration, that in the artistic handling of cumulative clauses he is one of Cicero's greatest pupils. Generous in his sympathies, liberal in his ideas, learned as few men of his own time or any other have been, having a memory retentive almost beyond belief, and an almost unequalled facility of expression, he became easily one of the ablest men of the nineteenth century, lacking nothing of greatness that the cultivation of the intellect could give him. What he did lack Emerson tells us plainly and comprehensively. "The brilliant Macaulay," he says, "who expresses the tone of the English governing classes of his day, explicitly teaches that 'good' means 'good to eat,' 'good to wear'—a material commodity."

Undoubtedly Macaulay believed in comfort. He has been called a very happy man, and he was certainly a very comfortable one. Never married, knowing nothing of the education of the deepest emotions which come from life in the family; admired as no other English essayist and historian had ever been; commanding unprecedented prices for his work; listened to with respect in the Cabinet and with rapt attention in Parliament; surrounded at home by well-loved books, whose contents he assimilated seemingly without effort; devoted to his work in literature; full of the broad sympathies with progress which made his public life a blessing to himself and to the world,—he lacked only the contradiction, the disturbance, the difficulty which Mr. Gladstone called "the rude and rocking cradle of every kind of excellence" to make him a greater orator than Burke, a greater statesman than Chatham. But, taking his life for what it was and his work for what it is, there is room in reason and in gratitude for nothing but thanks and praise. As an orator he illustrates the same perfection of lucid style which immortalizes his Essays. This is shown in his address, 'The Literature of Britain,' as it is in the abler address, 'Popular Education.' It must not be forgotten in considering the latter address, that however commonplace the great ideas it expresses may now seem to be, his genius in giving them expression so fit and memorable could not have failed to do much to give them that currency and vogue which finally achieve their triumph in becoming the commonplace.

Macaulay was born October 25th, 1800, and educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. He entered public life as a Member of Parliament in 1830 and divided his time between public affairs and literature until his death, December 28th, 1859. He was a member of the Supreme Council of India, and, after his return to England, served twice in the Cabinet. In 1857 he was raised to the peerage as "Baron Macaulay of Rothley."

W.V.B.

A TRIBUTE TO THE JEWS

(Delivered in the House of Commons, April 17th, 1833).

THE honourable Member for Oldham tells us that the Jews are naturally a mean race, a sordid race, a money-getting race; that they are averse to all honourable callings; that they neither sow nor reap; that they have neither flocks nor herds; that usury is the only pursuit for which they are fit; that they are destitute of all elevated and amiable sentiments. Such, sir, has in every age been the reasoning of bigots. They never fail to plead in justification of persecution, the vices which persecution has engendered. England has been free to the Jews less than half a century, and we revile them because they do not feel for England more than a half patriotism. We treat them as slaves, and wonder that they do not regard us as brethren. We drive them to mean occupations, and then reproach them for not embracing honourable professions. We long forbade them to possess land, and we complain that they chiefly occupy themselves in trade. We shut them out from all the paths of ambition, and then we despise them for taking refuge in avarice. During many ages we have, in all our dealings with them, abused our immense superiority of force, and then we are disgusted because they have recourse to that cunning which is the natural and universal defence of the weak against the violence of the strong. But were they always a mere money-changing, money-getting, moneyhoarding race? Nobody knows better than my honourable friend, the Member for the University of Oxford, that there is nothing in their national character which unfits them for the highest duties of citizens. He knows that in the infancy of civilization, when our island was as savage as New Guinea, when letters and arts were still unknown to Athens, when scarcely a thatched hut stood on what was afterwards the site of Rome, this contemned people had their fenced cities and cedar palaces, their splendid Temple, their fleets of merchant ships, their schools of sacred learning, their great statesmen and soldiers, their natural philosophers, their historians, and their poets. What nation ever contended more manfully against overwhelming odds for its independence and religion? What nation ever in its last agonies gave such signal proofs of what may be accomplished by a brave despair? And if, in the course of many centuries, the oppressed descendants of warriors and sages have degenerated from the qualities of their fathers; if, while excluded from the blessings of law, and bowed down under the yoke of slavery, they have contracted some of the vices of outlaws and of slaves, shall we consider this as matter of reproach to them? Shall we not rather consider it as matter of shame and remorse to ourselves? Let us do justice to them. Let us open to them the door of the House of Commons. Let us open to them every career in which ability and energy can be displayed. Till we have done this, let us not presume to say that there is no genius among the countrymen of Isaiah,—no heroism among the descendants of the Maccabees.

Sir, in supporting the motion of my honourable friend, I am, I firmly believe, supporting the honour and the interests of the Christian religion. I should think that I insulted that religion if I said that it cannot stand unaided by intolerant laws. Without such laws it was established, and without such laws it may be maintained. It triumphed over the superstitions of the most refined and of the most savage nations, over the graceful mythology of Greece and the bloody idolatry of the northern forests. It prevailed over the power and policy of the Roman Empire. It tamed the barbarians by whom that empire was overthrown. But all these victories were gained, not by the help of intolerance, but in spite of the opposition of intolerance. The whole history of Christianity proves that she has little, indeed, to fear from persecution as a foe, but much to fear from persecution as an ally. May she long continue to bless our country with her benignant influence, strong in her sublime philosophy, strong in her spotless morality, strong in those internal and external evidences to which the most powerful and comprehensive of human intellects have yielded assent, the last solace of those who have outlived every earthly hope, the last restraint of those who are raised above every earthly fear! But let us not, mistaking her character and her interests, fight the battle of truth with weapons of error, and endeavour to support by oppression that religion which first taught the human race the great lesson of universal charity.

CONSENT OR FORCE IN GOVERNMENT

(Speech in the House of Commons, October 10th, 1831).

IT is easy to say: "Be bold; be firm; defy intimidation; let the law have its course; the law is strong enough to put down the seditious." Sir, we have heard this blustering before, and we know in what it ended. It is the blustering of little men, whose lot has fallen on a great crisis. Xerxes scourging the waves, Canute commanding the waves to recede from his footstool, were but types of the folly. The law has no eyes; the law has no hands; the law is nothing—nothing but a piece of paper printed by the king's printer, with the king's arms at the top—till public opinion breathes the breath of life into the dead letter. We found this in Ireland. The elections of 1826—the Clare election, two years later—proved the folly of those who think that nations are governed by wax and parchment; and, at length, in the close of 1828, the government had only one plain alternative before it—concession or civil war.

I know only two ways in which societies can permanently be governed—by public opinion and by the sword. A government having at its command the armies, the fleets, and the revenues of Great Britain, might possibly hold Ireland by the sword. So Oliver Cromwell held Ireland; so William III. held it; so Mr. Pitt held it; so the Duke of Wellington might, perhaps, have held it. But to govern Great Britain by the sword—so wild a thought has never, I will venture to say, occurred to any public man of any party; and, if any man were frantic enough to make the attempt, he would find, before three days had expired, that there is no better sword than that which is fashioned out of a ploughshare! But if not by the sword, how are the people to be governed? I understand how the peace is kept at New York. It is by the assent and support of the people. I understand, also, how the peace is kept at Milan. It is by the bayonets of the Austrian soldiers. But how the peace is to be kept when you have neither the popular assent nor the military force,—how the peace is to be kept in England by a government acting on the principles of the present opposition,—I do not understand.

Sir, we read that, in old times, when the villeins were driven to revolt by oppression,—when the castles of the nobility were burned to the ground,—when the warehouses of London were pillaged,—when a hundred thousand insurgents appeared in arms on Blackheath,—when a foul murder, perpetrated in their presence, had raised their passions to madness,—when they were looking round for some captain to succeed and avenge him whom they had lost,—just then, before Hob Miller, or Tom Carter, or Jack Straw, could place himself at their head, the King rode up to them, and exclaimed: "I will be your leader!"—and at once the infuriated multitude laid down their arms, submitted to his guidance, dispersed at his command. Herein let us imitate him. Let us say to the people: "We are your leaders,—we, your own House of Commons." This tone it is our interest and our duty to take. The circumstances admit of no delay. Even while I speak, the moments are passing away,—the irrevocable moments, pregnant with the destiny of a great people. The country is in danger; it may be saved: we can save it. This is the way—this is the time. In our hands are the issues of great good and great evil—the issues of the life and death of the State.

THE GATES OF SOMNAUTH

(Delivered in the House of Commons, on March 9th, 1843).

On the ninth of March, 1843, Mr. Vernon Smith, Member for Northampton, made the following motion:

> "That this House, having regard to the high and important functions of the Governor-General of India, the mixed character of the native population, and the recent measures of the Court of Directors for discontinuing any seeming sanction to idolatry in India, is of opinion that the conduct of Lord Ellenborough in issuing the General Orders of the sixteenth of November, 1842, and in addressing the letter of the same date to all the chiefs, princes, and people of India, respecting the restoration of the gates of a temple to Somnauth, is unwise, indecorous, and reprehensible."

IF the practice of the honourable gentleman, the Secretary of the Board of Control, had been in accordance with his precepts, if he had not, after exhorting us to confine ourselves strictly to the subject before us, rambled far from that subject, I should have refrained from all digression. For in truth there is abundance to be said touching both the substance and the style of this proclamation. I cannot, however, leave the honourable gentleman's peroration entirely unnoticed. But I assure him that I do not mean to wander from the question before us to any great distance or for any long time.

I cannot but wonder, Sir, that he who has, on this, as on former occasions, exhibited so much ability and acuteness, should have gravely represented it as a ground of complaint, that my right honourable friend the member for Northampton has made this motion in the governor-general's absence. Does the honourable gentleman mean that this House is to be interdicted from ever considering in what manner her Majesty's Asiatic subjects, a hundred millions in number, are governed? And how can we consider how they are governed without considering the conduct of him who is governing them? And how can we consider the conduct of him who is governing them, except in his absence? For my own part, I can say for myself, and I may, I doubt not, say for my right honourable friend the member for Northampton, that we both of us wish, with all our hearts and souls, that we were discussing this question in the presence of Lord Ellenborough. Would to heaven, Sir, for the sake of the credit of England, and of the interest of India, that the noble lord were at this moment under our gallery! But, Sir, if there be any governor who has no right to complain of remarks made on him in his absence, it is that governor who, forgetting all official decorum, forgetting how important it is that, while the individuals who serve the state are changed, the state should preserve its identity, inserted in a public proclamation reflections on his predecessor, a predecessor of whom, on the present occasion, I will only say that his conduct had deserved a very different return. I am confident that no enemy of Lord Auckland, if Lord Auckland has an enemy in the House, will deny that, whatever faults he may have committed, he was faultless with respect to Lord Ellenborough. No brother could have laboured more assiduously for the interests and the honour of a brother than Lord Auckland laboured to facilitate Lord Ellenborough's arduous task, to prepare for Lord Ellenborough the means of obtaining success and glory. And what was the requital? A proclamation by Lord Ellenborough, stigmatising the conduct of Lord Auckland. And, Sir, since the honourable gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Control has thought fit to divert the debate from its proper course, I will venture to request that he, or the honourable director who sits behind him, will vouchsafe to give us some explanations on an important point to which allusion has been made. Lord Ellenborough has been accused of having publicly announced that our troops were about to evacuate Afghanistan before he had ascertained that our captive countrymen and countrywomen had been restored to liberty. This accusation, which is certainly a serious one, the honourable gentleman, the Secretary of the Board of Control, pronounces to be a mere calumny. Now, Sir, the proclamation which announces the withdrawing of the troops bears date the first of October, 1842. What I wish to know is, whether any member of the government, or of the Court of Directors, will venture to affirm that on the first of

October 1842, the governor-general knew that the prisoners had been set at liberty? I believe that no member either of the government or of the Court of Directors will venture to affirm any such thing. It seems certain that on the first of October the governor-general could not know that the prisoners were safe. Nevertheless, the honourable gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Control assures us that, when the proclamation was drawn up, the governor-general did know that the prisoners were safe. What is the inevitable consequence? It is this, that the date is a false date, that the proclamation was written after the first of October, and antedated? And for what reason was it antedated? I am almost ashamed to tell the House what I believe to have been the reason. I believe that Lord Ellenborough affixed the false date of the first of October to his proclamation because Lord Auckland's manifesto against Afghanistan was dated on the first of October. I believe that Lord Ellenborough wished to make the contrast between his own success and his predecessor's failure more striking, and that for the sake of this paltry, this childish, triumph, he antedated his proclamation, and made it appear to all Europe and all Asia that the English government was indifferent to the fate of Englishmen and Englishwomen who were in a miserable captivity. If this be so, and I shall be surprised to hear any person deny that it is so, I must say that by this single act, by writing those words, the first of October, the governor-general proved himself to be a man of an ill-regulated mind, a man unfit for high public trust.

I might, Sir, if I chose to follow the example of the honourable gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Control, advert to many other matters. I might call the attention of the House to the systematic manner in which the governor-general has exerted himself to lower the character and to break the spirit of that civil service on the respectability and efficiency of which chiefly depends the happiness of a hundred millions of human beings. I might say much about the financial committee which he appointed in the hope of finding out blunders of his predecessor, but which at last found out no blunders except his own. But the question before us demands our attention. That question has two sides, a serious and a ludicrous side. Let us look first at the serious side. Sir, I disclaim in the strongest manner all intention of raising any fanatical outcry or of lending aid to any fanatical project. I would very much rather be the victim of fanaticism than its tool. If Lord Ellenborough were called in question for having given an impartial protection to the professors of different religions, or for restraining unjustifiable excesses into which Christian missionaries might have been hurried by their zeal, I would, widely as I have always differed from him in politics, have stood up in his defence, though I had stood up alone. But the charge against Lord Ellenborough is that he has insulted the religion of his own country and the religion of millions of the Queen's Asiatic subjects in order to pay honour to an idol. And this the right honourable gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Control calls a trivial charge. Sir, I think it a very grave charge. Her Majesty is the ruler of a larger heathen population than the world ever saw collected under the sceptre of a Christian sovereign since the days of the Emperor Theodosius. What the conduct of rulers in such circumstances ought to be is one of the most important moral questions, one of the most important political questions, that it is possible to conceive. There are subject to the British rule in Asia a hundred millions of people who do not profess the Christian faith. The Mahometans are a minority : but their importance is much more than proportioned to their number : for they are united, a zealous, an ambitious, a warlike class. The great majority of the population of India consists of idolaters, blindly attached to doctrines and rites which, considered merely with reference to the temporal interests of mankind, are in the highest degree pernicious. In no part of the world has a religion ever existed more unfavourable to the moral and intellectual health of our race. The Brahminical mythology is so absurd that it necessarily debases every mind which receives it as truth ; and with this absurd mythology is bound up an absurd system of physics, an absurd geography, an absurd astronomy. Nor is this form of paganism more favourable to art than to science. Through the whole Hindoo Pantheon you will look in vain for anything resembling those beautiful and majestic forms which stood in the shrines of ancient Greece. All is hideous, and grotesque, and ignoble. As this superstition is of all superstitions the most irrational, and of all superstitions the most inelegant, so is it of all superstitions the most immoral. Emblems of vice are objects of public worship Acts of vice are acts of public worship. The courtesans are as much a part of the establishment of the temple, as much ministers of the god, as the priests. Crimes against life, crimes against property, are not only permitted but enjoined by this odious theology. But for our interference human victims would still be offered to the Ganges, and the widow would still be laid on the pile with the corpse of her husband, and burned alive by her own children. It is by the command and under the especial protection of one of the most powerful goddesses that the Thugs join themselves to the unsuspecting traveller, make friends with him, slip the noose round his neck, plunge their knives in his eyes, hide him in the earth, and divide his money and baggage. I have read many examinations of Thugs; and I particularly remember an altercation which took place between two of those wretches in the presence of an

English officer. One Thug reproached the other for having been so irreligious as to spare the life of a traveller when the omens indicated that their patroness required a victim. "How could you let him go? How can you expect the goddess to protect us if you disobey her commands? That is one of your north country heresies." Now, Sir, it is a difficult matter to determine in what way Christian rulers ought to deal with such superstitions as these. We might have acted as the Spaniards acted in the New World. We might have attempted to introduce our own religion by force. We might have sent missionaries among the natives at the public charge. We might have held out hopes of public employment to converts, and have imposed civil disabilities on Mahometans and Pagans. But we did none of these things; and herein we judged wisely. Our duty, as rulers, was to preserve strict neutrality on all questions merely religious: and I am not aware that we have ever swerved from strict neutrality for the purpose of making proselytes to our own faith. But we have, I am sorry to say, sometimes deviated from the right path in the opposite direction. Some Englishmen, who have held high office in India, seem to have thought that the only religion which was not entitled to toleration and to respect was Christianity. They regarded every Christian missionary with extreme jealousy and disdain; and they suffered the most atrocious crimes, if enjoined by the Hindoo superstition, to be perpetrated in open day. It is lamentable to think how long after our power was firmly established in Bengal, we, grossly neglecting the first and plainest duty of the civil magistrate, suffered the practices of infanticide and Suttee to continue unchecked. We decorated the temples of the false gods. We provided the dancing girls. We gilded and painted the images to which our ignorant subjects bowed down. We repaired and embellished the car under the wheels of which crazy devotees flung themselves at every festival to be crushed to death. We sent guards of honour to escort pilgrims to the places of worship. We actually made oblations at the shrines of idols. All this was considered, and is still considered, by some prejudiced Anglo-Indians of the old school, as profound policy. I believe that there never was so shallow, so senseless a policy. We gained nothing by it. We lowered ourselves in the eyes of those whom we meant to flatter. We led them to believe that we attached no importance to the difference between Christianity and heathenism. Yet how vast that difference is! I altogether abstain from alluding to topics which belong to divines. I speak merely as a politician anxious for the morality and the temporal well-being of society. And, so speaking, I say that to countenance the Brahminical idolatry, and to discountenance that religion which has done so much to promote justice, and mercy, and freedom, and arts, and sciences, and good government, and domestic happiness, which has struck off the chains of the slave, which has mitigated the horrors of war, which has raised women from servants and playthings into companions and friends, is to commit high treason against humanity and civilisation.

Gradually a better system was introduced. A great man whom we have lately lost, Lord Wellesley, led the way. He prohibited the immolation of female children; and this was the most unquestionable of all his titles to the gratitude of his country. In the year 1813 Parliament gave new facilities to persons who were desirous to proceed to India as missionaries. Lord William Bentinck abolished the Suttee. Shortly afterwards the home government sent out to Calcutta the important and valuable dispatch to which reference has been repeatedly made in the course of this discussion. That dispatch Lord Glenelg wrote, I was then at the Board of Control, and can attest the fact,—with his own hand. One paragraph, the sixty-second, is of the highest moment. I know that paragraph so well that I could repeat it word for word. It contains in short compass an entire code of regulations for the guidance of British functionaries in matters relating to the idolatry of India. The orders of the home government were express, that the arrangements of the temples should be left entirely to the natives. A certain discretion was of course left to the local authorities as to the time and manner of dissolving that connection which had long existed between the English government and the Brahminical superstition. But the principle was laid down in the clearest manner. This was in February 1833. In the year 1838 another dispatch was sent, which referred to the sixty-second paragraph in Lord Glenelg's dispatch, and enjoined the Indian government to observe the rules contained in that paragraph. Again in the year 1841, precise orders were sent out on the same subject, orders which Lord Ellenborough seems to me to have studied carefully for the express purpose of disobeying them point by point, and in the most direct manner. You murmur: but only look at the orders of the directors and at the proclamation of the governor-general. The orders are, distinctly and positively, that the British authorities in India shall have nothing to do with the temples of the natives, shall make no presents to those temples, shall not decorate those temples, shall not pay any military honour to those temples. Now, Sir, the first charge which I bring against Lord Ellenborough is, that he has been guilty of an act of gross disobedience, that he has done that which was forbidden in the strongest terms by those from whom his power is derived. The home government says, Do not interfere in the concerns of heathen temples. Is it denied that Lord Ellenborough has interfered in the concerns of a heathen temple? The home government says, Make no presents to heathen temples. Is it denied that Lord Ellenborough had proclaimed to all the world his intention to make a present to a heathen temple? The home government says, Do not decorate heathen temples. Is it denied that Lord Ellenborough has proclaimed to all the world his intention to decorate a heathen temple? The home government says, Do not send troops to do honour to heathen temples. Is it denied that Lord Ellenborough sent a body of troops to escort these gates to a heathen temple? To be sure, the honourable gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Control tries to get rid of this part of the case in rather a whimsical manner. He says that it is impossible to believe that, by sending troops to escort the gates, Lord Ellenborough can have meant to pay any mark of respect to an idol. And why? Because, says the honourable gentleman, the Court of Directors had given positive orders that troops should not be employed to pay marks of respect to idols. Why, Sir, undoubtedly, if it is to be taken for granted that Lord Ellenborough is a perfect man, if all our reasonings are to proceed on the supposition that he cannot do wrong, then I admit the force of the honourable gentleman's argument. But it seems to me a strange and dangerous thing to infer a man's innocence merely from the flagrancy of his guilt. It is certain that the home authorities ordered the governor-general not to employ the troops in the service of a temple. It is certain that Lord Ellenborough employed the troops to escort a trophy, an oblation, which he sent to the restored temple of Somnauth. Yes, the restored temple of Somnauth. Those are his lordship's words. They have given rise to some discussion, and seem not to be understood by everybody in the same sense. We all know that this temple is in ruins. I am confident that Lord Ellenborough knew it to be in ruins, and that his intention was to rebuild it at the public charge. That is the obvious meaning of his words. But, as this meaning is so monstrous that nobody here can venture to defend it, his friends pretend that he believed the temple to have been already restored, and that he had no thought of being himself the restorer. How can I believe this? How can I believe that, when he issued this proclamation, he knew nothing about the state of the temple to which he proposed to make an offering of such importance? He evidently knew that it had once been in ruins; or he would not have called it the restored temple. Why am I to suppose that he imagined it to have been rebuilt? He had people about him who knew it well, and who could have told him that it was in ruins still. To say that he was not aware that it was in ruins is to say that he put forth his proclamation without taking the trouble to ask a single question of those who were close at hand and were perfectly competent to give him information. Why, Sir, this defence is itself an accusation. I defy the honourable gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Control, I defy all human ingenuity, to get his lordship clear off from both the horns of this dilemma. Either way, he richly deserves a parliamentary censure. Either he published this proclamation in the recklessness of utter ignorance without making the smallest inquiry; or else he, an English and a Christian governor, meant to build a temple to a heathen god at the public charge, in direct defiance of the commands of his official superiors. Turn and twist the matter which way you will, you can make nothing else of it. The stain is like the stain of Blue Beard's key, in the nursery tale. As soon as you have scoured one side clean, the spot comes out on the other.

So much for the first charge, the charge of disobedience. It is fully made out: but it is not the heaviest charge which I bring against Lord Ellenborough. I charge him with having done that which, even if it had not been, as it was, strictly forbidden by the home authorities, it would still have been a high crime to do. He ought to have known, without any instructions from home, that it was his duty not to take part in disputes among the false religions of the East; that it was his duty, in his official character, to show no marked preference for any of those religions, and to offer no marked insult to any. But, Sir, he has paid unseemly homage to one of those religions; he has grossly insulted another; and he has selected as the object of his homage the very worst and most degrading of those religions, and as the object of his insults the best and purest of them. The homage was paid to Lingamism. The insult was offered to Mahometanism. Lingamism is not merely idolatry but idolatry in its most pernicious form. The honourable gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Control seemed to think that he had achieved a great victory when he had made out that his lordship's devotions had been paid, not to Vishnu, but to Siva. Sir, Vishnu is the preserving deity of the Hindoo mythology; Siva is the destroying deity; and, as far as I have any preference for one of your governor-general's gods over another, I confess that my own tastes would lead me to prefer the preserving to the destroying power. Yes, Sir; the temple of Somnauth was sacred to Siva; and the honourable gentleman cannot but know by what emblem Siva is represented, and with what rites he is adored. I will say no more. The governor-general, Sir, is in some degree protected by the very magnitude of his offence. I am ashamed to name those things to which he is not ashamed to pay public reverence. This god of destruction, whose images and whose worship it would be a violation of decency to describe, is selected as the object of homage. As the object of insult is selected a religion which has borrowed much of its theology and much of its morality from

Christianity, a religion which in the midst of polytheism teaches the unity of God, and, in the midst of idolatry, strictly proscribes the worship of images. The duty of our government is, as I said, to take no part in the disputes between Mahometans and idolaters. But, if our government does take a part, there cannot be a doubt that Mahometanism is entitled to the preference. Lord Ellenborough is of different opinion. He takes away the gates from a Mahometan mosque, and solemnly offers them as a gift to a Pagan temple. Morally, this is a crime. Politically, it is a blunder. Nobody who knows anything of the Mahometans of India can doubt that this affront to their faith will excite their fiercest indignation. Their susceptibility on such points is extreme. Some of the most serious disasters that have ever befallen us in India have been caused by that susceptibility. Remember what happened at Vellore in 1806, and more recently at Bangalore. The mutiny of Vellore was caused by a slight shown to the Mahometan turban; the mutiny of Bangalore, by disrespect said to have been shown to a Mahometan place of worship. If a governor-general had been induced by his zeal for Christianity to offer any affront to a mosque held in high veneration by Mussulmans, I should think that he had been guilty of indiscretion such as proved him to be unfit for his post. But to affront a mosque of peculiar dignity, not from zeal for Christianity, but for the sake of this loathsome god of destruction, is nothing short of madness. Some temporary popularity Lord Ellenborough may no doubt gain in some quarters. I hear, and I can well believe, that some bigoted Hindoos have hailed this proclamation with delight, and have begun to entertain a hope that the British government is about to take their worship under its peculiar protection. But how long will that hope last? I presume that the right honourable baronet the First Lord of the Treasury does not mean to suffer India to be governed on Brahminical principles. I presume that he will not allow the public revenue to be expended in rebuilding temples, adorning idols, and hiring courtesans. I have no doubt that there is already on the way to India such an admonition as will prevent Lord Ellenborough from persisting in the course on which he has entered. The consequence will be that the exaltation of the Brahmins will end in mortification and anger. See then of what a complication of faults the governor-general is guilty. In order to curry favour with the Hindoos he has offered an inexpiable insult to the Mahometans; and now, in order to quiet the English, he is forced to disappoint and disgust the Hindoos. But, apart from the irritating effect which these transactions must produce on every part of the native population, is it no evil to have this continual wavering and changing? This is not the only case in which Lord Ellenborough has, with great pomp, announced intentions which he has not been able to carry into effect. It is his lordship's habit. He put forth a notification that his durbar was to be honoured by the presence of Dost Mahomed. Then came a notification that Dost Mahomed would not make his appearance there. In the proclamation which we are now considering his lordship announced to all the princes of India his resolution to set up these gates at Somnauth. The gates, it is now universally admitted, will not be set up there. All India will see that the governor-general has changed his mind. The change may be imputed to mere fickleness and levity. It may be imputed to the disapprobation with which his conduct has been regarded here. In either case he appears in a light in which it is much to be deplored that a governor-general should appear.

So much for the serious side of this business; and now for the ludicrous side. Even in our mirth, however, there is sadness; for it is no light thing that he who represents the British nation in India should be a jest to the people of India. We have sometimes sent them governors whom they loved, and sometimes governors whom they feared; but they never before had a governor at whom they laughed. Now, however, they laugh; and how can we blame them for laughing, when all Europe and all America are laughing too? You see, Sir, that the gentlemen opposite cannot keep their countenances. And no wonder. Was such a state paper ever seen in our language before? And what is the plea set up for all this bombast? Why, the honourable gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Control brings down to the House some translations of Persian letters from native princes. Such letters, as everybody knows, are written in a most absurd and turgid style. The honourable gentleman forces us to hear a good deal of this detestable rhetoric; and then he asks why, if the secretaries of the Nizam and the King of Oudh use all these tropes and hyperboles, Lord Ellenborough should not indulge in the same sort of eloquence? The honourable gentleman might as well ask why Lord Ellenborough should not sit cross-legged, why he should not let his beard grow to his waist, why he should not wear a turban, why he should not hang trinkets all about his person, why he should not ride about Calcutta on a horse jingling with bells and glittering with false pearls. The native princes do these things; and why should not he? Why, Sir, simply because he is not a native prince, but an English governor-general. When the people of India see a nawab or a rajah in all his gaudy finery, they bow to him with a certain respect. They know that the splendour of his garb indicates superior rank and wealth. But if Sir Charles Metcalfe had so bedizened himself, they would have thought that he was out of his wits. They are not such fools as the honourable gentleman takes them for. Simplicity is not their fashion. But they understand and respect the simplicity of our fashions. Our plain clothing commands far more reverence than all the jewels which the most tawdry zemindar wears; and our plain language carries with it far more weight than the florid diction of the most ingenious Persian scribe. The plain language and the plain clothing are inseparably associated in the minds of our subjects with superior knowledge, with superior energy, with superior veracity, with all the high and commanding qualities which erected, and which still uphold, our empire. Sir, if, as the speech of the honourable gentleman the Secretary of the Board of Control seems to indicate, Lord Ellenborough has adopted this style on principle, if it be his lordship's deliberate intention to mimic, in his state papers, the Asiatic modes of thought and expression, that alone would be a reason for recalling him. But the honourable gentleman is mistaken in thinking that this proclamation is in the oriental taste. It bears no resemblance to the very bad oriental compositions which he has read to us, nor to any other oriental compositions that I ever saw. It is neither English nor Indian. It is not original, however; and I will tell the House where the governor-general found his models. He has apparently been studying the rants of the French Jacobins during the period of their ascendancy, the Carmagnoles of the Convention, the proclamations issued by the directory and its proconsuls: and he has been seized with a desire to imitate those compositions. The pattern which he seems to have especially proposed to himself is the rhodomontade in which it was announced that the modern Gauls were marching to Rome in order to avenge the fate of Dumnorix and Vercingetorix. Everybody remembers those lines in which revolutionary justice is described by Mr. Canning:—

> Not she in British courts who takes her stand,
> The dawdling balance dangling in her hand;
> But firm, erect, with keen reverted glance,
> The avenging angel of regenerate France,
> Who visits ancient sins on modern times,
> And punishes the Pope for Cæsar's crimes.

In the same spirit and in the same style our governor-general has proclaimed his intention to retaliate on the Mussulmans beyond the mountains the insults which their ancestors, eight hundred years ago, offered to the idolatry of the Hindoos. To do justice to the Jacobins, however, I must say that they had an excuse which was wanting to the noble lord. The revolution had made almost as great a change in literary tastes as in political institutions. The old masters of French eloquence had shared the fate of the old states and of the old parliaments.

The highest posts in the administration were filled by persons who had no experience of affairs, who in the general confusion had raised themselves by audacity and quickness of natural parts, uneducated men, or half educated men, who had no notion that the style in which they had heard the heroes and villains of tragedies declaim on the stage was not the style of real warriors and statesmen. But was it for an English gentleman, a man of distinguished abilities and cultivated mind, a man who had sat many years in parliament, and filled some of the highest posts in the state, to copy the productions of such a school?

But, it is said, what does it matter if the noble lord has written a foolish rhapsody which is neither prose nor verse? Is affected phraseology a subject for parliamentary censure? What great ruler can be named who has not committed errors much more serious than the penning of a few sentences of turgid nonsense? This, I admit, sounds plausible. It is quite true that very eminent men, Lord Somers, for example, Sir Robert Walpole, Lord Chatham and his son, all committed faults which did much more harm than any fault of style can do. But I beg the House to observe this, that an error which produces the most serious consequences may not necessarily prove that the man who has committed it is not a very wise man; and that, on the other hand, an error which directly produces no important consequences may prove the man who has committed it to be quite unfit for public trust. Walpole committed a ruinous error when he yielded to the public cry for war with Spain. But, notwithstanding that error, he was an eminently wise man. Caligula, on the other hand, when he marched his soldiers to the beach, made them fill their helmets with cockle-shells, and sent the shells to be placed in the Capitol as trophies of his conquests, did no great harm to anybody; but he surely proved that he was quite incapable of governing an empire. Mr. Pitt's expedition to Quiberon was most ill judged, and ended in defeat and disgrace. Yet Mr. Pitt was a statesman of a very high order. On the other hand, such ukases as those by which the Emperor Paul used to regulate the dress of the people of Petersburg, though they caused much less misery than the slaughter at Quiberon, proved that the Emperor Paul could not safely be trusted with power over his fellow-creatures. One day he forbade the wearing of pantaloons. Another day he forbade his subjects to comb their hair over their foreheads. Then he proscribed round hats. A young Englishman, the son of a merchant, thought to evade this decree by going about the city in a hunting cap. Then came out an edict which made it penal to wear on the head a round thing such as the English merchant's son wore. Now, Sir, I say that, when I examine the substance of Lord Ellenborough's proclamation, and consider all the consequences which that paper is likely to produce, I am forced to say that he has committed a grave moral and political offence. When I examine the style, I see that he has committed an act of eccentric folly, much of the same kind with Caligula's campaign against the cockles, and with the Emperor Paul's ukase against round hats. Consider what an extravagant self-confidence, what a disdain for the examples of his great predecessors and for the opinions of the ablest and most experienced men who are now to be found in the Indian services, this strange document indicates. Surely it might have occurred to Lord Ellenborough that, if this kind of eloquence had been likely to produce a favourable impression on the minds of Asiatics, such governors as Warren Hastings, Mr. Elphinstone, Sir Thomas Munro, and Sir Charles Metcalfe, men who were as familiar with the language and manners of the native population of India as any man here can be with the language and manners of the French, would not have left the discovery to be made by a new comer who did not know any Eastern tongue. Surely, too, it might have occurred to the noble lord that, before he put forth such a proclamation, he would do well to ask some person who knew India intimately what the effect both on the Mahometans and Hindoos was likely to be. I firmly believe that the governor-general either did not ask advice or acted in direct opposition to advice. Mr. Maddock was with his lordship as acting secretary. Now I know enough of Mr. Maddock to be quite certain that he never counselled the governor-general to publish such a paper. I will pawn my life that he either was never called upon to give an opinion, or that he gave an opinion adverse to the course which was taken. No governor-general who was on good terms with the civil service would have been, I may say, permitted to expose himself thus. Lord William Bentinck and Lord Auckland were, to be sure, the last men in the world to think of doing such a thing as this. But if either of those noble lords, at some unlucky moment when he was not quite himself, when his mind was thrown off the balance by the pride and delight of an extraordinary success, had proposed to put forth such a proclamation, he would have been saved from committing so great a mistake by the respectful but earnest remonstrances of those in whom he placed confidence, and who were solicitous for his honour. From the appearance of this proclamation, therefore, I infer that the terms on which Lord Ellenborough is with the civil servants of the company are such that those servants could not venture to offer him counsel when he most needed it.

For these reasons, Sir, I think the noble lord unfit for high public trust. Let us, then, consider the nature of the public trust which is now reposed in him. Are gentlemen aware that, even when he is at

Calcutta, surrounded by his councillors, his single voice can carry any resolution concerning the executive administration against them all? They can object: they can protest: they can record their opinions in writing, and can require him to give in writing his reasons for persisting in his own course: but they must then submit. On the most important questions, on the question whether a war shall be declared, on the question whether a treaty shall be concluded, on the question whether the whole system of land revenue established in a great province shall be changed, his single vote weighs down the votes of all who sit at the board with him. The right honourable baronet opposite is a powerful minister, a more powerful minister than any that we have seen during many years. But I will venture to say that his power over the people of England is nothing when compared with the power which the governor-general possesses over the people of India. Such is Lord Ellenborough's power when he is with his council, and is to some extent held in check. But where is he now? He has given his council the slip. He is alone. He has near him no person who is entitled and bound to offer advice, asked or unasked; he asks no advice: and you cannot expect men to outstep the strict line of their official duty by obtruding advice on a superior by whom it would be ungraciously received. The danger of having a rash and flighty governor-general is sufficiently serious at the very best. But the danger of having such a governor-general up the country, eight or nine hundred miles from any person who has a right to remonstrate with him, is fearful indeed. Interests so vast, that the most sober language in which they can be described sounds hyperbolical, are entrusted to a single man; to a man who, whatever his parts may be, and they are doubtless considerable, has shown an indiscretion and temerity almost beyond belief; to a man who has been only a few months in India; to a man who takes no counsel with those who are well acquainted with India.

I cannot sit down without addressing myself to those directors of the East India Company who are present. I exhort them to consider the heavy responsibility which rests on them. They have the power to recall Lord Ellenborough; and I trust that they will not hesitate to exercise that power. This is the advice of one who has been their servant, who has served them loyally, and who is still sincerely anxious for their credit and for the welfare of the empire of which they are the guardians. But if, from whatever cause, they are unwilling to recall the noble lord, then I implore them to take care that he be immediately ordered to return to Calcutta. Who can say what new freak we may hear of by the next mail? I am quite confident that neither the Court of Directors nor her Majesty's Ministers can look forward to the arrival of that mail without great uneasiness. Therefore I say, send Lord Ellenborough back to Calcutta. There at least he will find persons who have a right to advise him and to expostulate with him, and who will, I doubt not, have also the spirit to do so. It is something that he will be forced to hear reasons against his propositions. It is something that a delay, though only of twenty-four hours, will be interposed between the first conception of a wild scheme and the execution. I am afraid that these checks will not be sufficient to prevent much evil: but they are not absolutely nugatory. I entreat the directors to consider in what a position they will stand if, in consequence of their neglect, some serious calamity should befall the country which is confided to their care. I will only say, in conclusion, that, if there be any use in having a Council of India, if it be not meant that the members of council should draw large salaries for doing nothing, if they are really appointed for the purpose of assisting and restraining the governor, it is to the last degree absurd that their powers should be in abeyance when there is a governor who, of all the governors that ever England sent to the East, stands most in need both of assistance and of restraint.

J. RAMSAY MACDONALD

(1866-).

MR. MACDONALD, who has had the distinction of being the first Labour Premier, was early associated with the Socialist movement. He became secretary of the Labour Party in 1900 and held that post until 1911. From 1901 to 1904 he served on the London County Council. In 1906 he was elected by Leicester as a Labour candidate and represented the constituency for twelve years, losing his seat in the General Election of December, 1918, because of his pacifist attitude towards the war. As Chairman of the Independent Labour Party he defined the party's aim as "the conversion of society into a socialist community." His parliamentary career has been honourable and beneficial. He succeeded in his attempt to secure for Government employment equal terms with those of independent enterprise. He supported the National Insurance bill of 1911; brought the support of his party to the Parliament bill and, later, to the Home Rule bill; and opposed the increase in naval armaments before the war. At the outbreak of war he resigned his leadership to Mr. Henderson, remaining true to his pacific principles.

The more recent political activities of Mr. Macdonald are still fresh in memory. On the defeat of the Conservative Administration in January of 1924, he formed and carried on a Labour Ministry, with such success as was possible in unprecedented circumstances, until defeated in the Election of October. He continues to lead a gradually dividing party in opposition.

As a writer Mr. Macdonald has dealt chiefly with problems of Socialism. His publications include "Socialism and Society"; "Socialism and Government"; "The Socialist Movement" (Home University Library); and "Parliament and Revolution."

THE SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY

(Delivered at Brighton, March 6th, 1924).

TO-DAY, as in every generation, we are challenged to apply Christian faith to social conditions. The first great problem to be faced by us as Christians is the simple but very intricate problem of poverty. This is not a problem of inequality. It is the problem of the degradation of men and women; the problem of the sacrifices that good men and women have to undergo, sacrifices not of material things, sacrifices not of ideals or of wishes, but sacrifices that entail the crucifixion of qualities which they have by virtue of the fact that they have souls. When we discover that that sacrifice is not merely accidental or individual, but is part and parcel of an inter-related co-ordinated organic system, then our pity ought not to issue merely in charity, but in a great conception of social reconstruction by the way of evolutionary socialism.

Another great problem which the Christian cannot be comfortable about until it is solved is that of human value. In nine cases out of ten we value each other for mere material possessions. We are decorating our personalities not with the things of the spirit, but with things of the earth earthy. When people want appreciation they go and buy honours. For the first time in the whole of their lives their names appear in an honours list in a newspaper. It is the first association they have ever had with anything that is honourable. People who are rich, who can give great dinners, who are extravagant and ostentatiously vulgar, who have none of that finer inner sense of the gentleman, are too often the powerful people in these modern times of which we are so rashly inclined to boast.

This age, with all its tremendous conquests of the power of the air, of material resources, of the human being over the laws of nature, instead of subduing nature to man is subduing man to nature. This is a material age, and there is no use talking any humbug about it. It is an age where material possession is in power, where mere knowledge dominates. While this is true, this is also an age when the small still voice of spirituality is challenging it all. There is over-indulgence in recreation to-day. There is an incapacity to spend a quiet Sunday. I am amazed at a great many of my friends, who say that the old Scottish Sabbath was a burden. I should like to see a state of society where every man and woman preferred the old Scottish Sunday to the modern French one. In that state of society we should find solid eternal foundations of character and self-command upon which to build our Churches and our States, our Toryisms, Liberalisms and Labourisms. And none of these can exist without solid foundations of character. Whether there is a Tory, Liberal, or Labour Government in office they cannot do very much for people who can be nothing but amused, nothing but entertained by somebody else, people who have not in themselves the capacity to spend time profitably with themselves.

These things are evidence of general evil. There is something fundamentally wrong, and the great thing that is wrong is that we are losing sense of what real human value is. We are far too much after superficiality, after gold braid and the things hanging on the lapel of one's coat, after "right honourables." The essence of Christianity is that the human quality alone matters. We are not out for quantities or for equality, but for quality. We cannot solve or approach the solution of social problems unless we remember that the spiritual must be the predominant. We live by faith and not by sight. Life is not something justified by what has been. It is something justified by what is going to be. It is easy to apply Christianity to trifles, to be Christians in small deeds, but tremendously difficult to be Christians from a general point of view of life. What this and all the generations of the world are suffering from is that they have not the courage to go down to the sources of all these evils, and instead of spending time patching here, there, and elsewhere, to go out and say that the trouble was in man's general conception of what was good and what was bad.

It may take a little longer time and require a little more patience, but let us go after the big thing, knowing that if we take care of the pounds the pence will take care of themselves. We cannot go to church on Sunday in one frame of mind and then go to the counting-house on Monday in the opposite frame of mind. One or the other is wrong. We have either to apply the Sunday frame of mind to the conditions of business, or we have not. But if we do not, it is rather a waste of time to get into the Sunday frame of mind at all. As Christians we have a unity in a community. We are members one of each other. The bond between us is not economic. It is a spiritual bond which exists because we are possessors of a common soul and inheritors of a common destiny. I am one of those people who believe in the Socialist State, and I am neither ashamed of it nor afraid of it. Socialism is a thing that has two values, one as an electioneering cry, and the other as a philosophy and system of life.

As a philosophy, as a material embodiment of the spiritual conception of unity in community, it is a philosophy, a system, a comprehensive code, and it is based upon the Gospels. I mention this because I am going to appeal to you to systematize your ideas. Life depends upon ideas. We cannot go on for ever saying that circumstances on such and such a day produce certain conduct and that circumstances on another day produce different conduct. In such a case we are living a barren life and one day our moral natures will challenge that and compel us to be consistent. There is another corollary from this. We are all inclined to think too much in terms of class. I am supposed to be one who does that. I doubt if anybody here has fought against that idea more persistently than I have.

This idea of class is poisonous to the social mind. When we are wiser and more moral, classes will have disappeared, not by a sort of "hugger mugger" equality. They will have disappeared in a state of society in which one's qualities, tastes, differences will be so naturally followed that we shall not be at all conscious that a person who follows other vocations, tastes and qualities belongs to a different category of humanity from ourselves. It is only when men have no quality to boast of that they draw their cheque for a suit of clothes which marks them off from their fellows. Such a man knows he cannot cheat God and he doesn't try. He knows by experience he can cheat his fellows and so he does. That is the basis of class distinction.

The Christian faith gives us the courage to believe in truth and justice and in the moral categories. What faith or trust can we have in these except by believing that they are absolute in themselves? The peoples armed themselves and said they were safe. They made this treaty or that for convenience and said they were safe. They put flights of aeroplanes into the air and said they were safe, and they knew perfectly well in their heart all the time that they were nothing of the kind. The nations from the very beginning of things have been trying to secure security with a big club. In the days of the big club the other fellow went and got one a little bit bigger, and this has gone on and on, and it always will go on till the end of time, unless we discover a nation so full of Christian courage that it will say: "The only security we can have is the security of cherishing the moral categories, justice, fair play, honesty, and uprightness."

This is not only true internationally, but nationally. I wish I could appeal to this nation. I wish I could appeal to the interests of this nation to pursue methods in accordance with the moral categories. We are threatened with strikes and lockouts and disputes and disturbances. How childish it all is! How foolish it all is! What has happened? Why is there no mutual confidence? Surely these things can be arbitrated. Surely there are minds that can say what is the best that can be done, and which is the way to overcome difficulties. But what has happened is that the two sides, not owing to the faults of one, have lost confidence in each other and in the whole of the nation, and the only way we can get out of that is to have an occasional fight which is a loss to everybody.

We have but a short time to deal with these things. A year or two after a war are the most precious years in the life of a nation desirous to follow moral ways. Three or four years go by and you go back to the old ways, the old fears, the old lack of a sense of security. You are driven back again by the evil hounds that have driven you up to now, and the years go with inevitable certainty and the evils accumulate and another war becomes as inevitable as the war that preceded it. The time for changing is the time that elapses between the end of a war, when the peoples are exhausted and wise, and the time when peoples begin to recover and have no sure guide as to how their recovery is going to be further secured. Sands that are flowing through the sand-glass are golden, pure gold, precious gold to-day, and if this opportunity is missed, and if we go back to the old ways, to the old evils, to our old materialism, to our old trust in mere strength and power and force, then there will be another war, there will be more grief, more loss, more pain; there will be more ineffectiveness and more missing of those marks that you would like to attain.

HECTOR C. MACPHERSON

(1888-).

THE REV. H. C. MACPHERSON is a son of Hector Macpherson the well-known historian. Born in 1888, he was educated privately and proceeded subsequently to the University of Edinburgh and to New College, the theological school for the United Free Church of Scotland. Here he became Waterbeck Prizeman and Cunningham Fellow. He is Minister of Loudoun Church, Newmilns, Ayrshire, but has devoted much of his attention to Astronomy and it is as an astronomer that he is best known.

He has written "Astronomers of To-day," "Romance of Modern Astronomy," "A Century's Progress in Astronomy," and various papers in scientific journals. He is M.A. (Edin.), F.R.A.S., F.R.S.E., Member of the Société Astronomique de France and of the British Astronomical Association.

THE UNIVERSE AS REVEALED BY MODERN ASTRONOMY

(Delivered at Oxford).

THE modern science of astronomy is little more than three centuries old. It is true that over 380 years have elapsed since the cornerstone of the edifice was laid by the publication of the great work of Copernicus, "De Revolutionibus." In that book the quiet recluse of Frauenburg formulated the theory which was to have so profound an influence on human thought, that the apparently immovable Earth was in motion round the apparently mobile Sun. But for the best part of a century the new heliocentric theory was laughed out of court as the dream of a crank, not only by the theologians, Roman and Protestant alike, but also by the professional scientists of the times, and it was only when Galileo and Kepler, working along independent lines, were driven to accept the Copernican system, and as a result of their own scientific work became its protagonists, that the heliocentric system was seriously considered. Indeed, it can only be said to have been finally adopted by the scientific world as a whole as a result of the work of Newton.

It is necessary for us to remember, therefore, that at the time when the creeds of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation—those Protestant and Romanist Confessions which are still the standards of organized Christianity to-day—were formulated, the geocentric system was unquestioningly accepted. The Earth was regarded as the only world, the end and aim of creation round which all the heavenly bodies revolved, and for the benefit of the inhabitants of which the Sun had been created to illuminate the day and the Moon and stars to mitigate the darkness of the night. To this view the Reformers clung as tenaciously as the Inquisitors. Luther, in his usual pugnacious style, referred to Copernicus as a fool who dared to contradict the Bible, an "upstart astrologer" who "set his own authority above that of sacred Scripture." Melanchthon gravely deplored the lack of decency of those who set forth such theories; while Calvin clinched the matter, as he thought, by putting the scathing question—"Who will venture to place the authority of Copernicus above that of the Holy Spirit?"

These efforts to stem the current of human progress were about as efficacious as the legendary attempt of King Canute to stay the flowing tide. During the past three centuries the history of astronomy has been the record of the continuous extension of our knowledge of the Universe both in space and time, and the Cosmos which confronts the astronomer to-day is inconceivably vaster than the tiny world familiar to the ancients and regarding which the learned men even up to the seventeenth century believed themselves to know so much. Certainly the outstanding fact which the study of astronomy drives home upon our minds with irresistible force—the truth which strikes even the juvenile enquirer as he reads for the first time such a book as Ball's "Star-Land"—is the vastness of the visible Universe. The Earth, which our forefathers believed to be the centre of all things, is shown by modern astronomy to be but one planet among others revolving round the Sun; and when we realise the magnitude of the Sun and of the greater planets, and the vastness of the distances separating the various worlds from the Sun and from one another, we understand how insignificant a rôle our world plays even in the Solar System. The Earth is the centre, not of the Universe, but of a little sub-system within the greater Solar System—the Terrestrial or Earth-Moon system. Only in comparison with the Moon does the Earth appear large and important; and our satellite is the one astronomical body which is comparatively close to us. Only 238,000 miles—a mere trifle so far as celestial distances go—separate us from that mass of matter which appears to be after all, to quote the picturesque phrase of Flammarion, nothing but a "detached continent." The small domain over which our Earth holds sway is less than 500,000 miles in diameter, and when we are dealing with thousands of miles, we are still within the realm of the conceivable.

When we come to consider the magnitude and distance of the Sun we find ourselves projected into a new world of size and distance altogether. In volume this mighty globe exceeds our Earth 1,300,000 times; and while we measure the distance of the Moon in thousands of miles, our unit for the inter-planetary distances is the million. The mean distance of the Earth from the Sun, as every schoolboy knows, is 93,000,000 miles. But this is one of the smaller distances in the Solar System, for the Earth is comparatively close to the Sun. Neptune, the outermost known planet, revolves at a distance of 2,700,000,000 miles, so that the Sun's domain—leaving out of consideration the orbits of the erratic and unstable cometary bodies—is over 5,000,000,000 miles in diameter.

The eight primary planets fall into two distinct groups. They have been designated as the outer and inner planets, and this is a convenient classification; but they may be grouped also according to their size and physical condition, and following up the recent classification of the stars, I have suggested that the two groups should be designated the giant and dwarf planets respectively. Into which of these groups does our Earth fall? Not into the giant group. Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune vastly exceed our world in size—the volume of Jupiter being 1,300 times that of the Earth. The only position of dignity which our world may be said to occupy is the primacy among the dwarf planets, being slightly larger than Venus, considerably larger than Mars, and much larger than Mercury. The Earth, then, may be defined as a dwarf planet revolving round the Sun.

The Solar System, vast though it is, is not co-extensive with the Universe. The astronomers of the eighteenth century, preoccupied though they were with the motions of the planets and the verification of the Newtonian law, realised this in a dim, vague kind of way. But it is to the elder Herschel that the world owes the pioneer work which has issued in our present-day cosmology. His discovery of the motion through space of the Sun, carrying with it the Earth and all the planets and their satellites, indicated the essential kinship of the Sun and the so-called "fixed stars," some of which were even in Herschel's time known to be in quite rapid motion. And within the past sixty years, the spectroscope has proved beyond a doubt that there is nothing unique about the Sun. It is simply a star, one among a vast number—75,000,000 at a minimum estimate, and 1,000,000,000 at a maximum. Its importance to us consists simply in the fact that our Earth is one of its small satellites. Intrinsically it is not important.

One of the broad generalisations of modern astronomy is that associated with the name of Professor H. N. Russell, of Princeton. Professor Russell finds that the great mass of the stars falls into two well-defined groups, which he designates as giants and dwarfs. While the giants—which form the majority of the brilliant first-magnitude stars which are familiar even to the casual star-gazer, such as Antares, Betelgeux, Aldebaran, Arcturus and Rigel—are tens and hundreds of millions of miles in diameter, the diameters of the dwarfs are to be measured in hundreds of thousands of miles. Not quite four years ago, the astronomers at the Mount Wilson Observatory, in California, succeeded in measuring the diameter of the bright star Betelgeux, which they found to be 273,000,000 miles. Some time later they found that Antares is a still mightier star, its diameter being no less than 430,000,000 miles. And just the other day Dr. Shapley, the director of Harvard College Observatory, announced that in all likelihood the giant stars in the Nubecula Minor are still larger, some of them being about a thousand million miles in diameter. These amazing facts show us that the Sun, vast though it is relatively to our little world, falls into the group of dwarf stars. It is a large dwarf, certainly, but a dwarf nevertheless. So our Earth's status in the Stellar System proves to be that of a dwarf planet revolving round a dwarf star.

The vastness of the material Universe is perhaps still more forcibly impressed on us by the distances which separate the stars from one another. The nearest stars, the bright first-magnitude double star, Alpha Centauri, and the tiny dwarf Proxima, which seems to be physically connected with it, are distant twenty-five billions of miles. So distant are these stars, indeed, that light, which travels from the Moon to the Earth in a second and a half, and from the Sun in eight minutes, requires four years for the journey. And these Centaurus stars are our nearest neighbours. The familiar brilliants of our evening sky are situated at much greater distances. The nearest of the giants would appear to be Vega, about thirty light-years away—a light-year is about six billion miles—while the super-giants, Antares and Betelgeux, are distant over one hundred light-years away. At still greater distances are the familiar cluster of the Pleiades, and the bright groups which we know as Ursa Major and Orion. These appear to be at least six hundred light-years away.

The researches of Professor Shapley have resulted in a still further extension of our knowledge of stellar distances. Astronomers at the beginning of the century estimated the diameter of the entire Stellar System at about 10,000 light-years at the outside. But Dr. Shapley some years ago discovered in the dense star-clouds of the Galaxy faint blue stars, evidently giants, which cannot be nearer than 15,000 light-years. Sixty thousand light-years away from the Sun is the centre of gravity of the Stellar System, while the whole great assemblage of stars has the shape of a flattened disc, about 6,000 light-years in thickness and about 300,000 in diameter—a hundred thousand times greater than was supposed at the beginning of the century. Outside of this main sidereal system there are subordinate or satellite systems—"island universes," using that designation in a literal sense. By mutually confirmatory methods, Dr. Shapley has fixed the distances of eighty-six of these globular clusters. The nearest is 22,000 light-years away, and the most distant 220,000. Not so authoritative, perhaps, is an estimate made by the same astronomer of the distance of a still more distant outlying cluster, which he has computed to be a million light-years, or six million billion miles.

The vexed question of the finitude or infinity of the physical Universe, or rather the question as to whether it is limited or unlimited, remains unanswered. What we call the Stellar System is most certainly finite, but whether or not it is but one island amid myriads of others we do not know. The spiral nebulæ, which about ten or twelve years ago were thought by many astronomers to be external galaxies are most probably not so, but truly nebulous masses. If certain deductions from the Einstein theory be reliable, space—at least that space with which we are familiar—is finite. Einstein has indeed fixed an upper limit—a maximum extent of the space-time continuum, 1,000 million light-years in circumference. But even if this is so, if the space we know in association with matter is "finite yet unbounded," we have no reason to believe that it exhausts the All. It may be but a temporary manifestation. There may be more than poetry in Shelley's fine words:

> What is heaven? A globe of dew,
> A frail and fading sphere,
> With ten millions gathered there
> To tremble, gleam and disappear.

And if we are confronted by virtual illimitability in space, we are faced no less with virtual limitlessness in time. Religious people even a hundred years ago were accustomed to think of the world as six thousand years old. Archbishop Usher fixed the date of the creation of the world out of nothing, declaring for about four thousand years B.C. Dr. John Lightfoot, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University, one of the most erudite seventeenth century scholars, solemnly calculated the date of creation as the month of October, 4004—man being created by the Trinity on the twenty-third of that month at nine o'clock in the morning. By the mid-nineteenth century, Lord Kelvin fixed a maximum of 20 million years for the life of the Sun, with a shorter period for that of our world. His estimates, however, have been rendered obsolete by investigations in the realm of stellar evolution and by the recognition by physicists of the hitherto disregarded factor of inter-atomic energy. Dr. Shapley's study of the physical condition of the stars in the nearest cluster, 22,000 light-years away, and the most distant system separated by 220,000 light-years, indicates that the stars in the one cluster appear to be at the same stage of development as the stars in the other, though the light from the one cluster has been so much longer on its way than the light from the other. Two hundred thousand years, then, is a negligible quantity in the life of a star—a mere tick of the clock. Hundreds and thousands of millions of years have been required for the evolution of our own world. Possibly a billion years is the unit of time in the life history of a star. Finite it may be, nevertheless the visible Universe presents to the mind of man an impression of incomprehensible vastness alike in space and time. "The spirit of man acheth with this infinity," as Richter truly said. Flammarion does not over-estimate the truth when he says, "Such is the aspect, grand, splendid and sublime, of the universe which flies through space before the dazzled and stupefied gaze of the terrestrial astronomer, born to-day to die to-morrow on a globule, lost in the infinite night."

It must be confessed that the first effect of this impression of vastness must be one of unsettlement. Little wonder that conventional theologians fought this new cosmology long and fiercely. The new cosmology does not, as they thought, contradict the Confessions and the Creeds, but it somehow renders them meaningless; for the Power which the cosmology and cosmogony of to-day alike hint at is as much greater than the God of the Council of Trent or the Westminster Assembly as the Universe of to-day is wider than the Universe of Luther. When Shelley said of the God of the Jews, or rather he might have said the God of the Oxford theologians of the early nineteenth century, that "the works of His fingers have borne witness against Him," he was not blaspheming, however unfortunate the tone of those immature notes to "Queen Mab." He was simply stating the actual conclusion to be derived from the impact of modern astronomy on scholastic theology, and particularly on crude theories of the Atonement. I do not know of a better statement of the bearing of modern astronomical concepts on our theological outlook than the words of Dr. Beard in his Hibbert Lecture on "The Reformation in relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge." "How shall we rise to the thought of Him who is the

Lord of innumerable worlds, the Ruler of the boundless spaces, the Master of the Eternal years? Did then God, and such a God as the all of things prove He must be, die for us? I say it with the deepest respect for the religious feelings of others, but I cannot but think that the whole system of Atonement, of which Anselm is the author, shrivels into inanity amid the light, the space, the silence of the stellar worlds." And what Dr. Beard says of Atonement is true of much of our theological thinking on miracle, Christology, eschatology. While it is true that scientific and religious knowledge are in the last analysis incommensurable, it is also true that he who has in any real sense grasped the import of modern cosmology will hesitate before he maintains that in the subsidiary dogmas of theology we have absolute truth or that they are more than imperfect formulations, relative to our experience.

Is it accurate, then, to say that the foundations of faith are cut away from us in "the height, the depth, the gloom, the glory?" Does our spark of being wholly vanish in the depths and heights? By no means. Our cursory sketch of the visible Universe must have left on our minds certain impressions.

1. The most definite impression is surely that this stupendous system of stars and worlds is not self-explanatory. As a prominent American astronomer said about a year ago: "My own deliberately formed judgment, purely personal, not susceptible of proof, perhaps, is that so tremendous a cosmos must have divinity in it or over it; my reason rebels at the assumption that it is purely materialistic, the result of the chance concentration of self-created physical forces." The old cosmological proof of the divine existence is no longer valid, it is true, as a logical proof. At the same time the Universe as a whole does strongly suggest that it is not self-explanatory. "The cosmological argument," as has been well said by Professor Upton, "when it takes the shape of asserting that a unitary ground and cause is needed to account for and render intelligible this entire infinite series of dynamic activities and phenomenal changes which constitute the Universe rests still, I believe, upon a solid foundation of logical necessity," or as another philosopher has said with equal truth, "The earliest assumption of human thought, that an adequate producing power is implied in the existence of what we see, is also the testimony of the visible Universe, with its immeasurable vastness and its infinite variety." And even as the universe is immeasurable, its fundamental cause is immeasurable. The Universe is a manifestation of immeasurable power—of that "Infinite and Eternal Energy," before which even the professedly agnostic Spencer stood in awe and reverence. The primitive emotions of wonder and worship which the star-lit sky aroused in our ancestors

it still arouses, only the wonder and worship are heightened and deepened by the assured results of modern astronomy.

2. But astronomy reveals to us other aspects of the Universe besides vastness, and from these aspects we have something to learn. Without making any illegitimate assumptions, we can glean something further from the starry heavens concerning the Power beyond.

Modern astronomy has demonstrated the oneness of the Universe. When Newton formulated his law of gravitation he showed that the Sun and the planets formed one system, that the Earth and its fellow-worlds were members of one family, performing their revolutions in obedience to one law. And when, in 1802, Herschel discovered the binary stars, it was further proved that the Stellar System was one family, and that throughout the whole Stellar System masses of matter obeyed a uniform law. Further, the modern branch of astronomy known as astrophysics has still further emphasized the kinship between the Earth and the Sun on the one hand and the stars on the other. The dark lines in the solar spectrum tell unmistakably of the existence in the solar atmosphere, in gaseous form, of the very elements with which we are familiar here upon Earth—sodium and potassium, calcium, iron, hydrogen. The day-star is akin to us, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. And while it is profoundly true that "one star differeth from another star in glory," the same chemical elements are yet to be found in the atmospheres of giant and dwarf stars alike. These elements exist in different proportions and under varied conditions of temperature and pressure, but their presence is clearly demonstrated by the faint lines in the stellar spectra. Matter, then, is subject to the same laws in the most distant parts of the Universe as here on Earth. The same laws hold sway and the same processes are going on. The new physics does not speak of gravitation as a force, but as a property of space, but whatever gravitation may be on the ultimate analysis, it is cosmos-wide in its scope. What we look out on from our vantage-point on Earth is a unified Universe—one in law, one in substance, one in process. Given the same condition, the same results will follow. And in passing it may be observed we cannot but be struck by the absurdity of believing that only on one small speck of matter has the cosmic process resulted in what we know as life and intelligence. Apart from the interpretation of the mysterious markings on our neighbour world Mars which the keen eyes of Schiaparelli and Lowell discerned and which, it may be, seems to hint at the existence of cosmical cousins out there in space, the plurality of worlds would appear to be the necessary corollary of the oneness of the Universe. Even if, as some astronomers think, there are no planets revolving round the double stars, even if the Solar System had an unusual origin, even if only one star in a thousand can ever be the centre of a system of planets—all of which are highly controversial propositions—we are faced with the likelihood that life has appeared in many different regions of the Stellar System. The bearing of this on the dogmas of orthodox theology is obvious.

The Universe, then, is a Universe and not a multiverse, and if we are permitted to say that the system of the stars speaks to us of Power immeasurable, we can with equal legitimacy infer that it speaks of one Power. It is at theism and not at polytheism, at one Creator, not at many, that the Universe hints; and certainly not at a limited or finite God.

3. Further, the Universe is quite evidently an ordered Universe. A cursory glance, it is true, indicates chaos and confusion; but with the progress of science, this chaos and confusion gives place to order and harmony. For instance, the seemingly hopeless tangle of the planetary motions was resolved into the simplest of systems by the formulation of the Copernican theory. The apparently complex motions of the planets are the sum of the motions of the individual planets plus that of the Earth; and the actual movements are the necessary consequences of the Keplerian and the Newtonian laws. The motions of the stars are much more complicated, but since the time of Herschel it has been evident that the Stellar System will one day yield up the secret of its structure. Just as in the Solar System, so in the greater Stellar System the stars are concentrated to the plane of the Galaxy or Milky Way. And in recent years much progress has been made in unravelling the apparently tangled skein of the stellar motions. One of the greatest discoveries of the century has been the detection, chiefly through the labours of Kapteyn, Eddington and Dyson, of the fact that the stars in the vicinity of the Sun belong to one or other of two great streams of stars moving in opposite directions—a fact which seems to find an explanation in the tentative cosmology of Dr. Shapley, who views it as the effect of the mingling of two clusters of stars, to one of which our Sun belongs. It may take many decades or centuries before the construction of the Universe is even approximately known, but the problem is obviously not insoluble.

What, then, does the fact that the Universe is an ordered Universe teach us? That ultimately the Universe is understandable. And if we are entitled to say that the Universe speaks to us of Power, and of one Power, we are no less justified in saying that the Power hinted at is not blind Power, but a Power based on reason, whose thoughts, in Kepler's fine phrase, we think afterwards in the process of discovery.

4. We are, I think, entitled to go a step further. Astronomical science tells us a little more. When the average man thinks of evolution, he thinks of biology and Darwinism and Mendelism, of the struggle for existence and the origin of species. But, truth to tell, the first hint of evolution which the mind of man received was not from the Earth beneath, but from the heaven above. In the closing years of the eighteenth century the idea dawned on the mind of Herschel that some at least of the faint filmy nebulæ which his great reflectors revealed in such lavish profusion were masses of primeval world-stuff, from which the stars were in the course of ages evolved. And Laplace, contemplating the finished article before him, namely, the Solar System, reasoned backwards to a time when the Sun was a vastly extended nebula, and when this world was a "fluid haze of light." After many vicissitudes the idea of the development of stars out of nebulæ was finally accepted in the last half of the nineteenth century and is to-day established on unassailable foundations. That the primeval world-stuff is believed to be exemplified in the dark nebulous matter of which the luminous nebulæ are but exceptional specimens does not invalidate the nebular hypothesis in the least.

The classification of stars according to their physical condition, which the invention of the spectroscope rendered possible, gave the clue to Vogel in 1874 that a spectral classification might be taken to represent the order of stellar evolution. And while particular systems of classifications have come and gone, there can be no doubt that the vast majority of the stars in the sky can be arranged spectroscopically in an evolutionary series. The theory of Professor Russell divides the stars into the two classes of giants and dwarfs—the former being great gaseous masses in process of contraction and still growing hotter while the latter have passed the meridian of stellar life, and are still contracting but growing cooler, as our Sun is doing. But the mere fact that the stars can be arranged in an evolutionary sequence from the simple to the complex, from the shapeless cloud of cosmical dust to the steady star, fitted to be the centre of a system of worlds, strongly suggests purpose, cosmos-wide in its scope. What Professor Arthur Thomson says of the organic realm is equally true of the inorganic—"Only a system with order and progress in the heart of it could elaborate itself so perfectly and so intricately. There is assuredly much to incline us to 'assert Eternal Providence and justify the ways of God to men.'" If the universe hints at the existence of a great causal Power, one Power, one understandable Power, it hints as strongly that this Power is working with purpose according to plan.

I venture to say that while there is not, and in the nature of the case cannot be, any logical proof of the existence of God, the Universe revealed by modern astronomy gives us this impression of Power, one Power, one wise Power, one wise purposive Power behind all phenomena. I believe that the facts of astronomical science are not only not hostile to Christian Theism, but that the queen of the sciences is in a very real sense the handmaid of faith. The God of the scientist, to quote a notable sentence of John Fiske, the disciple of Spencer, "is still and must ever be the God of the Christian, though free from the illegitimate formulas by the aid of which theology has sought to render Deity comprehensible." Theism—Christian Theism—has nothing to fear from astronomical science, but rather much to gain by the assimilation of the assured results of astronomy. While a little knowledge may be conductive to atheism, as Bacon truly observed, "much natural philosophy and wading deep into it will bring about men's minds to religion."

CHIEF-JUSTICE MANSFIELD

(WILLIAM MURRAY, EARL OF MANSFIELD)

(1705-1793).

THE Earl of Mansfield was, perhaps, the ablest of those learned and earnest Conservatives whose determination to make no concession to what they regarded as anarchy and treason lost England its American colonies. His speeches in Parliament in this connection show his great intellect and force of character, but he is at his best in those short and dignified orations he was accustomed to make from the bench in such great cases as that of Wilkes and the Dean of St. Asaph. No one was more thoroughly aware of the lasting importance of the principle involved in these cases than he, and, without doubt, he felt that he was speaking to posterity more than to any one in his court-room when he defied intimidation and scorned popularity. Macaulay calls him the founder of " The Modern School of Tories " who concede that government must be *de facto* through parliaments or other representative popular assemblies. As a lawyer, he has scarcely been surpassed. It had been said of him that finding the common law, especially as it bears on business, in a chaotic state, he left a body of decisions so nearly adequate to its definition that they are almost equivalent to a code. He was born at Scone, Scotland, March 2nd, 1705, the eleventh child of Viscount Stormont, an impoverished Scottish nobleman, whose Jacobite politics are supposed to have greatly influenced the opinions of his son.

Graduating at Oxford, and beginning the practice of law in London, William Murray married Lady Elizabeth Finch, daughter of the Earl of Winchelsea, in 1738. Four years later he was appointed Solicitor-General. His great abilities were appreciated by his party, and he was steadily promoted. He was made Attorney-General in 1754, and Chief-Justice of the Court of King's Bench in 1756—leaving the House of Commons to take the office against the wishes of his party leaders, who thought him too valuable there to be spared. In 1776 he was made Earl of Mansfield. Twelve years later he resigned from the bench, and lived in retirement until his death, on March 20th, 1793.

IN THE CASE OF JOHN WILKES

(An Address delivered at the Trial of John Wilkes, on Two Informations for Libel, in the King's Bench and House of Lords; 4 George III., 10 George III., 1763, 1770).

IT is fit to take some notice of the various terrors hung out; the numerous crowds which have attended and now attend in and about the hall, out of all reach of hearing what passes in court; and the tumults which, in other places, have shamefully insulted all order and government. Audacious addresses in print dictate to us, from those they call the people, the judgment to be given now, and afterwards upon the conviction. Reasons of policy are urged, from danger to the kingdom, by commotions and general confusion.

Give me leave to take the opportunity of this great and respectable audience, to let the whole world know all such attempts are vain. Unless we have been able to find an error which will bear us out, to reverse the outlawry, it must be affirmed. The Constitution does not allow reasons of State to influence our judgments. God forbid it should! We must not regard political consequences, how formidable soever they might be; if rebellion were the certain consequence, we are bound to say, *fiat justitia, ruat cœlum.* (Let Justice be done though the heavens fall). The Constitution trusts the king with reasons of State and policy; he may stop prosecutions; he may pardon offences; it is his to judge whether the law or the criminal should yield. We have no election. None of us encouraged or approved the commission of either of the crimes of which the defendant is convicted; none of us had any hand in his being prosecuted. As to myself, I took no part (in another place) in the addresses for that prosecution. We did not advise or assist the defendant to fly from justice; it was his own act and he must take the consequences. None of us have been consulted, or had anything to do with the present prosecution. It is not in our power to stop it; it was not in our power to bring it on. We cannot pardon. We are to say what we take the law to be; if we do not speak our real opinion, we prevaricate with God and our own consciences.

I pass over many anonymous letters I have received. Those in print are public; some of them have been brought judicially before the court. Whoever the writers are, they take the wrong way. I will do my duty unawed. What am I to fear? That *mendax infamia* from the press, which daily coins false facts and false motives? The lies of calumny carry no terror to me. I trust that my temper of mind and the colour and conduct of my life have given me a suit of armour against these arrows. If, during this king's reign, I have ever supported his government and assisted his measures, I have done it without any other reward than the consciousness of doing what I thought right. If I have ever opposed I have done it upon the points themselves, without mixing in party or faction, and without any collateral views. I honour the king and respect the people, but many things acquired by the favour of either are, in my account, objects not worth ambition. I wish popularity, but it is that popularity which follows, not that which is run after. It is that popularity which, sooner or later, never fails to do justice to the pursuit of noble ends by noble means. I will not do that which my conscience tells me is wrong, upon this occasion, to gain the huzzas of thousands, or the daily praise of all the papers which come from the press; I will not avoid doing what I think is right, though it should draw on me the whole artillery of libels, all that falsehood and malice can invent, or the credulity of a deluded populace can swallow. I can say, with a great magistrate, upon an occasion and under circumstances not unlike, *Ego hoc animo semper fui, ut invidiam virtute partam, gloriam, haud infamiam, putarem.*

The threats go further than abuse; personal violence is denounced. I do not believe it; it is not the genius of the worst men of this country, in the worst of times. But I have set my mind at rest. The last end that can happen to any man never comes too soon, if he fall in support of the law and liberty of his country (for liberty is synonymous to law and government). Such a shock, too, might be productive of public good; it might awake the better part of the kingdom out of that lethargy which seems to have benumbed them, and bring the mad part back to their senses as men intoxicated are sometimes stunned into sobriety.

Once for all, let it be understood that no endeavours of this kind will influence any man who at present sits here. If they had any effect, it would be contrary to their intent; leaning against their impression might give a bias the other way. But I hope, and I know, that I have fortitude enough to resist even that weakness. No libels, no threats, nothing that has happened, nothing that can happen, will weigh a feather against allowing the defendant, upon this and every other question, not only the whole advantage he is entitled to from substantial law and justice, but every benefit from the most critical nicety of form, which any other defendant could claim under the like objection. The only effect I feel is an anxiety to be able to explain the grounds upon which we proceed so as to satisfy all mankind, "that a flaw of form given way to in this case could not have been got over in any other."

MRS. EMMELINE PANKHURST

MRS. EMMELINE PANKHURST was born in Manchester and educated at private schools there and in Paris. She is a life-long worker in the cause of social reform, and was formerly a member of the Manchester School Board and of the South Manchester Board of Guardians. After the abolition of the School Boards, she became a member of the Educational Committee. The final result of her work in the direction of social betterment was a firm conviction that to abolish sweated female labour and its many concomitant evils, it was necessary that women should have the vote. This resolution taken, she gave up all her other work to devote herself to the cause of Woman Suffrage. She was the founder (1903) of the Woman's Social and Political Union; and as a 'militant,' she was several times sentenced to terms of imprisonment for 'riot' and 'conspiracy.' With the outbreak of the great war, an act of amnesty was mutually agreed upon, and the energies of the W.S.P.U. were diverted to the common cause.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE WOMAN'S VOTE

(Delivered at the Portman Rooms, on Tuesday, March 24th, 1908).

IT seems to me a very strange thing that large numbers of women should have met together to-night to consider whether the vote is of importance, while all day long, across the water in the Peckham Bye-election, men, whether they realise the importance of the vote or not, have been exercising it, and in exercising it settling for women as well as for themselves great questions of public importance.

What, then, is this vote that we are hearing so much about just now, so much more than people have heard in discussion at least, for a great many years? I think we may give the vote a threefold description. We may describe the vote as, first of all, a symbol, secondly, a safeguard, and thirdly, an instrument. It is a symbol of freedom, a symbol of citizenship, a symbol of liberty. It is a safeguard of all those liberties which it symbolises. And in these later days it has come to be regarded more than anything else as an instrument, something with which you can get a great many more things than our forefathers who fought for the vote ever realised as possible to get with it. It seems to me that such a thing is worth fighting for, and women to-day are fighting very strenuously in order to get it.

Wherever masses of people are gathered together there must be government. Government without the vote is more or less a form of tyranny. Government with the vote is more or less representative according to the extent to which the vote is given. In this country they tell us we have representative government. So far as women are concerned, while you have representative government for men, you have despotic government for women. So it is in order that the government of the country may be made really representative, may represent not only all classes of the community, but both sexes of the community, that this struggle for the vote is going on on the part of women.

To-day, women are working very hard for it. And there is no doubt whatever that very, very soon the fight will be over, and victory will be won. Even a Liberal Government will be forced to give votes to women. Gentlemen with Liberal principles have talked about those principles for a very long time, but it is only just lately that women have realised that so far as they are concerned, it began in talk and ended in talk, and that there was absolutely no intention of performance. To-day, we have taken off the mask, and we have made these gentlemen realise that, whether they like it or not, they will have to yield. People ask us, " Why force it on just now ? Why give all this trouble to the Liberals, with their great and splendid programme of reform ? " Well, we say, after all, they are just the people to whom we ought to give trouble, and who, if they are sincere, ought to be very glad that we are giving them trouble, and forcing them to put their great principles into practice.

To-night, it is not for me to talk to you very much about the agitation. I have to talk to you about what the vote will do for women, and what being deprived of the vote has caused women to suffer. And so I mean to devote most of the time at my disposal to this side of the question. What I am going to say to you to-night is not new. It is what we have been saying at every street corner, at every bye-election during the last eighteen months. It is perfectly well known to many members of my audience, but they will not mind if I repeat for the benefit of those who are here for the first time to-night, those arguments and illustrations with which many of us are so very familiar.

In the first place it is important that women should have the vote in order that in the government of the country the women's point of view should be put forward. It is important for women that in any legislation that affects women equally with men, those who make the laws should be responsible to women in order that they may be forced to consult women and learn women's views when they are contemplating the making or the altering of laws. Very little has been done by legislation for women for many years—for obvious reasons. More and more of the time of Members of Parliament is occupied by the claims which are made on behalf of the people who are organised in various ways in order to promote the interests of their industrial organisations or their political or social organisations. So the Member of Parliament, if he does dimly realise that women have needs, has no time to attend to them, no time to give to the consideration of those needs. His time is fully taken up by attending to the needs of the people who have sent him to Parliament. While a great deal has been done, and a great deal more has been talked about for the benefit of the workers who have votes, yet so far as women are concerned, legislation relating to them has been practically at a standstill. Yet it is not because women have no need, or because their need is not very urgent. There are many laws on the Statute-book to-day which are admittedly out of date and call for reformation ; laws which inflict very grave injustices on women. I want to call the attention of women who are here to-night to a few Acts on the Statute-book which press very hardly and very injuriously on women.

Men politicians are in the habit of talking to women as if there were no laws that affect women. "The fact is," they say, "the home is the place for women. Their interests are the rearing and training of children. These are the things that interest women. Politics have nothing to do with these things, and therefore politics do not concern women." Yet the laws decide how women are to live in marriage, how their children are to be trained and educated, and what the future of their children is to be. All that is decided by Act of Parliament. Let us take a few of these laws, and see what there is to say about them from the women's point of view.

First of all, let us take the marriage laws. They are made by men for women. Let us consider whether they are equal, whether they are just, whether they are wise. What security of maintenance has the married woman ? Many a married woman having given up her economic independence in order to marry, how is she compensated for that loss ? What security does she get in that marriage for which she gave up economic independence ? Take the case of a woman who has been earning a good income. She is told that she ought to give up her employment when she becomes a wife and a mother. What does she get in return ? All that a married man is obliged by law to do for his wife is to provide for her shelter of some kind, food of some kind, and clothing of some kind. It is left to his good pleasure to decide what the shelter shall be, what the food shall be, what the clothing shall be. It is left to him to decide what money shall be spent on the home, and how it shall be spent; the wife has no voice legally in deciding any of these things. She has no legal claim upon any definite portion of his income. If he is a good man, a conscientious man, he does the right thing. If he is not, if he chooses almost to starve his wife, she has no remedy. What he thinks sufficient is what she has to be content with.

I quite agree, in all these illustrations, that the majority of men are considerably better than the law compels them to be, so the majority of women do not suffer as much as they might suffer if men were all as bad as they might be, but since there are some bad men, some unjust men, don't you agree with me that the law ought to be altered so that those men could be dealt with?

Take what happens to the woman if her husband dies and leaves her a widow, sometimes with little children. If a man is so insensible to his duties as a husband and father when he makes his will, as to leave all his property away from his wife and children, the law allows him to do it. That will is a valid one. So you see that the married woman's position is not a very secure one. It depends entirely on her getting a good ticket in the lottery. If she has a good husband, well and good: if she has a bad one, she has to suffer, and she has no remedy. That is her position as a wife, and it is far from satisfactory.

Now let us look at her position if she has been very unfortunate in marriage, so unfortunate as to get a bad husband, an immoral husband, a vicious husband, a husband unfit to be the father of little children. We turn to the Divorce Court. How is she to get rid of such a man? If a man has got married to a bad wife, and he wants to get rid of her, he has but to prove against her one act of infidelity. But if a woman who is married to a vicious husband wants to get rid of him, not one act nor a thousand acts of infidelity entitle her to a divorce; she must prove either bigamy, desertion, or gross cruelty, in addition to immorality before she can get rid of that man.

Let us consider her position as a mother. We have repeated this so often at our meetings that I think the echo of what we have said must have reached many. By English law no married woman exists as the mother of the child she brings into the world. In the eyes of the law she is not the parent of her child. The child, according to our marriage laws, has only one parent, who can decide the future of the child, who can decide where it shall live, how it shall live, how much shall be spent upon it, how it shall be educated, and what religion it shall profess. That parent is the father.

These are examples of some of the laws that men have made, laws that concern women. I ask you, if women had had the vote, should we have had such laws? If women had had the vote, as men have the vote, we should have had equal laws. We should have had equal laws for divorce, and the law would have said that as Nature has given to children two parents, so the law should recognise that they have two parents.

I have spoken to you about the position of the married woman who does not exist legally as a parent, the parent of her own child. In marriage, children have one parent. Out of marriage children have also one parent. That parent is the mother—the unfortunate mother. She alone is responsible for the future of her child; she alone is punished if her child is neglected and suffers from neglect. But let me give you one illustration. I was in Herefordshire during the bye-election. While I was there, an unmarried mother was brought before the bench of magistrates charged with having neglected her illegitimate child. She was a domestic servant, and had put the child out to nurse. The magistrates—there were colonels and landowners on that bench—did not ask what wages the mother got; they did not ask who the father was or whether he contributed to the support of the child. They sent that woman to prison for three months for having neglected her child. I ask you women here to-night, if women had had some share in the making of laws, don't you think they would have found a way of making all fathers of such children equally responsible with the mothers for the welfare of those children?

Let us take the law of inheritance? Often in this agitation for the vote, we have been told by advanced members of the Liberal Party that to give votes to women on the same terms as those on which men now have the vote, would be to strengthen the influence of property, and to help to continue the existing laws of property.

When you look at the laws of inheritance in this country, it makes you smile to hear that argument. Men have taken very good care that women do not inherit until all male heirs are exhausted. So I do not think these democratic gentlemen are quite sincere in the fears they express lest the influence of property should be very much strengthened if women got the Parliamentary franchise. I do not think it is time yet for women to consider whether the law that the eldest son shall inherit the estate is a just law. I think we should put it in this way; if it is to be the eldest child, let it be the eldest child, whether that child is a man or a woman. I am perfectly certain that if women had had the vote when that law was made, that that is how it would have been settled, if they had decided to have a law of primogeniture.

Well, one could go on giving you many more of these examples. I want now to deal with an objection which may be in the minds of some people here. They say, you are talking about laws made a long time ago. Laws would not now be made like that. If a new law were made, it would of course be equal between the sexes. But as a matter of fact, it seems almost impossible for men, when making new laws that will affect both sexes, to recognise that there is any woman's side at all. Let us take an illustration from the last session of Parliament. For many years we have been accustomed to see pass through the House of Commons and go up to the House of Lords that hardy evergreen, the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill. I used—it is many years since I began reading the debates on that measure—I used to read the speeches carefully through to see if I could find one speech from a man which showed any kind of realisation of the women's side of that Bill. You read eloquent appeals to make it possible for a man who had lost his wife to give to the children the best kind of step-mother that they could have. Who could make a better step-mother, it was asked, than the sister of their deceased mother ? By natural ties, by old associations, by her knowledge of the children, she was better fitted than anybody else to take the mother's place. But you never heard of a man who thought there might be another side to the picture. So you have on the Statute-book a piece of legislation which gives relief to the widower who would like to provide a kind step-mother for his children, but does not give relief to the widow who would like to give a kind step-father to her children. I do not think it ever entered into the minds of these legislators that there might be a widow who would like to fulfil the behest of the Old Testament that the living brother should take up his deceased brother's burden and do his duty to his brother's family. So you see, even in this twentieth century, you have got the same spirit.

The man voter and the man legislator see the man's needs first, and do not see the woman's needs. And so it will be until women get the vote. It is well to remember that, in view of what we have been told of what is the value of women's influence. Women's influence is only effective when men want to do the thing that her influence is supporting.

Now let us look a little to the future. If it ever was important for women to have the vote, it is ten times more important to-day, because you cannot take up a newspaper, you cannot go to a conference, you cannot even go to church, without hearing a great deal of talk about social reform and a demand for social legislation. Of course, it is obvious that that kind of legislation—and the Liberal Government tell us that if they remain in office long enough we are going to have a great deal of it—is of vital importance to women. If we have the right kind of social legislation it will be a very good thing for women and children. If we have the wrong kind of social legislation, we may have the worst kind of tyranny that women have ever known since the world began. We are hearing about legislation to decide what kind of homes people are to live in. That surely is a question for women. Surely every woman, when she seriously thinks about it, will wonder how men by themselves can have the audacity to think that they can say what homes ought to be without consulting women. Then take education. Since 1870 men have been trying to find out how to educate children. I think they have not yet realised that if they are ever to find out how to educate children, they will have to take women into their confidence, and try to learn from women some of those lessons that the long experience of ages has taught to them. One cannot wonder that whole sessions of Parliament should be wasted on Education Bills. For, you see, it is only just lately that men have begun to consider education, or to try to learn what the word means. So as we are going to have a great deal more time devoted to education, I think it will be a great economy of time if we get the vote, if only that we may have an opportunity of deciding how girls are to be trained, even in those domestic duties which gentlemen are so fond of reminding us we ought to attend to.

I suppose you all read your newspapers this morning. You saw that a great statesman (Mr. John Burns) was pouring out words of wisdom on a subject which one may think might well be regarded as women's business, and which they might at all events have some share in deciding. How it makes one smile to hear a statesman comparing whisky and milk, and discussing whether babies should have natural mother's milk, or humanised milk, or sterilised milk, or what is a sufficient quantity of milk. All these things Cabinet Ministers have discovered that they are quite competent to decide without us. And when a few women ventured to make a small protest and suggested that perhaps it would be best to give to women, the mothers of the race, an opportunity of expressing their views on the subject, they were characterised as disgraceful, and turned out of the meeting for daring to raise their voices in protest.

Well, we cannot wonder that they are deciding what sort of milk the babies are to have, for it is only a few months ago that they decided how babies should be brought into the world, and who should officiate on the occasion. The Midwives Act, owing to the extreme difficulty and slowness with which, during twelve years of ceaseless agitation, it was carried through Parliament, has made of the women who agitated for it convinced suffragists, since, if they had had votes, the measure could have been passed in a couple of years. Even when carried, it was at the expense of many concessions, which, had the women promoting the Bill possessed the franchise, they would certainly have been able to avoid. To this day the midwives have no direct representation on the Central Board which administers the Act. Still, in spite of legislation like that, we find politicians, responsible members of the Government, saying that women ought to have nothing to do with politics, and that they ought not to ask for the vote.

What limits are there to be to this? The same gentleman who thinks himself quite competent to say how babies ought to be fed tells us that he is going to interfere not only with babies, but with their mothers as well. He is going to decide by Act of Parliament whether married women are to be allowed to earn an economic independence, or are to be prevented from doing so. He thinks married women who are earning their living are going to submit to a virtual repeal of the Married Women's Property Act, and to leave it to their husbands to decide whether they shall have any money to spend as they please. To deprive married women of the right to go out to work, to decide this for them without consulting women voters whether they are to earn wages or not, is an act of tyranny to which, I believe, women, patient and long-suffering as they are, will not submit. I hope that even the Liberal women will revolt when it comes to that. But I am not over hopeful about them, because, unfortunately for poor married women who know what it is to need to earn a living, those who decide what the policy of the Liberal women shall be are women who have never had to earn a living, and do not know what it is to have little children dependent upon them and liable to be starved if their mothers are prevented from going out to work. But fortunately the women who are going to be interfered with are not the kind of women who will submit to be interfered with quietly. Women who belong to the aristocracy of industry, women such as the cotton workers in the Lancashire mills, are not likely to be driven into the ranks of the sweated without protest.

What is the reason for the proposal? We are told it is to set these women free, to let them stay at home. I do not see that Mr. John Burns proposes to compensate women for the loss of their earnings. I do not see that he proposes to compel husbands to give to their wives a definite portion of their income for housekeeping purposes. All he proposes is that women, who are earning from ten shillings to thirty shillings a week shall be prevented from earning that income for themselves. He does not propose if the husband is sick or weakly and unable to earn enough to keep the home, to supplement that income by a grant from the State. All he proposes to do is to take away from the married woman the right to earn an income for herself. This, he says, will stop infantile mortality and put an end to race degeneracy. Could you have a greater example of ignorance of the real facts of the situation? I come from Lancashire. I was born in Lancashire. I think I know more about Lancashire than Mr. John Burns. I can tell you this, that infantile mortality and physical degeneration are not found in the homes of the well paid factory operatives, but they are found in the home of the slum-dweller, the home of the casual labourer, where the mother does not go out to work, but where there is never sufficient income to provide proper food for the child after it is born. That is where babies die—in those horrible slum districts, where families have to be maintained on incomes of from sixteen shillings to eighteen shillings per week, and where you have rents from five shillings to eight shillings per week to pay. What woman can feed her children on an income like that, even if her husband brings the whole of it home?

I know the cotton workers of Lancashire. Not long ago, we were in the Rossendale Valley, Mr. Harcourt's constituency. In that constituency more women earn wages than men. You find daughters earning more money than their fathers. You find wives earning more money than their husbands. They do piece work, and they often earn better wages than the men. I was talking one day to one—a married woman worker whom I met in the train. She was going home from the mill. She had a child three or four years of age, well dressed, very blithe, and looking well fed. I asked her if she worked in the mill. She said "Yes." I asked her what wages she earned. She said, "Thirty shillings a week." She told me she had other children. "Who looks after the children while you are at work?" "I have a housekeeper," she answered. I said to her, "You are not going to be allowed to work much longer. Mr. John Burns is going to make you stay at home and look after the children." And she said, "I don't know what we shall do then. I suppose we shall have to clem." I don't know whether you all know our Lancashire word "clem." When we say clem, we mean starve. In thousands of homes in Lancashire, if we get Mr. John Burns' proposal carried into law, little children, now well clothed and well fed and well cared for, will have clemmed before many months are over. These women say a shilling that they earn themselves is worth two shillings of their husbands' money, for it is their own. They know far better than their husbands how much money is needed for food, how much is needed to be spent on the home. I do not think there is a woman in Lancashire who does not realise that it is better to earn an income of her own than to be dependent on her husband. They realise it better than women of the upper classes who provide nurses and governesses for their children. I put it to you whether the woman of the working class, so long as she sees that her children are well fed and are well enough cared for, has not as much right as her well-off sister to provide a nurse for her children. We should like to say this to Mr. John Burns, that when women get the vote, they will take very much better care of babies than men have been able to do.

There may be many women in this room to-night who do not know much about the industrial women from practical experience. I want to say something about them. Here in London last year there was the Sweated Industries Exhibition. That Exhibition went to Manchester. It went to Birmingham. The papers were full of it. After it was held there were conferences in the Guildhall, conferences in the large centres of population, and resolutions were carried demanding legislation to deal with the sweating evil. Nothing has come of it all. If any of you women are doubtful about the value of the vote to women, that example ought to be enough. Look at the Government's proposals. What do you get in the forefront of their programme? You get an eight hours' day for miners. But you get nothing for the sweated women. Why is the miner being attended to rather than the sweated worker? The miner is being attended to because he, the miner, has got a vote. You see what the vote will do. You see what political power will do. If women had had the vote there would have been proposals to help the sweated woman worker in the Government programme of this session. I think that women, realising the horrible degradation of these workers, the degradation not only to themselves, but to all of us, caused by that evil of sweating, ought to be eager to get political freedom, in order that something may be done to get for the sweated woman labourer some kind of pay that would enable her to live at least a moral and a decent life.

Now let me say something on another point. Among those here are some professional women. You know what a long and a weary struggle it has been for women to get into the professions, some of which are now open to women. But you all know that the position of women in those professions is not what it ought to be, and it is certainly not what it will be when women get the franchise. How difficult it is for women to get posts after they have qualified for them. I know this from practical experience on a public body. Every time we had applications from women for posts open to them, we had applications also from men. Usually the standing of the women was very much higher than that of the men. And yet the women did not get those appointments. The men got them. That would all be altered if we got political equality. It is the political key that is needed to unlock the door.

Again, in all grades of education, certainly in elementary education, women are better qualified for the work than the men. You get a better type of woman. Yet for work equal to that of men, she cannot get equal pay. If women teachers had the Parliamentary vote, those men who go to the House of Commons to represent the interests of teachers would have to represent the interests of the women teachers as well as the interests of the men. I think that that gentleman who made the teachers the stepping-stone to office, and who talks at bye-elections about manhood suffrage would have taken up the interests of the women who have paid his wages if he felt that he was responsible to women voters.

Almost everywhere the well-paid posts are given to men. Take the College of Arts. Women art students do quite as well as the men students. And yet after their training is over, women never get any of the posts. All the professorships, all the well-paid posts in the colleges and Universities are given to men. I knew the Head of one of the training colleges in one of our great cities. She said to me "It makes me feel quite sad to see bright young girls expecting to get their living, and finding after their training is over that they can get nothing to do." The Parliamentary vote will settle that. There is no department of life that you can think of in which the possession of the Parliamentary vote will not make things easier for women than they are to-day.

Then there is the administrative side of public life. We want the vote not merely to get laws made. I think the possession of the Parliamentary vote is very important on the administrative side of politics. I have every reason to think that, because I have just come out of prison. We may congratulate ourselves that the Militant Suffragists, of whom I am one, have at least succeeded in forcing the Government to appoint the first woman inspector of prisons. Of course, it is a very small thing, but it means a very great deal. It means the beginning of prison reform, reform in prison discipline and prison treatment that has been needed for a very long time. Well, when we get the vote, it won't take many years talking about things to get one woman inspector appointed. The immediate result of our getting the vote will be the appointment of many more women inspectors of factories. When I last made inquiries there was only one woman inspector of factories in all Ireland. Yet in Belfast alone, more women and girls are working in factories than men and boys. The need there is for inspection is enormous in those linen and jute factories. It is perfectly obvious that when you have women and girls working in factories, if they are to be properly inspected, you must have women inspectors. We shall get them as soon as we are able to get women's interests properly attended to, which we shall only be able to do when we are in possession of the vote.

There is the same thing with regard to education. Women inspectors of schools are greatly needed. Moreover, there is not a single woman

Poor Law inspector, nor a woman inspector of workhouses and workhouse hospitals. And yet it is to the workhouses and the workhouse hospitals that we send old people, sick people, and little children. We need to get women relieving officers appointed. I cannot get away from Mr. John Burns. You would think that a working man by origin, and the son of working people, might have been able to realise that it would have been a good thing to have women as relieving officers. And yet when Mr. John Burns, shortly after his appointment, was asked whether he would sanction the appointment of a woman relieving officer in a large Union in the North of England, he said it was not illegal, but it was a practice not to be encouraged. We shall get that position for women. We shall get it made possible for women to manage the business which men have always conceded is the business of women, the care of the sick, the care of the aged, the care of the little children.

Well, I could go on giving you many, many more of these illustrations. In fact, the more one thinks about the importance of the vote for women the more one realises how vital it is. We are finding out new reasons for the vote, new needs for the vote every day in carrying on our agitation.

I hope that there may be a few men and women here who will go away determined at least to give this question more consideration than they have in the past. They will see that we women who are doing so much to get the vote, want it because we realise how much good we can do with it when we have got it. We do not want it in order to boast of how much we have got. We do not want it because we want to imitate men or to be like men. We want it because without it we cannot do that work which it is necessary and right and proper that every man and woman should be ready and willing to undertake in the interests of the community of which they form a part. It has always been the business of women to care for these things, to think of these home questions. I assure you that no woman who enters into this agitation need feel that she has got to give up a single one of her woman's duties in the home. She learns to feel that she is attaching a larger meaning to those duties which have been woman's duties since the race began, and will be till the race has ceased to be. After all, home is a very, very big thing indeed. It is not just your own little home, with its four walls, and your own little private and personal interests that are looked after there. The home is the home of everybody of the nation. No nation can have a proper home unless women as well as men give their best to its building up and to making it what a home ought to be, a place where every single child born into it shall have a fair chance of growing up to be a fit, and a happy, and a useful member of the community.

THEODORE PARKER

(1810-1860).

THEODORE PARKER was born at Lexington, Massachusetts, the youngest of eleven children. His father was a typical New England yeoman. His mother took great pains with the religious education of her children, "caring, however, but little for doctrines," and making religion to consist of love and good works.

His early life was spent on his father's farm in the summer and at school in the winter. At the age of seventeen he himself became a winter schoolmaster. In his twentieth year he entered himself at Harvard, working on the farm, as usual, until 1831 while he followed his studies and going over to the University for the examinations only. For his theological course he took up in 1834 his residence in the college, meeting his expenses by a small sum amassed by school-keeping and by help from a poor students' fund.

Ordained as a Unitarian minister in 1837 he had charge at West Roxbury, a few miles from Boston. Here he stayed until January, 1846. In 1841, he preached at Boston a sermon on "the transient and permanent in Christianity." The Boston Unitarian ministers declared that "the young man must be silenced."

However he was invited to deliver a series of lectures in the Masonic Hall, Boston, in the winter of 1841-1842. These lectures in their published form made his name famous throughout America and Europe. Beginning in 1845 he preached in Boston regularly for fourteen years. Besides his work in Boston he lectured throughout the States, being particularly interested in the emancipation of the slaves. One of his political speeches, delivered in 1858, contained the sentence, "Democracy is direct self-government, over all the people, by all the people, for all the people," which may have suggested Abraham Lincoln's well-known phrase.

The subject of the following speech, Daniel Webster (1782-1852), had a long connection with Massachusetts, serving that State in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. He served twice as Secretary of State, and for sixteen years was a candidate for the Presidency. His speech in favour of the Compromise of 1850 alienated his admirers in New England, by whom he was bitterly attacked.

DANIEL WEBSTER ; A TEMPERAMENTAL STUDY

DO men mourn for him, the great man eloquent? I put on sackcloth long ago. I mourned for him when he wrote the Creole letter which surprised Ashburton, Briton that he was. I mourned when he spoke the speech of the seventh of March. I mourned when the Fugitive Slave Bill passed Congress, and the same cannon that have fired " minute guns " for him fired also one hundred rounds of joy for the forging of a new fetter for the fugitive's foot. I mourned for him when the kidnappers first came to Boston—hated then—now respectable men, the companions of princes, enlarging their testimony in the court. I mourned when my own parishioners fled from the " stripes " of New England to the " stars " of Old England. I mourned when Ellen Craft fled to my house for shelter and for succour ; and for the first time in all my life, I armed this hand. I mourned when the courthouse was hung in chains ; when Thomas Sims, from his dungeon, sent out his petition for prayers and the churches did not dare to pray. I mourned when I married William and Ellen Craft, and gave them a Bible for their soul, and a sword to keep that soul living, and in a living frame. I mourned when the poor outcast in yonder dungeon sent for me to visit him, and when I took him by the hand that Daniel Webster was chaining in that house. I mourned for Webster when we prayed our prayer and sang our psalm on Long Wharf in the morning's gray. I mourned then ; I shall not cease to mourn.

He was a great man, a man of the largest mould, a great body, and a great brain ; he seemed made to last a hundred years. Since Socrates, there has seldom been a head so massive, so huge—seldom such a face since the stormy features of Michael Angelo :—

" The hand that rounded Peter's dome,
And groined the aisles of Christian Rome "—

he who sculptured Day and Night into such beautiful forms,—he looked them in the face before he chiselled them into stone. Dupuytren and Cuvier are said to be the only men in our day that have had a brain so vast. Since Charlemagne I think there has not been such a grand figure in all Christendom. A large man, decorous in dress, dignified in deportment, he walked as if he felt himself a king. Men from the country who knew him not, stared at him as he passed through our streets. The coalheavers and porters of London looked on him as one of the great forces of the globe ; they recognized a native king. In the Senate of the United States he looked an emperor in that council. Even the majestic Calhoun seemed common compared with him. Clay looked vulgar, and Van Buren but a fox. What a mouth he had! It was a lion's mouth. Yet there was a sweet grandeur in his smile, and a woman's sweetness when he would. What a brow it was! What eyes! like charcoal fire in the bottom of a deep, dark well. His face was rugged with volcanic fires, great passions, and great thoughts:—

"The front of Jove himself;
And eyes like Mars, to threaten and command."

Divide the faculties, not bodily, into intellectual, moral, affectional and religious; and try him on that scale. His late life shows that he had little religion—somewhat of its lower forms—conventional devoutness, formality of prayer, "the ordinances of religion"; but he had not a great man's all-conquering look to God. It is easy to be "devout." The Pharisee was more so than the Publican. It is hard to be moral. "Devoutness" took the Priest and the Levite to the Temple; morality the Samaritan to the man fallen among thieves. Men tell us he was religious, and in proof declare that he read the Bible; thought Job a great epic poem; quoted Habbakuk from memory, and knew hymns by heart; and latterly agreed with a New Hampshire divine in all the doctrines of a Christian life.

Of the affections, he was well provided by nature—though they were little cultivated—very attractable to a few. Those who knew him, loved him tenderly; and if he hated like a giant, he also loved like a king. Of unimpassioned and unrelated love, there are two chief forms: friendship and philanthropy. Friendship he surely had; all along the shore men loved him. Men in Boston loved him; even Washington held loving hearts that worshipped him.

Of philanthropy, I cannot claim much for him; I find it not. Of conscience, it seemed to me he had little; in his later life, exceeding little; his moral sense seemed long besotted; almost, though not wholly, gone. Hence, though he was often generous, he was not just. Free to give as to grasp, he was charitable by instinct, not disinterested on principle.

His strength lay not in the religious, nor in the affectional, nor in the moral part of man. His intellect was immense. His power of comprehension was vast. He methodized swiftly. But if you look at the forms of intellectual action, you may distribute them into three great modes of force; the understanding, the imagination, and the reason—the understanding, dealing with details and methods; imagination, with beauty, with power to create; reason, with first principles and universal laws.

We must deny to Webster the great reason. He does not belong to the great men of that department,—the Socrates, Aristotles, Platos, Leibnitzs, Newtons, Descartes, and other mighties. He seldom grasps a universal law. His measures of expediency for to-day are seldom bottomed on universal principles of right which last forever.

I cannot assign to him a large imagination. He was not creative of new forms of thought or of beauty; so he lacks the poetic charm which gladdens the loftiest eloquence. But his understanding was exceedingly great. He acquired readily and retained well; arranged with ease and skill; and fluently reproduced. As a scholar he passed for learned in the Senate, where scholars are few; for a universal man with editors of political and commercial prints. But his learning was narrow in its range, and not very nice in its accuracy. His reach in history and literature was very small for a great man seventy years of age, always associating with able men. To science he seems to have paid scarcely any attention at all. It is a short radius that measures the arc of his historic realm. A few Latin authors whom he loved to quote make up his meagre classic store. He was not a scholar, and it is idle to claim great scholarship for him.

As a statesman his lack of what I call the highest reason and imagination continually appears. To the national stock he added no new idea, created out of new thought; no great maxim, created out of human history and old thought. The great ideas of the time were not born in his bosom. He organized nothing. There were great ideas of practical value seeking lodgment in the body; he aided them not. . . .

What a sad life was his! At Portsmouth his house burned down. His wife died,—a loving woman, beautiful and tenderly beloved! Of several children, all save one have gone before him to the tomb. Sad man; he lived to build his children's monument! Do you remember the melancholy spectacle in the street when Major Webster, a victim of the Mexican War, was by his father laid down in yonder tomb,—a daughter, too, but recently laid low! How poor seemed then the ghastly pageant in the street,—empty and hollow as the muffled drum. For years he has seemed to me like one of the tragic heroes of the Grecian tale, pursued by fate, and latterly, the saddest sight in all this Western World,—widowed of so much he loved, and grasping of what was not only vanity, but the saddest vexation of the heart. I have long mourned for him as for no living or departed man. He blasted us with scornful lightning. Him, if I could, I would not blast, but only bless continually and evermore.

WILLIAM PENN

(1644-1718).

IN 1670, William Penn and his fellow-Quaker, William Mead, were arrested on the charge that "he, the said Penn, abetted by the said Mead, did take upon himself to speak and preach upon the streets" of London, without permission. At their trial before the Mayor, Samuel Starling, and the Recorder, Penn attempted to defend himself by summing up the inalienable rights of Englishmen. He was repeatedly interrupted, the Mayor finally saying: "Stop his mouth, jailer. Bring fetters and stake him to the ground!" Penn afterwards published the speech he would have made if allowed to proceed. The jury were instructed by the Mayor to convict, and when, disregarding the instructions, they acquitted Penn and Mead, each juryman was fined forty marks for contempt. Penn's speech shows that he had a most remarkable intellect. He was born at London, October 14th, 1644, and educated at Oxford, where he acquired the learning he shows in this address. His connection with the Quakers began in 1668. The grant of Pennsylvania was made to him in 1681, and, except when he was deprived of it for a short time (from 1692 to 1694), the control of that colony remained with him until his death, July 30th, 1718. His works were collected and published in 1726, but as they are largely controversial they are seldom read, and he has almost ceased to be suspected of the ability shown in the construction of the Old Bailey address.

PRINCIPLES OF MAGNA CHARTA

(Delivered at the Trial of William Penn and William Mead, at the Old Bailey, for a "Tumultuous Assembly," in 1670).

WE have lived to an age so debauched from all humanity and reason, as well as faith and religion, that some stick not to turn butchers to their own privileges and conspirators against their own liberties. For however Magna Charta had once the reputation of a sacred unalterable law, and few were hardened enough to incur and bear the long curse that attends the violators of it, yet it is frequently objected

now, that the benefits there designed are but temporary, and therefore liable to alteration, as other statutes are. What game such persons play at may be read in the attempts of Dionysius, Phalaris, etc., which would have will and power to be the people's law.

But that the privileges due to Englishmen, by the Great Charter of England, have their foundation in reason and law; and that those new Cassandrian ways to introduce will and power deserve to be detested by all persons professing sense and honesty, and the least allegiance to our English Government, we shall make appear from a sober consideration of the nature of those privileges contained in that charter.

1. The ground of alteration of any law in government (where there is no invasion) should arise from the universal discommodity of its continuance, but there can be no disprofit in the discontinuance of liberty and property, therefore there can be no just ground of alteration.

2. No one Englishman is born slave to another, neither has the one a right to inherit the sweat and benefit of the other's labour, without consent; therefore the liberty and property of an Englishman cannot reasonably be at the will and beck of another, let his quality and rank be never so great.

3. There can be nothing more unreasonable than that which is partial, but to take away the liberty and property of any, which are natural rights, without breaking the law of nature (and not of will and power) is manifestly partial, and therefore unreasonable.

4. If it be just and reasonable for men to do as they would be done by, then no sort of men should invade the liberties and properties of other men, because they would not be served so themselves.

5. Where liberty and property are destroyed, there must always be a state of force and war, which, however pleasing it may be unto the invaders, will be esteemed intolerable by the invaded, who will no longer remain subject in all human probability than while they want as much power to free themselves as their adversaries had to enslave them; the troubles, hazards, ill consequences, and illegality of such attempts, as they have declined by the most prudent in all ages, so have they proved most uneasy to the most savage of all nations, who first or last have by a mighty torrent freed themselves, to the due punishment and great infamy of their oppressors; such being the advantage, such the disadvantage which necessarily do attend the fixation and removal of liberty and property.

We shall proceed to make it appear that Magna Charta (as recited by us) imports nothing less than their preservations:—

"No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned, or be disseized of his freehold, or liberties, or free customs, or be outlawed, or exiled, or any other ways destroyed ; nor we will not pass upon him nor condemn him, but by lawful judgment of his peers, etc.

" A freeman shall not be amerced for a small fault, but after the manner of the fault, and for a great fault after the greatness thereof, and none of the said amercement shall be assessed, but by the oath of good and lawful men of the vicinage."

1. It asserts Englishmen to be free ; that's liberty.
2. That they have freeholds ; that's property.
3. That amercement or penalties should be proportioned to the faults committed, which is equity.
4. That they shall lose neither, but when they are adjudged to have forfeited them, in the judgment of their honest neighbours, according to the law of the land, which is lawful judgment.

It is easy to discern to what pass the enemies of the Great Charter would bring the people.

1. They are now freemen ; but they would have them slaves.
2. They have now right unto their wives, children, and estates, as their undoubted property ; but such would rob them of all.
3. Now no man is to be amerced or punished but suitably to his fault ; whilst they would make it suitable to their revengeful minds.
4. Whereas the power of judgment lies in the breasts and consciences of twelve honest neighbours, they would have it at the discretion of mercenary judges ; to which we cannot choose, but add that such discourses manifestly strike at this present constitution of government ; for it being founded upon the Great Charter, which is the ancient common law of the land, as upon its best foundation, none can design the cancelling of the charter, but they must necessarily intend the extirpation of the English Government ; for where the cause is taken away the effect must consequently cease. And as the restoration of our ancient English laws, by the Great Charter, was the sovereign balsam which cured our former breaches, so doubtless will the continuation of it prove an excellent prevention to any future disturbances.

But some are ready to object that " The Great Charter consisting as well of religious as civil rights, the former having received an alteration, there is the same reason why the latter may have the like."

To which we answer that the reason of alteration cannot be the same ; therefore the consequence is false. The one being a matter of opinion, about faith and religious worship, which is as various as the unconstant apprehensions of men ; but the other is matter of so immutable right and justice, that all generations, however differing in their religious opinions, have concentrated, and agreed to the certainty, equity, and indispensable necessity of preserving these fundamental laws ; so that Magna Charta hath not risen and fallen with the differing religious opinions that have been in this land, but have ever remained as the stable right of every individual Englishman, purely as an Englishman. Otherwise if the civil privileges of the people had fallen with the pretended religious privileges of the popish tyranny, at the first reformation, as must needs be suggested by this objection, our case had ended here, that we had obtained a spiritual freedom, at the cost of a civil bondage; which certainly was far from the intention of the first reformers, and probably an unseen consequence, by the objectors to their idle opinion.

In short, there is no time in which any man may plead the necessity of such an action as is unjust in its own nature, which he must unavoidably be guilty of, that doth deface or cancel that law by which the justice of liberty and property is confirmed and maintained to the people. And consequently no person may legally attempt the subversion or extenuation of the force of the Great Charter. We shall proceed to prove from instances out of both.

1. Any judgment given contrary to the said charter is to be undone and holden for naught. 25th Edward I., chap. ii.

2. Any that by word, deed, or counsel, go contrary to the said charter are to be excommunicated by the bishops; and the archbishops of Canterbury and York are bound to compel the other bishops to denounce sentence accordingly, in case of their remissness or neglect, which certainly hath relation to the State rather than the Church, since there was never any necessity of compelling the bishops to denounce sentence in their own case, though frequently in the people's. 25th Edward I., chap. iv.

3. That the Great Charter and Charter of Forest be holden and kept in all points, and if any statute be made to the contrary, that it shall be holden for naught. 42nd Edward III., chap. i. Upon which Coke, that famous English lawyer, said:—

"Albeit judgments in the King's courts are of high regard in law, and *judicia* are accounted as *juris dicta*, yet it is provided by act of Parliament that if any judgment be given contrary to any of the points of the Great Charter, it should be holden for naught."

He further said:—

"That upon the Statute of the 25th of Edward I., chap. i., that this Great Charter and the Charter of Forest are properly the common law of the land, or the law is common to all the people thereof."

4. Another statute runs thus:—

"If any force come to disturb the execution of the common law, ye shall cause their bodies to be arrested and put in prison; ye shall deny no man right by the King's letters, nor counsel the King anything that may turn to his damage or disherison. 18th Edward III., chap. vii. Neither to delay right by the Great and Little Seal." This is the judge's charge and oath. 2nd Edward III., chap. viii.; 14th Edward III., chap. xiv.; 11th Richard II., chap. x.

Such care hath been taken for the preservation of this Great Charter that in the 25th Edward I. it was enacted:—

"That commissioners should issue forth that there should be chosen in every shire court, by the commonalty of the same shire, three substantial men, knights or other lawful, wise, and well-disposed persons, to be justices, which shall be assigned by the King's letters patent, under the Great Seal, to hear and determine without any other writ, but only their commission, such plaints as shall be made upon all those that commit or offend against any point contained in the aforesaid charters." 28th Edward I., chap. i. . . .

So heinous a thing was it esteemed of old to endeavour an enervation or subversion of these ancient rights and privileges, that acts of Parliament themselves (otherwise the most sacred with the people) have not been of force enough to secure or defend such persons from condign punishment, who, in pursuance of them, have acted inconsistent with out Great Charter. Therefore it is that great lawyer, the Lord Coke, doth once more aggravate the example of Empson and Dudley (with persons of the same rank) into a just caution, as well to Parliaments as judges, justices, and inferior magistrates, to decline making or executing any act that may in the least seem to restringe or confirm this so often avowed and confirmed Great Charter of the liberties of England, since Parliaments are said to err when they cross it; the obeyers of their acts punished as time-serving transgressors, and that kings themselves (though enriched by those courses) have, with great compunction and repentance, left among their dying words their recantations.

Therefore most notable and true it was, with which we shall conclude this present subject, what the King pleased to observe in the speech to the Parliament about 1662, namely: "The good old rules of law are our best security."

PLATO

(427-347 B.C.).

PLATO was of good family. His father Ariston was said to have been a descendant of Codrus, the last king of Athens, who sacrificed himself for his country. On his mother's side he claimed descent from Solon the law-giver, and an uncle of his was one of the thirty tyrants. He became in early life a friend and disciple of Socrates and imbibed from him the philosophy that he was to record in the "Dialogues." Later, years after Socrates had been tried, condemned and killed, Plato discoursed on philosophy to disciples of his own in the grove of Academus and founded the first philosophical school there. These are all the facts about his life that we can safely accept as authentic. Legend tells of his travels to Cyrene, of conversations with the priests of Egypt, of how after Socrates' death he fled with other Socratics to Megara, of the famous journeys to Sicily to instruct Dion and the younger Dionysius.

Till his death he is said to have presided over his Academy. He left in the "Dialogues" the greatest contribution to philosophical thought that any man has made.

THE CHARACTER OF THE PHILOSOPHER

THUS, Glaucon, I said, after pursuing a lengthened inquiry we have, not without difficulty, discovered who are true philosophers and who are not.

Yes, he replied ; probably it was not easy to abridge the inquiry.

Apparently not, I said. However that may be, I think, for my part, that the result would have been brought out still more clearly, if we had to speak of this only, without discussing the many points that still await our notice, if we wish to ascertain wherein the superiority of a righteous over an unrighteous life consists.

Then what are we to do next ?

We have only to take the step next in order. Since those who are able to apprehend the eternal and immutable, are philosophers, while those who are incapable of this and who wander in the region of change and multiformity, are not philosophers, which of the two, tell me, ought to be governors of a state?

What must I reply, if I am to do justice to the question?

Ask yourself which of the two are to be thought capable of guarding the laws and customs of states, and let these be appointed guardians.

You are right.

Can there be any question as to whether a blind man, or one with quick sight, is the right person to guard and keep any thing?

There can be no question about it.

Then do you think that there is a particle of difference between the condition of blind persons, and the state of those who are absolutely destitute of the knowledge of things as they really are, and who possess in their soul no distinct exemplar, and cannot, like painters, fix their eyes on perfect truth as a perpetual standard of reference, to be contemplated with the minutest care, before they proceed to deal with earthly canons about things beautiful and just and good, laying them down where they are required, and where they already exist watching over their preservation?

No, indeed, there is not much difference.

Shall we then appoint such persons to the office of guardians, in preference to those who not only have gained a knowledge of each thing in its reality, but in practical skill are not inferior to the former, and come behind them in no other department of excellence?

Why, if these latter are not wanting in the other qualifications, it would be perfectly absurd to choose any others. For just the point in which they are superior may be said to be the most important of all.

Then shall we proceed to explain how the same persons will be enabled to possess both qualifications?

By all means.

If so, we must begin by gaining a thorough insight into their proper character, as we said at the outset of this discussion. And I think, if we agree tolerably on that point, we shall also agree that the two qualifications may be united in the same persons, and that such characters, and no others, are the proper governors of states.

How so?

With regard to the philosophic nature, let us take for granted that its possessors are ever enamoured of all learning, that will reveal to them somewhat of that real and permanent existence, which is exempt from the vicissitudes of generation and decay.

Let it be granted.

Again, I said, let us also assume that they are enamoured of the whole of that real existence, and willingly resign no part of it, be it small or great, honoured or slighted; as we shewed on a previous occasion, in speaking of the ambitious and the amorous.

You are right.

Now then proceed to consider, whether we ought not to find a third feature in the character of those who are to realize our description.

What feature do you mean?

I mean truthfulness, that is, a determination never to admit falsehood in any shape, if it can be helped, but to abhor it, and love the truth.

Yes, it is probable we shall find it.

Nay, my friend, it is not only probable, but absolutely inevitable, that one who is by nature prone to any passion, should be well pleased with everything that is bound by the closest ties to the beloved object.

True, he said.

And can you find any thing allied to wisdom more closely than truth?

Certainly not.

And is it possible for the same nature to love wisdom, and at the same time love falsehood?

Unquestionably it is not.

Consequently, the genuine lover of knowledge must, from his youth up, strive intensely after all truth.

Yes, he must thoroughly.

Well, but we cannot doubt that when a person's desires set strongly in one direction, they run with corresponding feebleness in every other channel, like a stream whose waters have been diverted into another bed.

Undoubtedly they do.

So that when the current has set towards science, and all its branches, a man's desires will, I fancy, hover around pleasures that are purely mental, abandoning those in which the body is instrumental,—provided that the man's love of wisdom is real, not artificial.

It cannot be otherwise.

Again, such a person will be temperate and thoroughly uncovetous: for he is the last person in the world to value those objects, which make men anxious for money at any cost.

True.

Once more, there is another point which you ought to take into consideration, when you are endeavouring to distinguish a philosophic from an unphilosophic character.

What is that?

You must take care not to overlook any taint of meanness. For surely little-mindedness thwarts above everything the soul that is destined ever to aspire to grasp truth, both divine and human, in its integrity and universality.

That is most true.

And do you think that a spirit full of lofty thoughts, and privileged to contemplate all time, and all existence, can possibly attach any great importance to this life ?

No, it is impossible.

Then such a person will not regard death as a formidable thing, will he ?

Certainly not.

So that a mean and cowardly character can have no part, as it seems, in true philosophy.

I think it cannot.

What then ? Can the man whose mind is well-regulated, and free from covetousness, meanness, pretentiousness, and cowardice, be by any possibility hard to deal with or unjust ?

No ; it is impossible.

Therefore, when you are noticing the indications of a philosophical or unphilosophical temper, you must also observe in early youth whether the mind is just and gentle, or unsociable and fierce.

Quite so.

There is still another point, which I think you must certainly not omit.

What is that ?

Whether the mind in question is quick or slow at learning. For you can never expect a person to take a decent delight in an occupation which he goes through with pain, and in which he makes small progress with great exertion ?

No, it would be impossible.

Again, if he can remember nothing of what he has learned, can he fail, being thus full of forgetfulness, to be void of knowledge ?

No, he cannot.

Then, will not his fruitless toil, think you, compel him at last to hate both himself and such employment ?

Doubtless it will.

Let us never, then, admit a forgetful mind into the ranks of those that are counted worthy of philosophy ; but let us look out for a good memory as a requisite for such admission.

Yes, by all means.

Again, we should certainly say that the tendency of an unrefined and awkward nature is wholly towards disproportion.

Certainly.

And do you think that truth is akin to disproportion, or to proportion?

To proportion.

In addition, then, to our other requirements, let us search for a mind naturally well-proportioned and graceful, whose native instincts will permit it to be easily led to apprehend the Forms of things as they really are.

By all means.

What then? Do you think that the qualities which we have enumerated are in any way unnecessary or inconsistent with one another, provided the soul is to attain unto full and satisfactory possession of real existence?

On the contrary, they are most strictly necessary.

Then can you find any fault with an employment which requires of a man who would pursue it satisfactorily, that nature shall have given him a retentive memory, and made him quick at learning, lofty-minded and graceful, the friend and brother of truth, justice, fortitude, and temperance?

No, he replied; the very Genius of criticism could find no fault with such an employment.

THE ALLEGORY OF THE CAVE

NOW then, I proceeded to say, go on to compare our natural condition, so far as education and ignorance are concerned, to a state of things like the following. Imagine a number of men living in an underground cavernous chamber, with an entrance open to the light, extending along the entire length of the cavern, in which they have been confined, from their childhood, with their legs and necks so shackled, that they are obliged to sit still and look straight forwards, because their chains render it impossible for them to turn their heads round: and imagine a bright fire burning some way off, above and behind them, and an elevated roadway passing between the fire and the prisoners, with a low wall built along it, like the screens which conjurors put up in front of their audience, and above which they exhibit their wonders.

I have it, he replied.

Also figure to yourself a number of persons walking behind this wall, and carrying with them statues of men, and images of other animals, wrought in wood and stone and all kinds of materials, together with various other articles, which overtop the wall; and, as you might expect, let some of the passers-by be talking, and others silent.

You are describing a strange scene, and strange prisoners.

They resemble us, I replied. For let me ask you, in the first place, whether persons so confined could have seen anything of themselves or of each other, beyond the shadows thrown by the fire upon the part of the cavern facing them?

Certainly not, if you suppose them to have been compelled all their lifetime to keep their heads unmoved.

And is not their knowledge of the things carried past them equally limited?

Unquestionably it is.

And if they were able to converse with one another, do you not think that they would be in the habit of giving names to the objects which they saw before them?

Doubtless they would.

Again: if their prison-house returned an echo from the part facing them, whenever one of the passers-by opened his lips, to what, let me ask you, could they refer the voice, if not to the shadow which was passing?

Unquestionably they would refer it to that.

Then surely such persons would hold the shadows of those manufactured articles to be the only realities.

Without a doubt they would.

Now consider what would happen if the course of nature brought them a release from their fetters, and a remedy for their foolishness, in the following manner. Let us suppose that one of them has been released, and compelled suddenly to stand up, and turn his neck round and walk with open eyes towards the light; and let us suppose that he goes through all these actions with pain, and that the dazzling splendour renders him incapable of discerning those objects of which he used formerly to see the shadows. What answer should you expect him to make, if some one were to tell him that in those days he was watching foolish phantoms, but that now he is somewhat nearer to reality, and is turned towards things more real, and sees more correctly; above all, if he were to point out to him the several objects that are passing by, and question him, and compel him to answer what they are? Should you not expect him to be puzzled, and to regard his old visions as truer than the objects now forced upon his notice?

Yes, much truer.

And if he were further compelled to gaze at the light itself, would not his eyes, think you, be distressed, and would he not shrink and turn away to the things which he could see distinctly, and consider them to be really clearer than the things pointed out to him?

Just so.

And if some one were to drag him violently up the rough and steep ascent from the cavern, and refuse to let him go till he had drawn him out into the light of the sun, would he not, think you, be vexed and indignant at such treatment, and on reaching the light, would he not find his eyes so dazzled by the glare as to be incapable of making out so much as one of the objects that are now called true?

Yes, he would find it so at first.

Hence, I suppose, habit will be necessary to enable him to perceive objects in that upper world. At first he will be most successful in distinguishing shadows; then he will discern the reflections of men and other things in water, and afterwards the realities; and after this he will raise his eyes to encounter the light of the moon and stars, finding it less difficult to study the heavenly bodies and the heaven itself by night, than the sun and the sun's light by day.

Doubtless.

Last of all, I imagine, he will be able to observe and contemplate the nature of the sun, not as it appears in water or on alien ground, but as it is in itself in its own territory.

Of course.

His next step will be to draw the conclusion, that the sun is the author of the seasons and the years, and the guardian of all things in the visible world, and in a manner the cause of all those things which he and his companions used to see.

Obviously, this will be his next step.

What then? When he recalls to mind his first habitation, and the wisdom of the place, and his old fellow-prisoners, do you not think he will congratulate himself on the change, and pity them?

Assuredly he will.

And if it was their practice in those days to receive honour and commendations one from another, and to give prizes to him who had the keenest eye for a passing object, and who remembered best all that used to precede and follow and accompany it, and from these data divined most ably what was going to come next, do you fancy that he will covet these prizes, and envy those who receive honour and exercise authority among them? Do you not rather imagine that he will feel what Homer describes, and wish extremely

> "To drudge on the lands of a master,
> Under a portionless wight,"

and be ready to go through anything, rather than entertain those opinions, and live in that fashion ?

For my own part, he replied, I am quite of that opinion. I believe he would consent to go through anything rather than live in that way.

And now consider what would happen if such a man were to descend again and seat himself on his old seat ? Coming so suddenly out of the sun, would he not find his eyes blinded with the gloom of the place ?

Certainly, he would.

And if he were forced to deliver his opinion again, touching the shadows aforesaid, and to enter the lists against those who had always been prisoners, while his sight continued dim, and his eyes unsteady,—and if this process of initiation lasted a considerable time,—would he not be made a laughingstock, and would it not be said of him, that he had gone up only to come back again with his eyesight destroyed, and that it was not worth while even to attempt the ascent ? And if any one endeavoured to set them free and carry them to the light, would they not go so far as to put him to death, if they could only manage to get him into their power ?

Yes, that they would.

Now this imaginary case, my dear Glaucon, you must apply in all its parts to our former statements, by comparing the region which the eye reveals, to the prisonhouse, and the light of the fire therein to the power of the sun : and if, by the upward ascent and the contemplation of the upper world, you understand the mounting of the soul into the intellectual region, you will hit the tendency of my own surmises, since you desire to be told what they are ; though, indeed, God only knows whether they are correct. But, be that as it may, the view which I take of the subject is to the following effect. In the world of knowledge, the essential Form of Good is the limit of our inquiries, and can barely be perceived ; but, when perceived, we cannot help concluding that it is in every case the source of all that is bright and beautiful,—in the visible world giving birth to light and its master, and in the intellectual world dispensing, immediately and with full authority, truth and reason ;—and that whosoever would act wisely, either in private or in public, must set this Form of Good before his eyes.

To the best of my power, said he, I quite agree with you.

That being the case, I continued, pray agree with me on another point, and do not be surprised, that those who have climbed so high are unwilling to take a part in the affairs of men, because their souls are ever loath to desert that upper region. For how could it be otherwise, if the preceding simile is indeed a correct representation of their case ?

True, it could scarcely be otherwise.

Well: do you think it a marvellous thing, that a person, who has just quitted the contemplation of divine objects for the study of human infirmities, should betray awkwardness, and appear very ridiculous, when with his sight still dazed, and before he has become sufficiently habituated to the darkness that reigns around, he finds himself compelled to contend in courts of law, or elsewhere, about the shadows of justice, or images which throw the shadows, and to enter the lists in questions involving the arbitrary suppositions entertained by those who have never yet had a glimpse of the essential features of justice?

No, it is anything but marvellous.

Right: for a sensible man will recollect that the eyes may be confused in two distinct ways and from two distinct causes,—that is to say, by sudden transitions either from light to darkness, or from darkness to light. And believing the same idea to be applicable to the soul, whenever such a person sees a case in which the mind is perplexed and unable to distinguish objects, he will not laugh irrationally, but he will examine whether it has just quitted a brighter life, and has been blinded by the novelty of darkness, or whether it has come from the depths of ignorance into a more brilliant life, and has been dazzled by the unusual splendour; and not till then will he congratulate the one upon its life and condition, and compassionate the other; and if he chooses to laugh at it, such laughter will be less ridiculous than that which is raised at the expense of the soul that has descended from the light of a higher region.

You speak with great judgment.

Hence, if this be true, we cannot avoid adopting the belief, that the real nature of education is at variance with the account given of it by certain of its professors, who pretend, I believe, to infuse into the mind a knowledge of which it was destitute, just as sight might be instilled into blinded eyes.

True; such are their pretensions.

Whereas, our present argument shews us that there is a faculty residing in the soul of each person, and an instrument enabling each of us to learn; and that, just as we might suppose it to be impossible to turn the eye round from darkness to light without turning the whole body, so must this faculty, or this instrument, be wheeled round, in company with the entire soul, from the perishing world, until it be enabled to endure the contemplation of the real world and the brightest part thereof, which, according to us, is the Form of Good. Am I not right?

You are.

Hence, I continued, this very process of revolution must give rise to an art, teaching in what way the change will most easily and most effectually be brought about. Its object will not be to generate in the person the power of seeing. On the contrary, it assumes that he possesses it, though he is turned in a wrong direction, and does not look towards the right quarter ; and its aim is to remedy this defect.

So it would appear.

Hence, while, on the one hand, the other so-called virtues of the soul seem to resemble those of the body, inasmuch as they really do not pre-exist in the soul, but are formed in it in the course of time by habit and exercise ; the virtue of wisdom, on the other hand, does most certainly appertain, as it would appear, to a more divine substance, which never loses its energy, but by change of position becomes useful and serviceable, or else remains useless and injurious. For you must, ere this, have noticed how keen-sighted are the puny souls of those who have the reputation of being clever but vicious, and how sharply they see through the things to which they are directed, thus proving that their powers of vision are by no means feeble, though they have been compelled to become the servants of wickedness, so that the more sharply they see, the more numerous are the evils which they work.

Yes, indeed it is the case.

But, I proceeded, if from earliest childhood these characters had been shorn and stripped of those leaden, earthborn weights, which grow and cling to the pleasures of eating and gluttonous enjoyments of a similar nature, and keep the eye of the soul turned upon the things below ;—if, I repeat, they had been released from these snares, and turned round to look at objects that are true, then these very same souls of these very same men would have had as keen an eye for such pursuits as they actually have for those in which they are now engaged.

Yes, probably it would be so.

Once more : is it not also probable, or rather is it not a necessary corollary to our previous remarks, that neither those who are uneducated and ignorant of truth, nor those who are suffered to linger over their education all their life, can ever be competent overseers of a state,—the former, because they have no single mark in life, which they are to constitute the end and aim of all their conduct both in private and in public ; the latter, because they will not act without compulsion, fancying that while yet alive, they have been translated to the islands of the blest.

That is true.

It is, therefore, our task, I continued, to constrain the noblest characters in our colony to arrive at that science which we formerly pronounced the highest, and to set eyes upon the good, and to mount that ascent we spoke of; and, when they have mounted and looked long enough, we must take care to refuse them that liberty which is at present permitted them.

Pray what is that?

The liberty of staying where they are, and refusing to descend again to those prisoners, or partake of their toils and honours, be they mean or be they exalted.

Then are we to do them a wrong, and make them live a life that is worse than the one within their reach?

You have again forgotten, my friend, that law does not ask itself how some one class in a state is to live extraordinarily well. On the contrary, it tries to bring about this result in the entire state; for which purpose it links the citizens together by persuasion and by constraint, makes them share with one another the benefit which each individual can contribute to the common weal, and does actually create men of this exalted character in the state, not with the intention of letting them go each on his own way, but with the intention of turning them to account in its plans for the consolidation of the state.

True, he replied; I had forgotten.

Therefore reflect, Glaucon, that far from wronging the future philosophers of our state, we shall only be treating them with strict justice, if we put them under the additional obligation of watching over their fellow-citizens, and taking care of them. We shall say: It is with good reason that your compeers elsewhere refuse to share in the labours of their respective states. For they take root in a city spontaneously, in defiance of the prevailing constitution; and it is but fair that a self-sown plant, which is indebted to no one for support, should have no inclination to pay to anybody wages for attendance. But in your case, it is we that have begotten you for the state as well as for yourselves, to be like leaders and kings of a hive,—better and more perfectly trained than the rest, and more capable of playing a part in both modes of life. You must therefore descend by turns, and associate with the rest of the community, and you must habituate yourselves to the contemplation of these obscure objects. For, when habituated, you will see a thousand times better than the residents, and you will recognize what each image is, and what is its original, because you have seen the realities of which beautiful and just and good things are copies. And in this way you and we shall find that the life of the state is a substance, and not a phantom like the life of our present states, which are mostly composed of men who fight among themselves for shadows, and are at feud for the administration of affairs, which they regard as a great boon. Whereas I conceive the truth stands thus: That city in which the destined rulers are least eager to rule, will inevitably be governed in the best and least factious manner, and a contrary result will ensue if the rulers are of a contrary disposition.

You are perfectly right.

And do you imagine that our pupils, when addressed in this way, will disobey our commands, and refuse to toil with us in the state by turns, while they spend most of their time together in that bright region ?

Impossible, he replied : for certainly it is a just command, and those who are to obey it are just men. No ; doubtless each of them will enter upon his administration as an unavoidable duty,—conduct the reverse of that pursued by the present rulers in each state.

True, my friend ; the case stands thus. If you can invent for the destined rulers a life better than ruling, you may possibly realize a well-governed city : for only in such a city will the rulers be those who are really rich, not in gold, but in a wise and virtuous life, which is the wealth essential to a happy man. But if beggars, and persons who hunger after private advantages, take the reins of the state, with the idea that they are privileged to snatch advantage from their power, all goes wrong. For the post of magistrate is thus made an object of strife ; and civil and intestine conflicts of this nature, ruin not only the contending parties, but also the rest of the state.

A MYTH CONCERNING THE SOUL

IN considering the nature of the soul let us proceed in the following manner. To explain what the soul is, would be a long and most assuredly a god-like labour ; to say what it resembles, is a shorter and a human task. Let us attempt then the latter ; let us say that the soul resembles the combined efficacy of a pair of winged steeds and a charioteer. Now the horses and drivers of the gods are all both good themselves and of good extraction, but the character and breed of all others is mixed. In the first place, with us men the supreme ruler has a pair of horses to manage, and then of these horses he finds one generous and of generous breed, the other of opposite descent and opposite character. And thus it necessarily follows that driving in our case is no easy or agreeable work. We must at this point endeavour to express what we mean respectively by a mortal and an immortal animal. All that is soul presides over all that is without soul, and patrols all heaven, now appearing in one form and now in another. When it is perfect and fully feathered it roams in upper air, and regulates the entire universe ; but the soul that has lost its feathers is carried down till it finds some solid resting place; and when it has settled there, when it has taken to itself, that is, an earthly body, which seems capable of self-motion, owing to the power of its new inmate, the name of animal is given to the whole, to this compound, I mean, of soul and body, with the addition of the epithet mortal. The immortal, on the other hand, has received its name from the conclusion of no human reasoning; but without having either seen or formed any adequate conception of a god, we picture him to ourselves as an immortal animal, possessed of soul and possessed of body, and of both in intimate conjunction from all eternity. But this matter I leave to be and to be told as Heaven pleases—my task is to discover what is the cause that makes the feathers fall off the soul. It is something, I conceive, of the following kind.

The natural efficacy of a wing is to lift up heavy substances, and bear them aloft to those upper regions which are inhabitated by the race of the gods. And of all the parts connected with the body it has perhaps shared most largely (with the soul) in the divine nature. Now of this nature are beauty, wisdom, virtue, and all similar qualities. By these then the plumage of the soul is chiefly fostered and increased; by deformity, vice, and all such contraries, it is wasted and destroyed. Zeus, the great chieftan in heaven, driving a winged car, travels first, arranging and presiding over all things; and after him comes a host of gods and inferior deities, marshalled in eleven divisions, for Hestia stays at home alone in the mansion of the gods; but all the other ruling powers that have their place in the number of the twelve march at the head of a troop in the order to which they have been severally appointed. Now there are, it is true, many ravishing views and opening paths within the bounds of heaven, whereon the family of the blessed gods go to and fro, each in performance of his own proper work; and they are followed by all who from time to time possess both will and power; for envy has no place in the celestial choir. But whenever they go to feast and revel, they forthwith journey by an uphill path to the summit of the heavenly vault. Now the chariots of the gods being of equal poise, and obedient to the rein, move easily, but all others with difficulty; for they are burdened by the horse of vicious temper, which sways and sinks them towards the earth, if haply he has received no good training from his charioteer. Whereupon there awaits the soul a crowning pain and agony. For those which we called immortal go outside when they are come to the topmost height, and stand on the outer surface of heaven, and as they stand they are borne round by its revolution, and gaze on the external scene. Now of that region beyond the sky no earthly bard has ever yet sung, or ever will sing in worthy strains. But this is the fashion of it; for sure I must venture to speak the truth, especially as truth is my theme. Real existence, colourless, formless, and intangible, visible only to the intelligence which sits at the helm of the soul, and with which the family of true science is concerned, has its abode in this region. The mind then of deity, as it is fed by intelligence and pure science, and the mind of every soul that is destined to receive its due inheritance, is delighted at seeing the essence to which it has been so long a stranger, and by the light of truth is fostered and made to thrive, until, by the revolution of the heaven, it is brought round again to the same point. And during the circuit it sees distinctly absolute justice, and absolute temperance, and absolute science; not such as they appear in creation, nor under the variety of forms to which we now-a-days give the name of realities, but the justice, the temperance, the science, which exist in that which is real and essential being. And when in like manner it has seen all the rest of the world of essence, and feasted on the sight, it sinks down again into the interior of heaven, and returns to its own home. And on its arrival, the charioteer takes his horses to the manger, and sets before them ambrosia, and gives them nectar to drink with it. Such is the life of the gods; but of the other souls, that which follows a god most closely and resembles him most nearly, succeeds in raising the head of its charioteer into the outer region, and is carried round with the immortals in their revolution, though sore encumbered by its horses, and barely able to contemplate the real existences; while another rises and sinks by turns, his horses plunging so violently that he can discern no more than a part of these existences. But the common herd follow at a distance, all of them indeed burning with desire for the upper world, but, failing to reach it, they make the revolution in the moisture of the lower element, trampling on one another, and striking against one another, in their efforts to rush one before the other. Hence ensues the extremest turmoil and struggling and sweating; and herein, by the awkwardness of the drivers, many souls are maimed, and many lose many feathers in the crush; and all after painful labour go away without being blessed by admission to the spectacle of truth, and thenceforth live on the food of mere opinion.

And now will I tell you the motives of this great anxiety to behold the fields of truth. The suitable pasturage for the noblest portion of the soul is grown on the meadows there, and it is the nature of the wing, which bears aloft the soul, to be fostered thereby; and moreover, there is an irrevocable decree, that if any soul has followed a god in close companionship and discerned any of the true essences, it shall continue free from harm till the next revolution, and if it be ever thus successful, it shall be ever thus unharmed: but whenever, from inability to follow, it has missed that glorious sight, and, through some mishap it may have encountered, has become charged with forgetfulness and vice, and been thereby so burdened as to shed its feathers and fall to the earth, in that case there is a law that the soul thus fallen be not planted in any bestial nature during the first generation, but that if it has seen more than others of essential verity, it pass into the germ of a man who is to become a lover of wisdom, or a lover of beauty, or some votary of the Muses and Love ; if it be of second rank, it is to enter the form of a constitutional ruler, a warrior, or a man fitted for command ; the third will belong to a politician, or economist, or merchant ; the fourth, to a laborious professor of gymnastics, or some disciple of the healing art ; the fifth will be possessed by a soothsayer, or some person connected with mysteries ; the sixth will be best suited by the life of a poet or some other imitative artist ; the seventh, by the labour of an artisan or a farmer ; the eighth, by the trade of a sophist or a demagogue ; and the ninth, by the lot of an absolute monarch. And in all these various conditions those who have lived justly receive afterwards a better lot, those who have lived unjustly, a worse.

WILLIAM PULTENEY

(1684-1764).

WILLIAM PULTENEY was one of the most thoroughgoing Whigs of the reigns of Queen Anne and George I., when in some respects the Whigs were more thoroughgoing than their successors, the English Liberals, of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Though no English Liberal of the present might care to make such a speech against English armament as Pulteney made in 1738, it is still of great contemporary interest. Pulteney was born in 1684 and educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He entered Parliament in 1705, and supported Walpole, though twenty years later they opposed each other. Under George I., Pulteney was Secretary for War, and in 1742 was created Earl of Bath, a title which failed to usurp the honour he had done his own patronymic. He died July 7th, 1764.

AGAINST STANDING ARMIES

(A Speech in Parliament in 1738).

SIR, as my principles are well known, as I have always declared myself of Whig principles, therefore I shall take the liberty to speak with the more freedom upon the question now before us; and indeed, upon the present occasion, I think myself under a sort of necessity, not only of speaking, but of speaking freely, because I find those very fears which were the occasion of our late happy Revolution are now made use of as arguments for leading us into measures which must necessarily disappoint its effect. For recovering our religion and liberties, or at least for delivering them from the dangers they were then exposed to, our ancestors ventured their lives and fortunes under the glorious and successful banners of the Prince of Orange. For securing those liberties in time to come, the Prince of Orange was advanced to our throne, and for the same end our present royal family was established. This is the end we have had in view ever since the Revolution. This is the end which I shall always have in view; and, therefore, I can never allow the apprehensions of arbitrary power from one man to grow so prevalent with me as to induce me to be for any measure that may probably subject this nation, some time hereafter, to the arbitrary power of another; for if our liberties are to be destroyed, it signifies nothing to me, whether they are to be destroyed by a Richard, a John, or a Thomas; I am sure they can never be in any danger from a George.

If I were sure, sir, that the custom of keeping up a standing army in time of peace would come to an end as soon as it shall please God to visit this nation, by taking his present Majesty from us, I should be very easy, even though our army were much more numerous than it is; but as I know that the custom in one reign is generally made a precedent for the next, and as experience has shown us that a standing army is an evil more apt to grow than decrease, therefore I shall never be for keeping up a greater number of regular troops than shall at the time appear absolutely necessary. I know there are some gentlemen, who, upon the present and many former occasions, have argued for the necessity of keeping up a standing army in time of peace, and yet pretend to be proud of being thought Whigs; but I likewise know that a change in a man's circumstances has often produced a change in his sentiments; and, indeed, I am surprised to find that any man who has read the writings of some of our most eminent Whigs in former reigns can pretend to call himself a Whig, or that he is governed by Whig principles, and yet at the same time declare for keeping up a numerous standing army in this island at a time when we are in the most profound tranquillity both abroad and at home. A numerous standing army, an army of men depending upon the king only, for their bread as well as their preferment, has always been deemed inconsistent with liberty. This has been the language of Whigs ever since the name was known; this has always been the language of those who were in times past the glorious supporters of liberty; the contrary doctrine was never till of late years professed by any but courtiers and the corrupt advocates for arbitrary power. Corrupt, sir, I may surely call them; for in favour of such a cause, I am certain no man would argue without a fee.

From all histories, both ancient and modern, we shall find that standing armies have been the destruction of liberty; and from the history of our own we may see how apt a standing army is to increase. Before the reign of King Charles II., no king of England had so much as a regiment of guards; they had no guards but the gentlemen pensioners; and though King Charles II. upon his restoration established but two regiments of guards, one of foot, and another of horse, or rather some troops of horse, yet the Whigs of those days (notwithstanding the unsettled state the nation was in, and the many republicans and republican soldiers who were then known to be in the kingdom) found great fault with that establishment, and looked upon it as an innovation dangerous to the liberties of the nation. But these two regiments are now increased to an army of eighteen thousand men, and even the most zealous Whigs of this, which is but the next succeeding age, seem to be willing to submit to the keeping up of twelve thousand. For my part, sir, I must confess that I think even twelve thousand too great a number to be kept up in time of peace, and should look upon it as extremely dangerous if it were to be established as a maxim, that it would always be necessary for us to keep up such a number; therefore, though I may now argue for no greater reduction than what has been proposed, I hope it will not be from thence inferred that I shall always be for keeping up that number.

Even twelve thousand regular forces may, in my opinion, be dangerous, especially if the keeping up of that number should be attended with an utter neglect of military discipline among the rest of our people; but eighteen thousand of such forces is, I think, a number which is absolutely inconsistent with our constitution; for no man can say our Constitution is secure when it is in the power of the court to overturn it at any time they have a mind; and considering the circumstances the nation is now in, considering that our militia is reduced to the lowest contempt, that there are no arms, nor any knowledge of military discipline among our people, that there is no great family in the kingdom that has any military dependence, or is in possession of any magazine of arms, I will be bold to say that eighteen thousand regular troops, devoted to a court faction, will not only enable that faction to overturn the liberties of their country, but will be sufficient for supporting the arbitrary power they have established. In all countries we find that the keeping up of standing armies debases the spirit and courage of the rest of the people. In this country it has already had some effect, and that effect will grow stronger and more general every day. If an ambitious or oppressive court, supported by eighteen thousand regular, mercenary troops, should begin to govern without any Parliament, and to make his Majesty's proclamation carry the force of a law, nothing but a military opposition could be made to them, and no such opposition can be made without a previous concert and great preparation; for as no single man in the kingdom has now any number of followers he can depend on, nor any quantity of arms for arming those that may follow him from pure inclination, therefore no considerable body of men could assemble together in arms in any part of the kingdom against an established government, nor can any one man, no nor any half dozen of the best families in the kingdom, propose to bring such a thing about with any probability of success; for a general concert might probably be discovered before it could be brought to the execution, and if any private man should begin to provide himself with a quantity of arms the government might probably hear of it, and would not only seize upon his arms, but might make it a sufficient proof for convicting him of high treason. In our present circumstances, therefore, it cannot be expected that such a government would meet with any opposition, but from mobs and sudden tumultuous assemblies, and one squadron of dragoons, or two or three companies of foot, will always be sufficient for dispersing any such tumultuous assembly, especially after our people have been rendered more dastardly than they are at present, by a long disuse of arms and by having been long accustomed to be bullied and cowed by parties of regular troops.

From reason therefore, sir, and the nature of things, I must conclude that eighteen thousand regular troops will be sufficient for establishing and supporting arbitrary power in this kingdom, whenever our government has a mind; and in this opinion I am strongly fortified by experience. I believe there was never in any country a more illegal, a more arbitrary, or a more unpopular government, than that of Oliver Cromwell; yet that government was supported till his death by an army not much greater than what we have now on foot, for when he died his army amounted to but twenty-seven thousand men; and the same sort of government would probably have been re-established under some other general, if a part of the army itself had not joined in restoring King Charles II. If then, at that time, twenty-seven thousand men were found sufficient, when a great part of our people were not only accustomed to arms, but bred to action, what may not eighteen thousand now do, after our people have been for so long bred up in a total disuse of arms, and hardly any man in the kingdom, except a few in our army, that ever saw an engagement? From the histories of other countries we may learn the same sort of experience. Julius Cæsar conquered the world with an army not much superior to what we have now on foot, for it is reckoned he had but about twenty-two thousand men, when he fought the battle of Pharsalia; and both in France and Spain we shall find that the armies which first established that arbitrary power which now subsists in each were not a great deal more numerous than the standing army now kept up in this island. . . .

Having thus, I think, clearly shown that the keeping up a standing army of eighteen thousand men in this island may be of the most dangerous consequence to our Constitution, I shall next consider the necessity we are now under for keeping up such a number; but first, sir, I shall take some notice of our militia, notwithstanding its being now in such a contemptible state that 'tis worth no man's while to take notice of it, notwithstanding my being convinced that it will be growing more and more contemptible every day; for while our government has a standing army to trust to, I am afraid they will endeavour to render our militia more and more contemptible, in order to make a standing army the more necessary and to make their dependence upon that army the more safe and infallible. However, sir, notwithstanding the present contemptible state of our militia, I am still of opinion that it might be made a good militia; nay, I am convinced that by proper regulations it might, in a few years, be made as good as any regular troops that have never been in action; for, with respect to discipline and the use of arms, I cannot look upon our present standing army as anything else than a well-disciplined militia. There are but few of the officers and soldiers that have ever been in action, and such as have might be incorporated with the militia; so that I can see no reason why our militia might not, in a few years, be made as good as our present regular troops can be supposed to be. In time of war, indeed, it would be necessary to have regular regiments and to give pay both to the officers and soldiers of those regiments; but at the end of the war all such regiments ought to be disbanded and incorporated with our militia, and proper care taken to provide handsomely for those officers and soldiers who could not provide for themselves. By this means, even our militia would always have a great number of veteran soldiers among them, which would make those soldiers of much more service to their country, and much less expensive or dangerous, than when kept in separate corps by themselves, according to our present method. . . .

But, sir, if we still go on in the same error; if we continue to neglect our militia and to put our whole trust in a standing army, our king may enjoy the hearts and affections of the generality of the people and yet fall a sacrifice to the unjust resentment of his army; for in all countries where a standing army is kept up, those very measures and qualities which serve to endear a king to the generality of his people may probably expose him to the hatred and contempt of a standing army. In all countries where a standing army has been long kept up, and the rest of the people bred up to a total disuse of arms, the gentlemen of the army are apt to begin to look upon themselves, not as the servants, but as the lords and masters of the people; therefore they are apt to take such liberties with the people as ought not to be indulged in any society; and if the king, by an equal and impartial distribution of justice, should take care to prevent or put a stop to their taking any such liberties, they will probably think he does them injustice by not allowing them to make use of that right which they may think belongs to them as lords and masters of the people. In every such case, if the people have neither skill nor courage to defend their king and protector, he must necessarily fall a sacrifice to the resentment of his army, and for this reason we find that in all governments where a standing army has been long kept up, the king or chief magistrate generally despises the affections of the people and minds nothing but the affections of the army, for the securing of which it becomes absolutely necessary for him to look upon the people in the same light his army does. They join in considering the people as their slaves only, and they join in treating them accordingly.

I come now, sir, to the third necessary use we are said to have for a numerous standing army, and I must say it is such a one as surprises me. We are told that an army of eighteen thousand men is necessary for enabling the civil magistrate to execute those laws, which have been thought necessary by the wisdom of our legislature. If it were so, I am sure I should not think the wisdom of our legislature very conspicuous. 'Tis well known, sir, that with respect to some laws lately passed I have nothing to answer for, because I testified my disapprobation in the most public and explicit manner, of which several gentlemen in this House can bear me witness; but, nevertheless, I have so much confidence in the wisdom of our legislature, that I am convinced they neither have passed, nor will pass, any law for the execution of which a military force shall appear to be necessary, and if from experience such a thing should afterwards be found to be necessary, they would certainly repeal such a law and contrive some other method for effectuating that which was intended by the enacting of such a law; for in a free and civil government the lawgivers must always take care to pass no laws but what may be executed by the civil magistrate, assisted by the civil power of the country, or what we in this kingdom call the *posse* of the county. If they do otherwise, they must necessarily alter the frame of their government, and instead of a civil and free government they must establish a military and arbitrary form of government. In this we may see the difference between a free government supported by the power of the people only and an arbitrary government supported by a standing army. The former in all the laws they pass, or measures they take, are obliged to consult the inclinations of the people in general, because it is by the power of the people only they can propose to execute the laws they pass, or to enforce the measures they pursue. . . . .

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

(*For Biographical Note see Section* i.).

" PIONEERS "

(Delivered in the Guildhall, London).

I AM about to speak to you on matters of real concern as to which I happen at this moment to possess some first-hand knowledge; for recently I traversed certain portions of the British Empire under conditions which made me intimately cognisant of their circumstances and needs. I have just spent nearly a year in Africa. While there I saw four British Protectorates. I grew heartily to respect the men whom I there met; settlers and military and civil officials; and it seems to me that the best service I can render them and you is very briefly to tell you how I was impressed by some of the things that I saw.

" Your men in Africa are doing a great work for your Empire, and they are also doing a great work for civilisation. This fact, and my sympathy for and belief in them, are my reasons for speaking. The people at home, whether in Europe or in America, who live softly, often fail fully to realise what is being done for them by the men who are actually engaged in the pioneer work of civilisation abroad. Of course, in any mass of men there are sure to be some who are weak or unworthy, and even those who are good are sure to make occasional mistakes; and that is as true of pioneers as of other men. Nevertheless, the great fact in world history during the last century has been the spread of civilisation over the world's waste spaces; the work is still going on; and the soldiers, the settlers, and the civic officials who are actually doing it are, as a whole entitled to the heartiest respect and the fullest support from their brothers who remain at home.

" At the outset, there is one point upon which I wish to insist with all possible emphasis. The civilised nations who are conquering for civilisation savage lands should work together in a spirit of hearty mutual good-will. Ill-will between such nations is bad enough anywhere, but it is peculiarly harmful and contemptible when those actuated by it are engaged in the same task, a task of such far-reaching importance to the future of humanity—the task of subduing the savagery of wild man and wild nature and of bringing abreast of our civilisation those lands where there is an older civilisation which has somehow gone crooked.

"Mankind as a whole has benefited by the noteworthy success that has attended the French occupation of Algiers and Tunis, just as mankind as a whole has benefited by what England has done in India; and each nation should be glad of the other nations' achievements. In the same way it is of interest to all civilised men that a similar success shall attend alike the Englishman and the German as they work in East Africa; exactly as it has been a benefit to every one that America took possession of the Philippines. Those of you who know Lord Cromer's excellent book in which he compares modern and ancient imperialism need no word from me to prove that the dominion of modern civilised nations over the dark spaces of the earth has been fraught with widespread good for mankind; and my plea is that the civilised nations engaged in doing this work shall treat one another with respect and friendship, and shall hold it as discreditable to permit envy and jealousy, backbiting and antagonism, among themselves.

"I visited four different British Protectorates or Possessions in Africa—namely, East Africa, Uganda, the Sudan, and Egypt. About the first three I have nothing to say to you save what is pleasant as well as true; about the last I wish to say a few words because they are true, without regard to whether or not they are pleasant.

"In the highlands of East Africa you have a land which can be made a true white man's country. While there I met many settlers on intimate terms, and I felt for them a peculiar sympathy because they so strikingly reminded me of the men of our own western frontier in America—of the pioneer farmers and ranchmen who built up the States of the great plains and the Rocky Mountains. It is of high importance to encourage these settlers in every way, remembering that the prime need is not for capitalists to exploit the land, but for settlers who shall make their permanent homes therein. No alien race should be permitted to come into competition with them. Fortunately, you have now in the Governor of East Africa, Sir Percy Girouard, a man admirably fitted to deal wisely and firmly with the many problems before him; he is on the ground and knows the needs of the country, and is zealously devoted to its interests; all that is necessary is to follow his lead and to give him cordial support and backing.

"In Uganda the problem is totally different. Uganda cannot be made a white man's country, and the prime need is to administer the land in the interests of the native races and so help forward their development. Uganda has been the scene of an extraordinary development of Christianity; nowhere else of recent times has missionary effort met with such success. The inhabitants of the Dark Continent in their capacity for progress towards civilisation have made great strides, and the English officials have shown equal judgment and disinterestedness in the work they have done; and they have been especially wise in trying to develop the natives along their own lines instead of seeking to turn them into imitation Englishmen. In Uganda all that is necessary is to go forward on the paths you have already marked out.

"The Sudan is peculiarly interesting because if affords the best possible example of the wisdom of disregarding the well-meaning but unwise sentimentalists who object to the spread of civilisation at the expense of savagery. I do not believe that in the whole world there is to be found any nook of territory which has shown such astonishing progress from the most hideous misery to well-being and prosperity as the Sudan has shown during the last twelve years while it has been under British rule. Up to that time it was independent and it governed itself, and independence and self-government in the hands of the Sudanese proved to be much what independence and self-government would have been in a wolf-pack.

"During a decade and a half, while Mahdism controlled the country, there flourished a tyranny which for cruelty, blood-thirstiness, unintelligence, and wanton destructiveness surpassed anything which a civilised people can even imagine. The keystones of the Mahdist Party were religious intolerance and slavery, with murder and the most abominable cruelty as the method of obtaining each. During these fifteen years at least two-thirds of the population—probably seven or eight millions of people—died by violence or by starvation. Then the English came in, put an end to the independence and self-government which had wrought this hideous evil, restored order, kept the peace, and gave to each individual a liberty which during the evil days of their own self-government not one human being possessed, save only the blood-stained tyrant who at the moment was ruler.

"I stopped at village after village in the Sudan, and in many of them I was struck by the fact that while there were plenty of children they were all under twelve years old; and inquiry always developed the fact that these children were known as 'Government children' because in the days of Mahdism it was the literal truth that in a very large proportion of the communities every child was either killed or died of starvation and hardship, whereas under the peace brought by English rule families are flourishing, men and women are no longer hunted to death, and the children are brought up under more favourable circumstances for soul and body, than have ever previously obtained in the entire history of the Sudan.

"In administration, in education, in police work, the Sirdar and his lieutenants, great and small, have performed to perfection a task equally important and difficult. The Government officials, civil and military, who are responsible for this task, and the Egyptian and Sudanese who have worked with and under them, and as directed by them, have a claim upon all civilised mankind which should be heartily admitted.

"It would be a crime not to go on with the work—a work which the inhabitants themselves are helpless to perform, unless under firm and wise outside guidance. I have met some people who had some doubt, as to whether the Sudan would pay. Personally, I think it probably will. But I may add that, in my judgment, this fact does not alter the duty of England to stay there. It is not worth while belonging to a big nation unless a big nation is willing, when the necessity arises, to undertake a big task. I feel about you in the Sudan just as I felt about us in Panama. When we acquired the right to build the Panama Canal and entered on the task, there were worthy people who came to me and said they wondered whether it would pay. I always answered that it was one of the great world works, which had to be done; that it was our business as a nation to do it, if we were ready to make good our claim to be treated as a great world power; and that, as we were unwilling to abandon the claim, no American worth his salt ought to hesitate about performing the task. I feel just the same way about you in the Sudan.

"Now as to Egypt. It would not be worth my while to speak to you at all, nor would it be worth your while to listen, unless on condition that I say what I deeply feel ought to be said. I speak as an outsider, but in one way this is an advantage, for I speak without national prejudice. I would not talk to you about your own internal affairs here at home; but you are so very busy at home that I am not sure whether you realise just how things are—in some places at least—abroad. At any rate, it can do you no harm to hear the view of one who has actually been on the ground and has information at first hand; of one, moreover, who, it is true, is a sincere well-wisher of the British Empire, but who is not English by blood, and who is impelled to speak mainly because of his deep concern in the welfare of mankind and in the future of civilisation.

"Remember also that I who address you am not only an American, but a Radical, a real—not a mock—democrat, and that what I have to say is spoken chiefly because I am a democrat—a man who feels that his first thought is bound to be the welfare of the masses of mankind, and his first duty to war against violence, and injustice, and wrong-doing, wherever found, and I advise you only in accordance with the principles on which I have myself acted as American President in dealing with the Philippines.

"In Egypt you are not only the guardians of your own interests; you are also the guardians of the interests of civilisation, and the present condition of affairs in Egypt is a grave menace both to your Empire and to civilisation. You have given Egypt the best government it has had for at least two thousand years—probably a better government than it has ever had before; for never in history has the poor man in Egypt, the tiller of the soil, the ordinary labourer, been treated with as much justice and mercy, under a rule as free from corruption and brutality, as during the last twenty-eight years.

"Yet recent events, and especially what has happened in connection with and following on the assassination of Boutros Pasha three months ago, have shown that in certain vital points you have erred, and it is for you to make good your error. It has been an error proceeding from the effort to do too much, and not too little, in the interests of the Egyptians themselves; but unfortunately it is necessary for all of us who have to do with uncivilised peoples and especially with fanatical peoples, to remember that in such a situation as yours in Egypt weakness, timidity, and sentimentality may cause even more far-reaching harm than violence and injustice. Of all broken reeds, sentimentality is the most broken reed on which righteousness can lean.

"In Egypt you have been treating all religions with studied fairness and impartiality; and instead of gratefully acknowledging this, a noisy section of the native population takes advantage of what your good treatment has done to bring about an anti-foreign movement, a movement in which, as events have shown, murder on a large or a small scale is expected to play a leading part. Boutros Pasha was the best and most competent Egyptian official, a steadfast upholder of English rule, and an earnest worker for the welfare of his fellow-countrymen; and he was murdered simply and solely because of these facts, and because he did his duty wisely, fearlessly, and uprightly. The attitude of the so-called Egyptian Nationalist party, in connection with this murder, has shown that they were neither desirous nor capable of guaranteeing even that primary justice the failure to supply which makes self-government not merely an empty, but a noxious farce.

"Such are the conditions; and where the effort made by your officials to help the Egyptians towards self-government is taken advantage of by them, not to make things better, not to help their country, but to try to bring murderous chaos upon the land, then it becomes the primary duty of whoever is responsible for the government in Egypt to establish order, and to take whatever measures are necessary to that end.

"It was with this primary object of establishing order that you went into Egypt twenty-eight years ago; and the chief and ample justification for your presence in Egypt was this absolute necessity of order being established from without, coupled with your ability and willingness to establish it. Now, either you have the right to be in Egypt, or you have not ; either it is, or it is not, your duty to establish and keep order. If you feel that you have not the right to be in Egypt, if you do not wish to establish and keep order there—why, then, by all means get out of Egypt.

" If, as I hope, you feel that your duty to civilised mankind and your fealty to your own great traditions alike bid you to stay, then make the fact and the name agree, and show that you are ready to meet in very deed the responsibility which is yours. It is the thing, not the form, which is vital ; if the present forms of government in Egypt, established by you in the hope that they would help the Egyptians upward, merely serve to provoke and permit disorder, then it is for you to alter the forms ; for if you stay in Egypt it is your first duty to keep order, and above all things else to punish murder, and to bring to justice all who directly or indirectly incite others to commit murder, or condone the crime when it is committed. When a people treats assassination as the corner-stone of self-government it forfeits all right to be treated as worthy of self-government.

" You are in Egypt for several purposes, and among them one of the greatest is the benefit of the Egyptian people. You saved them from ruin by coming in ; and at the present moment, if they are not governed from outside, they will again sink into a welter of chaos. Some nation must govern Egypt. I hope and believe that you will decide that it is your duty to be that nation."

JOHN RUSKIN

(1819-1900).

AMONG English essayists and lecturers of the second half of the nineteenth century, Ruskin held easily the same rank which belonged to Carlyle from 1845 to 1885. He was Carlyle's last and greatest pupil. After the collapse of his health and the loss of his intellectual efficiency, no one could attempt to take his place. With Carlyle he constitutes a distinct school of expression governed more by Teutonic than by classical influences, intense in its feeling, and too strenuous in expression to be safe for any one who is not well assured that his intellect and his moral purposes are strong enough for the demands of the highest thought. As a platform speaker, Ruskin had no equal in the England of his day, and a number of his best-known essays are really orations prepared as lectures or addresses and delivered to English audiences. As it was said of Macaulay that all his orations are essays, it might be said with equal truth, both of Carlyle and Ruskin, that all their essays are orations.

WAR

(Delivered at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich).

YOUNG soldiers, I do not doubt but that many of you came unwillingly to-night, and many in merely contemptuous curiosity, to hear what a writer on painting could possibly say, or would venture to say, respecting your great art of war. You may well think within yourselves, that a painter might, perhaps without immodesty, lecture younger painters upon painting, but not young lawyers upon law, nor young physicians upon medicine—least of all, it may seem to you, young warriors upon war. And, indeed, when I was asked to address you, I declined at first, and declined long; for I felt that you would not be interested in my special business, and would certainly think there was small need for me to come to teach you yours. Nay, I knew that there ought to be no such need, for the great veteran soldiers of England are now men every way so thoughtful, so noble, and so good, that no other teaching than their knightly example, and their few words of grave and tried counsel, should be either necessary for you, or even, without assurance of due modesty in the offerer, endured by you.

But being asked, not once nor twice, I have not ventured persistently to refuse ; and I will try, in very few words, to lay before you some reason why you should accept my excuse, and hear me patiently. You may imagine that your work is wholly foreign to, and separate from mine. So far from that, all the pure and noble arts of peace are founded on war ; no great art ever yet rose on earth, but among a nation of soldiers. There is no art among a shepherd people, if it remains at peace. There is no art among an agricultural people, if it remains at peace. Commerce is barely consistent with fine art ; but cannot produce it. Manufacture not only is unable to produce it, but invariably destroys whatever seeds of it exist. There is no great art possible to a nation but that which is based on battle.

Now, though I hope you love fighting for its own sake, you must, I imagine, be surprised at my assertion that there is any such good fruit of fighting. You supposed, probably, that your office was to defend the works of peace, but certainly not to found them ; nay, the common course of war, you may have thought, was only to destroy them. And truly, I, who tell you this of the use of war, should have been the last of men to tell you so, had I trusted my own experience only. Hear why: I have given a considerable part of my life to the investigation of Venetian painting; and the result of that enquiry was my fixing upon one man as the greatest of all Venetians, and therefore, as I believed, of all painters whatsoever. I formed this faith (whether right or wrong matters at present nothing,) in the supremacy of the painter Tintoret, under a roof covered with his pictures ; and of these pictures, three of the noblest were then in the form of shreds of ragged canvas, mixed up with the laths of the roof, rent through by three Austrian shells. Now, it is not every lecturer who *could* tell you that he had seen three of his favourite pictures torn to rags by bomb-shells. And after such a sight, it is not every lecturer who *would* tell you that, nevertheless, war was the foundation of all great art.

Yet the conclusion is inevitable, from any careful comparison of the states of great historic races at different periods. Merely to show you what I mean, I will sketch for you, very briefly, the broad steps of the advance of the best art of the world. The first dawn of it is in Egypt ; and the power of it is founded on the perpetual contemplation of death, and of future judgment, by the mind of a nation of which the ruling caste were priests, and the second, soldiers. The greatest works produced by them are sculptures of their kings going out to battle, or receiving the homage of conquered armies. And you must remember also, as one of the great keys to the splendour of the Egyptian nation, that the priests were not occupied in theology only. Their theology was the basis of practical government and law ; so that they were not so much priests as religious judges ; the office of Samuel, among the Jews, being as nearly as possible correspondent to theirs.

All the rudiments of art then, and much more than the rudiments of all science, are laid first by this great warrior-nation, which held in contempt all mechanical trades, and in absolute hatred the peaceful life of shepherds. From Egypt art passes directly into Greece, where all poetry, and all painting, are nothing else than the description, praise, or dramatic representation of war, or of the exercises which prepare for it, in their connection with offices of religion. All Greek institutions had first respect to war ; and their conception of it, as one necessary office of all human and divine life, is expressed simply by the images of their guiding gods. Apollo is the god of all wisdom of the intellect ; he bears the arrow and the bow, before he bears the lyre. Again, Athena is the goddess of all wisdom in conduct. Yet it is by the helmet and the shield, oftener than by the shuttle, that she is distinguished from other deities.

There were, however, two great differences in principles between the Greek and the Egyptian theories of policy. In Greece there was no soldier caste ; every citizen was necessarily a soldier. And, again, while the Greeks rightly despised mechanical arts as much as the Egyptians, they did not make the fatal mistake of despising agricultural and pastoral life ; but perfectly honoured both. These two conditions of truer thought raise them quite into the highest rank of wise manhood that has yet been reached ; for all our great arts, and nearly all our great thoughts, have been borrowed or derived from them. Take away from us what they have given ; and I hardly can imagine how low the modern European would stand.

Now, you are to remember, in passing to the next phase of history, that though you *must* have war to produce art—you must also have much more than war ; namely, an art-instinct or genius in the people ; and that, though all the talent for painting in the world won't make painters of you, unless you have a gift for fighting as well, you may have the gift for fighting, and none for painting. Now, in the next great dynasty of soldiers, the art-instinct is wholly wanting. I have not yet investigated the Roman character enough to tell you the causes of this ; but I believe, paradoxical as it may seem to you, that, however truly the Roman might say of himself that he was born of Mars, and suckled by the wolf, he was nevertheless, at heart, more of a farmer than a soldier. The exercises of war were with him practical, not poetical; his poetry was in domestic life only, and the object of battle, *pacis imponere morem*. And the arts are extinguished in his hands, and do not rise again, until, with Gothic chivalry, there comes back into the mind of Europe a passionate delight in war itself, for the sake of war. And then, with the romantic knighthood which can imagine no other noble employment,—under the fighting kings of France, England, and Spain; and under the fighting dukeships and citizenships of Italy, art is born again, and rises to her height in the great valleys of Lombardy and Tuscany, through which there flows not a single stream, from all their Alps or Apennines, that did not once run dark red from battle: and it reaches its culminating glory in the city which gave to history the most intense type of soldiership yet seen among men;—the city whose armies were led in their assault by their king, led through it to victory by their king, and so led, though that king of theirs was blind and in the extremity of his age.

And from this time forward, as peace is established or extended in Europe, the arts decline. They reach an unparalleled pitch of costliness, but lose their life, enlist themselves at last on the side of luxury and various corruption, and, among wholly tranquil nations, wither utterly away; remaining only in partial practice among races who, like the French and us, have still the minds, though we cannot all live the lives, of soldiers.

"It may be so," I can suppose that a philanthropist might exclaim. "Perish then the arts, if they can flourish only at such a cost. What worth is there in toys of canvas and stone, if compared to the joy and peace of artless domestic life?" And the answer is—truly, in themselves, none. But as expressions of the highest state of the human spirit, their worth is infinite. As results they may be worthless, but, as signs, they are above price. For it is an assured truth that, whenever the faculties of men are at their fullness, they *must* express themselves by art; and to say that a state is without such expression, is to say that it is sunk from its proper level of manly nature. So that, when I tell you that war is the foundation of all the arts, I mean also that it is the foundation of all the high virtues and faculties of men.

It was very strange to me to discover this; and very dreadful—but I saw it to be quite an undeniable fact. The common notion that peace and the virtues of civil life flourished together, I found to be wholly untenable. Peace and the *vices* of civil life only flourish together. We talk of peace and learning, and of peace and plenty, and of peace and civilization; but I found that those were not the words which the Muse of History coupled together: that, on her lips, the words were—peace and sensuality, peace and selfishness, peace and corruption, peace and death. I found, in brief, that all great nations learned their truth of word, and strength of thought, in war; that they were nourished in war, and wasted by peace; taught by war, and deceived by peace; trained by war, and betrayed by peace;—in a word, that they were born in war, and expired in peace.

Yet now note carefully, in the second place, it is not all war of which this can be said—nor all dragon's teeth, which, sown, will start up into men. It is not the ravage of a barbarian wolf-flock, as under Genseric or Suwarrow; nor the habitual restlessness and rapine of mountaineers, as on the old borders of Scotland; nor the occasional struggle of a strong peaceful nation for its life, as in the wars of the Swiss with Austria; nor the contest of merely ambitious nations for extent of power, as in the wars of France under Napoleon, or the just terminated war in America. None of these forms of war build anything but tombs. But the creative or foundational war is that in which the natural restlessness and love of contest among men are disciplined, by consent, into modes of beautiful—though it may be fatal—play: in which the natural ambition and love of power of men are disciplined into the aggressive conquest of surrounding evil: and in which the natural instincts of self-defence are sanctified by the nobleness of the institutions, and purity of the households, which they are appointed to defend. To such war as this all men are born; in such war as this any man may happily die; and forth from such war as this have arisen, throughout the extent of past ages, all the highest sanctities and virtues of humanity.

I shall therefore divide the war of which I would speak to you into three heads. War for exercise or play; war for dominion; and, war for defence.

I. And first, of war for exercise or play. I speak of it primarily in this light, because, through all past history, manly war has been more an exercise than anything else, among the classes who cause, and proclaim it. It is not a game to the conscript, or the pressed sailor; but neither of these are the causers of it. To the governor who determines that war shall be, and to the youths who voluntarily adopt it as their profession it has always been a grand pastime; and chiefly pursued because they had nothing else to do. And this is true without any exception. No king whose mind was fully occupied with the development of the inner resources of his kingdom, or with any other sufficing subject of thought, ever entered into war but on compulsion. No youth who was earnestly busy with any peaceful subject of study, or set on any serviceable course of action, ever voluntarily became a soldier. Occupy him, early and wisely, in agriculture or business, in science or in literature, and he will never think of war otherwise than as a calamity. But leave him idle; and, the more brave and active and capable he is by nature, the more he will thirst for some appointed field for action; and find, in the passion and peril of battle, the only satisfying fulfilment of his unoccupied being. And from the earliest incipient civilisation until now, the population of the earth divides itself, when you look at it widely, into two races; one of workers, and the other of players—one tilling the ground, manufacturing, building, and otherwise providing for the necessities of life;—the other part proudly idle, and continually therefore needing recreation, in which they use the productive and laborious orders partly as their cattle, and partly as their puppets or pieces in the game of death.

Now, remember, whatever virtue or goodliness there may be in this game of war, rightly played, there is none when you thus play it with a multitude of small human pawns.

If you, the gentlemen of this or any other kingdom, choose to make your pastime of contest, do so, and welcome; but set not up these unhappy peasant-pieces upon the green fielded board. If the wager is to be of death, lay it on your own heads, not theirs. A goodly struggle in the Olympic dust, though it be the dust of the grave, the gods will look upon, and be with you in; but they will not be with you, if you sit on the sides of the amphitheatre, whose steps are the mountains of earth, whose arena its valleys, to urge your peasant millions into gladiatorial wars. You also, you tender and delicate women, for whom, and by whose command, all true battle has been, and must ever be; you would perhaps shrink now, though you need not, from the thought of sitting as queens above set lists where the jousting game might be mortal. How much more, then, ought you to shrink from the thought of sitting above a theatre pit in which even a few condemned slaves were slaying each other only for your delight! And do you *not* shrink from the *fact* of sitting above a theatre pit, where,—not condemned slaves,—but the best and bravest of the poor sons of your people, slay each other,—not man to man,—as the coupled gladiators; but race to race, in duel of generations? You would tell me, perhaps, that you do not sit to see this; and it is indeed true, that the women of Europe—those who have no heart-interest of their own at peril in the contest—draw the curtains of their boxes, and muffle the openings; so that from the pit of the circus of slaughter there may reach them only at intervals a half-heard cry and a murmur as of the wind's sighing, when myriads of souls expire. They shut out the death-cries; and are happy, and talk wittily among themselves That is the utter literal fact of what our ladies do in their pleasant lives.

Nay, you might answer, speaking for them—"We do not let these wars come to pass for our play, nor by our carelessness; we cannot help them. How can any final quarrel of nations be settled otherwise than by war?" I cannot now delay, to tell you how political quarrels might be otherwise settled. But grant that they cannot. Grant that no law of reason can be understood by nations; no law of justice submitted to by them: and that, while questions of a few acres, and of petty cash, can be determined by truth and equity, the questions which are to issue in the perishing or saving of kingdoms can be determined only by the truth of the sword, and the equity of the rifle. Grant this, and even then, judge if it will always be necessary for you to put your quarrel into the hearts of your poor, and sign your treaties with peasants' blood. You would be ashamed to do this in your own private position and power. Why should you not be ashamed also to do it in public place and power? If you quarrel with your neighbour, and the quarrel be indeterminable by law, and mortal, you and he do not send your footmen to Battersea fields to fight it out; nor do you set fire to his tenants' cottages, nor spoil their goods. You fight out your quarrel yourselves, and at your own danger, if at all. And you do not think it materially affects the arbitrament that one of you has a larger household than the other; so that, if the servants or tenants were brought into the field with their masters, the issue of the contest could not be doubtful? You either refuse the private duel, or you practise it under laws of honour, not of physical force; that so it may be, in a manner, justly concluded. Now the just or unjust conclusion of the private feud is of little moment while the just or unjust conclusion of the public feud is of eternal moment: and yet, in this public quarrel, you take your servants' sons from their arms to fight for it, and your servants' food from their lips to support it; and the black seals on the parchment of your treaties of peace are the deserted hearth and the fruitless field. There is a ghastly ludicrousness in this, as there is mostly in these wide and universal crimes. Hear the statement of the very fact of it in the most literal words of the greatest of our English thinkers:—

"What, speaking in quite unofficial language, is the net-purport and upshot of war? To my own knowledge, for example, there dwell and toil, in the British village of Dumdrudge, usually some five-hundred souls. From these, by certain 'natural enemies' of the French there are successively selected, during the French war, say thirty able-bodied men. Dumdrudge, at her own expense, has suckled and nursed them; she has, not without difficulty and sorrow, fed them up to manhood, and even trained them to crafts, so that one can weave, another build, another hammer, and the weakest can stand under thirty stone avoirdupois. Nevertheless, amid much weeping and swearing, they are selected; all dressed in red; and shipped away, at the public charges, some two thousand miles, or say only to the south of Spain; and fed there till wanted.

"And now to that same spot in the south of Spain are thirty similar French artisans, from a French Dumdrudge, in like manner wending; till at length, after infinite effort, the two parties come into actual juxtaposition; and Thirty stand fronting Thirty, each with a gun in his hand.

"Straightway the word 'Fire!' is given, and they blow the souls out of one another, and in place of sixty brisk useful craftsmen, the world has sixty dead carcases, which it must bury, and anon shed tears for. Had these men any quarrel? Busy as the devil is, not the smallest! They lived far enough apart; were the entirest strangers; nay, in so wide a universe, there was even, unconsciously, by commerce, some mutual helpfulness between them. How then? Simpleton! their governors had fallen out; and instead of shooting one another, had the cunning to make these poor blockheads shoot." (*Sartor Resartus.*)

Positively, then, gentlemen, the game of battle must not, and shall not, ultimately be played this way. But should it be played any way? Should it, if not by your servants, be practised by yourselves? I think, yes. Both history and human instinct seem alike to say, yes. All healthy men like fighting, and like the sense of danger; all brave women like to hear of their fighting, and of their facing danger. This is a fixed instinct in the fine race of them; and I cannot help fancying that fair fight is the best play for them; and that a tournament was a better game than a steeplechase. The time may perhaps come in France as well as here, for universal hurdle-races and cricketing: but I do not think universal "crickets" will bring out the best qualities of the nobles of either country. I use, in such question, the test which I have adopted, of the connection of war with other arts; and I reflect how, as a sculptor, I should feel, if I were asked to design a monument for a dead knight, in Westminster Abbey, with a carving of a bat at one end, and a ball at the other. It may be the remains in me only of savage Gothic prejudice; but I had rather to carve it with a shield at one end, and a sword at the other. And this, observe, with no reference whatever to any story of duty done, or cause defended. Assume the knight merely to have ridden out occasionally to fight his neighbour for exercise; assume him even a soldier of fortune, and to have gained his bread, and filled his purse, at the sword's point. Still, I feel as if it were, somehow, grander and worthier in him to have made his bread by sword play than any other play; I had rather he had made it by thrusting than by batting;—much more, than by betting. Much rather that he should ride war horses, than back race horses; and—I say it sternly and deliberately—much rather would I have him slay his neighbour, than cheat him.

But remember, so far as this may be true, the game of war is only that in which the *full personal power of the human creature* is brought out in management of its weapons. And this for three reasons:—

First, the great justification of this game is that it truly, when well played, determines *who is the best man*;—who is the highest bred, the most self-denying, the most fearless, the coolest of nerve, the swiftest of eye and hand. You cannot test these qualities wholly, unless there is a clear possibility of the struggle's ending in death. It is only in the fronting of that condition that the full trial of the man, soul and body, comes out. You may go to your game of wickets, or of hurdles, or of cards, and any knavery that is in you may stay unchallenged all the while. But if the play may be ended at any moment by a lance-thrust, a man will probably make up his accounts a little before he enters it. Whatever is rotten and evil in him will weaken his hand more in holding a sword hilt, than in balancing a billiard cue; and on the whole, the habit of living lightly hearted, in daily presence of death, always has had, and must have, a tendency both to the making and testing of honest men. But for the final testing, observe, you must make the issue of battle strictly dependent on fineness of frame, and firmness of hand. You must not make it the question, which of the combatants has the longest gun, or which has got behind the biggest tree, or which has the wind in his face, or which has gunpowder made by the best chemists, or iron smelted with the best coal, or the angriest mob at his back. Decide your battle, whether of nations or individuals, on *those* terms;—and you have only multiplied confusion, and added slaughter to iniquity. But decide your battle by pure trial which has the strongest arm, and steadiest heart,—and you have gone far to decide a great many matters besides, and to decide them rightly.

And the other reasons for this mode of decision of cause, are the diminution both of the material destructiveness, or cost, and of the physical distress of war. For you must not think that in speaking to you in this, (as you may imagine), fantastic praise of battle, I have overlooked the conditions weighing against me. I pray all of you, who have not read, to read with the most earnest attention, Mr. Helps' two essays on War and Government, in the first volume of the last series of *Friends in Council*. Everything that can be urged against war is there simply, exhaustively, and most graphically stated. And all, there urged, is true. But the two great counts of evil alleged against war by that most thoughtful writer, hold only against modern war. If you have to take away masses of men from all industrial employment,—to feed them by the labour of others,—to move them and provide them with destructive machines, varied daily in national rivalship of inventive cost; if you have to ravage the country which you attack,—to destroy, for a score of future years, its roads, its woods, its cities, and its harbours;—and if, finally, having brought masses of men, counted by hundreds of thousands, face to face, you tear those masses to pieces with jagged shot, and leave the fragments of living creatures, countless beyond all help of surgery, to starve and parch, through days of torture, down into clots of clay—what book of account shall record the cost of your work;—What book of judgment sentence the guilt of it?

That, I say, is *modern war*,—scientific war,—chemical and mechanic war,—worse even than the savage's poisoned arrow. And yet you will tell me perhaps, that any other war than this is impossible now. It may be so; the progress of science cannot, perhaps, be otherwise registered than by new facilities of destruction; and the brotherly love of our enlarging Christianity be only proved by multiplication of murder. Yet hear, for a moment, what war was, in Pagan and ignorant days;—what war might yet be, if we could extinguish our science in darkness, and join the heathen's practice to the Christian's theory. I read you this from a book which probably most of you know well, and all ought to know—Muller's *Dorians*;—but I have put the points I wish you to remember in closer connection than in his text.

"The chief characteristic of the warriors of Sparta was great composure and a subdued strength; the violence (λύσσα) of Aristodemus and Isadas being considered as deserving rather of blame than praise; and these qualities in general distinguished the Greeks from the northern Barbarians, whose boldness always consisted in noise and tumult. For the same reason the Spartans *sacrificed to the Muses* before an action; these goddesses being expected to produce regularity and order in battle; as they *sacrificed on the same occasion in Crete to the god of love* as the confirmer of mutual esteem and shame. Every man put on a crown, when the band of flute-players gave the signal for attack; all the shields of the line glittered with their high polish, and mingled their splendour with the dark red of the purple mantles, which were meant both to adorn the combatant, and to conceal the blood of the wounded; to fall well and decorously being an incentive the more to the most heroic valour. The conduct of the Spartans in battles denotes a high and noble disposition, which rejected all the extremes of brutal rage. The pursuit of the enemy ceased when the victory was completed; and after the signal for retreat had been given, all hostilities ceased. The spoiling of arms, at least during the battle, was also interdicted; and the consecration of the spoils of slain enemies to the gods, as, in general, all rejoicings for victory, were considered as ill-omened."

Such was the war of the greatest soldiers who prayed to heathen gods. What Christian war is, preached by Christian ministers, let any one tell you, who saw the sacred crowning, and heard the sacred flute-playing, and was inspired and sanctified by the divinely-measured and musical language, of any North American regiment preparing for its charge. And what is the relative cost of life in pagan and Christian wars, let this one fact tell you:—the Spartans won the decisive battle of Corinth with the loss of eight men; the victors at indecisive Gettysburg confess to the loss of 30,000.

II. I pass now to our second order of war, the commonest among men, that undertaken in desire of dominion. And let me ask you to think for a few moments what the real meaning of this desire of dominion is—first in the minds of kings—then in that of nations.

Now, mind you this first,—that I speak either about kings, or masses of men, with a fixed conviction that human nature is a noble and beautiful thing; not a foul nor a base thing. All the sin of men I esteem as their disease, not their nature; as a folly which may be prevented, not a necessity which must be accepted. And my wonder, even when things are at their worst, is always at the height which this human nature can attain. Thinking it high, I find it always a higher thing than I thought it; while those who think it low, find it, and will find it, always, lower than they thought it: the fact being, that it is infinite, and capable of infinite height and infinite fall; but the nature of it—and here is the faith which I would have you hold with me—the *nature* of it is in the nobleness, not in the catastrophe.

Take the faith in its utmost terms. When the captain of the *London* shook hands with his mate, saying, "God speed you! I will go down with my passengers," *that* I believe to be "human nature." He does not do it from any religious motive,—from any hope of reward, or any fear of punishment; he does it because he is a man. But when a mother, living among the fair fields of merry England, gives her two-year-old child to be suffocated under a mattress in her inner room, while the said mother waits and talks outside; *that* I believe to be *not* human nature. You have the two extremes there, shortly. And you, men, and mothers, who are here face to face with me to-night, I call upon you to say which of these is human, and which inhuman,—which "natural" and which "unnatural"? Choose your creed at once, I beseech you: —choose it with unshaken choice,—choose it for ever. Will you take, for foundation of act and hope, the faith that this man was such as God made him, or that this woman was such as God made her? Which of them has failed from their nature,—from their present, possible, actual nature ;—not their nature of long ago, but their nature of now ? Which has betrayed it—falsified it ? Did the guardian who died in his trust, die inhumanly, and as a fool ; and did the murderess of her child fulfil the law of her being ? Choose, I say ; infinitude of choices hang upon this. You have had false prophets among you,—for centuries you have had them,—solemnly warned against them though you were ; false prophets, who have told you that all men are nothing but fiends or wolves, half beast, half devil. Believe that, and indeed you may sink to that. But refuse that, and have faith that God " made you upright," though *you* have sought out many inventions ; so, you will strive daily to become more what your Maker meant and means you to be, and daily gives you also the power to be,—and you will cling more and more to the nobleness and virtue that is in you, saying, " My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go."

I have put this to you as a choice, as if you might hold either of these creeds you liked best. But there is in reality no choice for you ; the facts being quite easily ascertainable. You have no business to *think* about this matter, or to choose in it. The broad fact is, that a human creature of the highest race, and most perfect as a human thing, is invariably both kind and true ; and that as you lower the race, you get cruelty and falseness, as you get deformity : and this so steadily and assuredly, that the two great words which, in their first use, meant only perfection of race, have come, by consequence of the invariable connection of virtue with the fine human nature, both to signify benevolence of disposition. The word generous, and the word gentle, both, in their origin, meant only " of pure race," but because charity and tenderness are inseparable from this purity of blood, the words which once stood only for pride, now stand as synonyms for virtue.

Now, this being the true power of our inherent humanity, and seeing that all the aim of education should be to develop this,—and seeing also what magnificent self-sacrifice the higher classes of men are capable of, for any cause that they understand or feel,—it is wholly inconceivable to me how well-educated princes, who ought to be of all gentlemen the gentlest, and of all nobles the most generous, and whose title of royalty means only their function of doing every man " *right* "—how these, I say, throughout history, should so rarely pronounce themselves on the side of the poor and of justice, but continually maintain themselves and their own interests by oppression of the poor, and by wresting of justice ; and how this should be accepted as so natural, that the word loyalty, which means faithfulness to law, is used as it it were only the duty of a people to be loyal to their king, and not the duty of a king to be infinitely more loyal to his people. How comes it to pass that a captain will die with his passengers, and lean over the gunwale to give the parting boat its course ; but that a king will not usually die with, much less *for*, his passengers—thinks it rather incumbent on his passengers, in any number, to die for *him* ? Think, I beseech you, of the wonder of this. The sea captain, not captain by divine right, but only by company's appointment ;—not a man of royal descent, but only a plebeian who can steer ;—not with the eyes of the world upon him, but with feeble chance, depending on one poor boat, of his name being ever heard above the wash of the fatal waves ;—not with the cause of a nation resting on his act, but helpless to save so much as a child from among the lost crowd with whom he resolves to be lost,—yet goes down quietly to his grave, rather than break his faith to these few emigrants. But your captain by divine right,—your captain with the hues of a hundred shields of kings upon his breast,—your captain whose every deed, brave or base, will be illuminated or branded for ever before unescapable eyes of men,—your captain whose every thought and act are beneficent, or fatal, from sunrising to setting, blessing as the sunshine, or shadowing as the night,—this captain, as you find him in history, for the most part thinks only how he may tax his passengers, and sit at most ease in his state cabin !

For observe, if there had been indeed in the hearts of the rulers of great multitudes of men any such conception of work for the good of those under their command, as there is in the good and thoughtful masters of any small company of men, not only wars for the sake of mere increase of power could never take place, but our idea of power itself would be entirely altered. Do you suppose that to think and act even for a million of men, to hear their complaints, watch their weaknesses, restrain their vices, make laws for them, lead them, day by day, to purer life, is not enough for one man's work ? If any of us were absolute lord only of a district of a hundred miles square, and were resolved on doing our utmost for it ; making it feed as large a number of people as possible ; making every clod productive, and every rock defensive, and every human being happy ; should we not have enough on our hands think you ? But if the ruler has any other aim than this ; if, careless of the result of his interference, he desire only the authority to interfere ; and, regardless of what is ill-done or well-done, cares only that it shall be done at his bidding ;—if he would rather do two hundred miles' space of mischief, than one hundred miles' space of good, of course he will try to add to his territory ; and to add illimitably. But does he add to his power ? Do you call it power in a child, if he is allowed to play with the wheels and bands of some vast engine, pleased with their murmur and whirl, till his unwise touch, wandering where it ought not, scatters beam and wheel into ruin? Yet what machine is so vast, so incognisable, as the working of the mind of a nation; what child's touch so wanton, as the word of a selfish king? And yet, how long have we allowed the historian to speak of the extent of the calamity a man causes, as a just ground for his pride; and to extol him as the greatest prince, who is only the centre of the widest error. Follow out this thought by yourselves; and you will find that all power, properly so called, is wise and benevolent. There may be capacity in a drifting fireship to destroy a fleet; there may be venom enough in a dead body to infect a nation:—but which of you, the most ambitious, would desire a drifting kinghood, robed in consuming fire, or a poison-dipped sceptre whose touch was mortal? There is no true potency, remember, but that of help; nor true ambition, but ambition to save.

And then, observe farther, this true power, the power of saving, depends neither on multitude of men, nor on extent of territory. We are continually assuming that nations become strong according to their numbers. They indeed become so, if those numbers can be made of one mind; but how are you sure you can stay them in one mind, and keep them from having north and south minds? Grant them unanimous, how know you they will be unanimous in right? If they are unanimous in wrong, the more they are, essentially the weaker they are. Or, suppose that they can neither be of one mind, nor of two minds, but can only be of *no* mind? Suppose they are a mere helpless mob; tottering into precipitant catastrophe, like a waggon load of stones when the wheel comes off. Dangerous enough for their neighbours, certainly, but not "powerful."

Neither does strength depend on extent of territory, any more than upon number of population. Take up your maps when you go home this evening—put the cluster of British Isles beside the mass of South America; and then consider whether any race of men need care how much ground they stand upon. The strength is in the men, and in their unity and virtue, not in their standing room; a little group of wise hearts is better than a wilderness full of fools; and only that nation gains true territory, which gains itself.

And now for the brief practical outcome of all this. Remember, no government is ultimately strong, but in proportion to its kindness and justice; and that a nation does not strengthen, by merely multiplying and diffusing itself. We have not strengthened as yet, by multiplying into America. Nay, even when it has not to encounter the separating conditions of emigration, a nation need not boast itself of multiplying on its own ground, if it multiplies only as flies or locusts do, with the god of flies for its god. It multiplies its strength only by increasing as one great family, in perfect fellowship and brotherhood. And lastly, it does not strengthen itself by seizing dominion over races whom it cannot benefit. Austria is not strengthened, but weakened, by her grasp of Lombardy; and whatever apparent increase of majesty and of wealth may have accrued to us from the possession of India, whether these prove to us ultimately power or weakness, depends wholly on the degree in which our influence on the native race shall be benevolent and exalting. But, as it is at their own peril that any race extends their dominion in mere desire of power, so it is at their own still greater peril that they refuse to undertake aggressive war, according to their force, whenever they are assured that their authority would be helpful and protective. Nor need you listen to any sophistical objection of the impossibility of knowing when a people's help is needed, or when not. Make your national conscience clean, and your national eyes will soon be clear. No man who is truly ready to take part in a noble quarrel will ever stand long in doubt by whom, or in what cause, his aid is needed. I hold it my duty to make no political statement of any special bearing in this presence; but I tell you broadly and boldly, that, within these last ten years, we English have, as a knightly nation, lost our spurs: we have fought where we should not have fought, for gain; and we have been passive where we should not have been passive, for fear. I tell you that the principle of non-intervention, as now preached among us, is as selfish and cruel as the worst frenzy of conquest, and differs from it only by being, not only malignant, but dastardly.

I know, however, that my opinions on this subject differ too widely from those ordinarily held, to be any farther intruded upon you; and therefore I pass lastly to examine the conditions of the third kind of noble war;—war waged simply for defence of the country in which we were born, and for the maintainence and execution of her laws, by whomsoever threatened or defied. It is to this duty that I suppose most men entering the army consider themselves in reality to be bound, and I want you now to reflect what the laws of mere defence are; and what the soldiers' duty, as now understood, or supposed to be understood. You have solemnly devoted yourselves to be English soldiers, for the guardianship of England. I want you to feel what this vow of yours indeed means, or is gradually coming to mean. You take it upon you, first, while you are sentimental schoolboys; you go into your military convent, or barracks, just as a girl goes into her convent while she is a sentimental schoolgirl; neither of you then know what you are about, though both the good soldiers and good nuns make the best of it afterwards. You don't understand perhaps why I call you "sentimental" schoolboys, when you go into the army? Because, on the whole, it is the love of adventure, of excitement, of fine dress and of the pride of fame, all which are sentimental motives, which chiefly makes a boy like going into the Guards better than into a counting-house. You fancy, perhaps, that there is a severe sense of duty mixed with these peacocky motives? And in the best of you, there is; but do not think that it is principal. If you cared to do your duty to your country in a prosaic and unsentimental way, depend upon it, there is now truer duty to be done in raising harvests, than in burning them; more in building houses, than in shelling them—more in winning money by your own work, wherewith to help men, than in taxing other people's work, for money wherewith to slay men;—more duty finally, in honest and unselfish living than in honest and unselfish dying, though that seems to your boys' eyes the bravest. So far then, as for your own honour, and the honour of your families, you choose brave death in a red coat before brave life in a black one, you are sentimental; and now see what this passionate vow of yours comes to. For a little while you ride, and you hunt tigers or savages, you shoot, and are shot; you are happy, and proud, always, and honoured and wept if you die; and you are satisfied with your life, and with the end of it; believing, on the whole, that good rather than harm of it comes to others, and much pleasure to you. But as the sense of duty enters into your forming minds, the vow takes another aspect. You find that you have put yourselves into the hand of your country as a weapon. You have vowed to strike, when she bids you, and to stay scabbarded when she bids you; all that you need answer for is, that you fail not in her grasp. And there is goodness in this, and greatness, if you can trust the hand and heart of the Britomart who has braced you to her side, and are assured that when she leaves you sheathed in darkness, there is no need for your flash to the sun. But remember, good and noble as this state may be, it is a state of slavery. There are different kinds of slaves and different masters. Some slaves are scourged to their work by whips, others are scourged to it by restlessness or ambition. It does not matter what the whip is; it is none the less a whip, because you have cut thongs for it out of your own souls; the fact, so far, of slavery, is in being driven to your work without thought, at another's bidding. Again, some slaves are bought with money, and others with praise. It matters not what the purchase-money is. The distinguishing sign of slavery is to have a price, and be bought for it. Again, it matters not what kind of work you are set on; some slaves are set to forced diggings, others to forced marches; some dig furrows, others field-works, and others graves. Some press the juice of reeds, and some the juice of vines, and some the blood of men. The fact of the captivity is the same whatever work we are set upon, though the fruits of the toil may be different. But, remember, in thus vowing ourselves to be the slaves of any master, it ought to be some subject of forethought with us, what work he is likely to put us upon. You may think that the whole duty of a soldier is to be passive, that it is the country you have left behind who is to command, and you have only to obey. But are you sure that you have left *all* your country behind or that the part of it you have so left is indeed the best part of it? Suppose—and, remember, it is quite conceivable—that you yourselves are indeed the best part of England; that you, who have become the slaves, ought to have been the masters; and that those who are the masters, ought to have been the slaves! If it is a noble and whole-hearted England, whose bidding you are bound to do, it is well; but if you are yourselves the best of her heart, and the England you have left be but a half-hearted England, how say you of your obedience? You were too proud to become shop-keepers: are you satisfied then to become the servants of shop-keepers? You are too proud to become merchants or farmers yourselves: will you have merchants, or farmers, then, for your field-marshals? You have no gifts of special grace for Exeter Hall: will you have some gifted person thereat for your commander-in-chief, to judge of your work, and reward it? You imagine yourselves to be the army of England; how if you should find yourselves, at last, only the police of her manufacturing towns, and the beadles of her little Bethels?

It is not so yet, nor will be so, I trust, for ever; but what I want you to see, and to be assured of, is, that the ideal of soldiership is not mere passive obedience and bravery; that, so far from this, no country is in a healthy state which has separated, even in a small degree, her civil from her military power. All states of the world, however great, fall at once when they use mercenary armies; and although it is a less instant form of error, (because involving no national taint of cowardice), it is yet an error no less ultimately fatal—it is the error especially of modern times, of which we cannot yet know all the calamitous consequences,—to take away the best blood and strength of the nation, all the soul-substance of it that is brave, and careless of reward, and scornful of pain, and faithful in trust; and to cast that into steel, and make a mere sword of it; taking away its voice and will; but to keep the worst part of the nation—whatever is cowardly, avaricious, sensual, and faithless—and to give to this the voice, to this the authority, to this the chief privilege, where there is least capacity, of thought. The fulfilment of your vow for the defence of England will by no means consist in carrying out such a system. You are not true soldiers, if you only mean to stand at a shop-door, to protect shop-boys who are cheating inside. A soldier's vow to his country is that he will die for the guardianship of her domestic virtue, of her righteous laws, and of her any-way challenged or endangered honour. A state without virtue, without laws, and without honour, he is bound *not* to defend ; nay, bound to redress by his own right hand that which he sees to be base in her. So sternly is this the law of Nature and life, that a nation once utterly corrupt can only be redeemed by a military despotism—never by talking, nor by its free effort. And the health of any state consists simply in this ; that in it, those who are wisest shall also be strongest ; its rulers should be also its soldiers ; or, rather, by force of intellect more than of sword, its soldiers also its rulers. Whatever the hold which the aristocracy of England has on the heart of England, in that they are still always in front of her battles, this hold will not be enough, unless they are also in front of her thoughts. And truly her thoughts need good captain's leading now, if ever ! Do you know what, by this beautiful division of labour (her brave men fighting, and her cowards thinking), she has come at last to think ? Here is a bit of paper in my hand, a good one too, and an honest one ; quite representative of the best common public thought of England at this moment ; and it is holding forth in one of its leaders upon our " social welfare," —upon our " vivid life "—upon the " political supremacy of Great Britain." And what do you think all these are owing to ? To what our English sires have done for us, and taught us, age after age ? No : not to that. To our honesty of heart, or coolness of head, or steadiness of will ? No : not to these. To our thinkers, or our statesmen, or our poets, or our captains, or our martyrs, or the patient labour of our poor ? No : not to these ; at least not to these in any chief measure. Nay, says the journal, " more than any agency, it is the cheapness and abundance of our coal which have made us what we are." If it be so, then " ashes to ashes " be our epitaph ! and the sooner the better. I tell you, Gentlemen of England, if ever you would have your country breathe the pure breath of heaven again, and receive again a soul into her body, instead of rotting into a carcase, blown up in the belly with carbonic acid (and great *that* way), you must think, and feel, for your England, as well as fight for her : you must teach her that all the true greatness she ever had, or ever can have, she won while her fields were green and her faces ruddy ;—that greatness is still possible for Englishmen, even though the ground be not hollow under their feet, nor the sky black over their heads ;—and that, when the day comes for their country to lay her honours in the dust, her crest will not rise from it more loftily because it is dust of coal. Gentlemen, I tell you, solemnly, that the day is coming when the soldiers of England must be her tutors ; and the captains of her army, captains also of her mind.

And now, remember, you soldier youths, who are thus in all ways the hope of your country; or must be, if she have any hope: remember that your fitness for all future trust depends upon what you are now. No good soldier in his old age was ever careless or indolent in his youth. Many a giddy and thoughtless boy has become a good bishop, or a good lawyer, or a good merchant; but no such an one ever became a good general. I challenge you, in all history, to find a record of a good soldier who was not grave and earnest in his youth. And, in general, I have no patience with people who talk about "the thoughtlessness of youth" indulgently. I had infinitely rather hear of thoughtless old age, and the indulgence due to *that*. When a man has done his work, and nothing can any way be materially altered in his fate, let him forget his toil, and jest with his fate, if he will; but what excuse can you find for wilfulness of thought, at the very time when every crisis of future fortune hangs on your decisions? A youth thoughtless! when all the happiness of his home for ever depends on the chances, or the passions, of an hour! A youth thoughtless! when the career of all his days depends on the opportunity of a moment! A youth thoughtless! when his every act is a foundation-stone of future conduct, and every imagination a fountain of life or death! Be thoughtless in *any* after years, rather than now—though, indeed, there is only one place where a man may be nobly thoughtless,—his deathbed. No thinking should ever be left to be done there.

Having, then, resolved that you will not waste recklessly, but earnestly use, these early days of yours, remember that all the duties of her children to England may be summed up in two words—industry, and honour. I say first, industry, for it is in this that soldier youths are especially tempted to fail. Yet, surely, there is no reason, because your life may possibly or probably be shorter than other men's that you should therefore waste more recklessly the portion of it that is granted you; neither do the duties of your profession, which require you to keep your bodies strong, in any wise involve the keeping of your minds weak. So far from that, the experience, the hardship, and the activity of a soldier's life render his powers of thought more accurate than those of other men; and while, for others, all knowledge is often little more than a means of amusement, there is no form of science which a soldier may not at some time or other find bearing on business of life and death. A young mathematician may be excused for languor in studying curves to be described only with a pencil; but not in tracing those which are to be described with a rocket. Your knowledge of a wholesome herb may involve the feeding of an army; and acquaintance with an obscure point of geography, the success of a campaign. Never waste an instant's time, therefore; the sin of idleness is a thousand-fold greater in you than in other youths; for the fates of those who will one day be under your command hang upon your knowledge; lost moments now will be lost lives then, and every instant which you carelessly take for play, you buy with blood. But there is one way of wasting time, of all the vilest, because it wastes, not time only, but the interest and energy of your minds. Of all the ungentlemanly habits into which you can fall, the vilest is betting, or interesting yourselves in the issues of betting. It unites nearly every condition of folly and vice; you concentrate your interest upon a matter of chance, instead of upon a subject of true knowledge; and you back opinions which you have no grounds for forming, merely because they are your own. All the insolence of egotism is in this; and so far as the love of excitement is complicated with the hope of winning money, you turn yourselves into the basest sort of tradesmen—those who live by speculation. Were there no other ground for industry, this would be a sufficient one; that it protected you from the temptation to so scandalous a vice. Work faithfully, and you will put yourselves in possession of a glorious and enlarging happiness; not such as can be won by the speed of a horse, or marred by the obliquity of a ball.

First, then, by industry you must fulfil your vow to your country: but all industry and earnestness will be useless unless they are consecrated by your resolution to be in all things men of honour; not honour in the common sense only, but in the highest. Rest on the force of the two main words in the great verse, *integer* vitæ, scelerisque *purus*. You have vowed your life to England; give it her wholly—a bright, stainless, perfect life—a knightly life. Because you have to fight with machines instead of lances, there may be a necessity for more ghastly danger, but there is none for less worthiness of character, than in olden time. You may be true knights yet, though perhaps not *equites;* you may have to call yourselves "cannonry" instead of "chivalry," but that is no reason why you should not call yourselves true men. So the first thing you have to see to in becoming soldiers is that you make yourselves wholly true. Courage is a mere matter of course among any ordinarily well-born youths; but neither truth nor gentleness is matter of course. You must bind them like shields about your necks; you must write them on the tables of your hearts. Though it be not exacted of you, yet exact it of yourselves, this vow of stainless truth. Your hearts are, if you leave them unstirred, as tombs in which a god lies buried. Vow yourselves crusaders to redeem that sacred sepulchre. And remember, before all things—for no other memory will be so protective of you—that the highest law of this knightly truth is that under which it is vowed to women. Whomsoever else you deceive, whomsoever you injure, whomsoever you leave unaided, you must not deceive, nor injure, nor leave unaided, according to your power, any woman of whatever rank. Believe me, every virtue of the higher phases of manly character begins in this ;—in truth and modesty before the face of all maidens ; in truth and pity, or truth and reverence, to all womanhood.

And now let me turn for a moment to you,—wives and maidens, who are the souls of soldiers ; to you,—mothers, who have devoted your children to the great hierarchy of war. Let me ask you to consider what part you have to take for the aid of those who love you ; for if you fail in your part they cannot fulfil theirs ; such absolute helpmates you are that no man can stand without that help, nor labour in his own strength.

I know your hearts, and that the truth of them never fails when an hour of trial comes which you recognise for such. But you know not when the hour of trial first finds you, nor when it verily finds you. You imagine that you are only called upon to wait and to suffer ; to surrender and to mourn. You know that you must not weaken the hearts of your husbands and lovers, even by the one fear of which those hearts are capable —the fear of parting from you, or of causing you grief. Through weary years of separation ; through fearful expectancies of unknown fate ; through the tenfold bitterness of the sorrow which might so easily have been joy, and the tenfold yearning for glorious life struck down in its prime ;—through all these agonies you fail not, and never will fail. But your trial is not in these. To be heroic in danger is little,— you are Englishwomen. To be heroic in change and sway of fortune is little ;—for do you not love ? To be patient through the great chasm and pause of loss is little ;—for do you not still love in heaven ? But to be heroic in happiness ; to bear yourselves gravely and righteously in the dazzling of the sunshine of morning ; not to forget the God in whom you trust, when He gives you most ; not to fail those who trust you, when they seem to need you least ; this is the difficult fortitude. It is not in the pining of absence, not in the peril of battle, not in the wasting of sickness, that your prayer should be most passionate, or your guardianship most tender. Pray, mothers and maidens, for your young soldiers in the bloom of their pride ; pray for them, while the only dangers round them are in their own wayward wills ; watch you, and pray, when they have to face, not death, but temptation. But it is this fortitude also for which there is the crowning reward. Believe me, the whole course and character of your lovers' lives is in your hands ; what you would have them be, they shall be, if you not only desire to have them so, but deserve to have them so ; for they are but mirrors in which you will see yourselves imaged. If you are frivolous, they will be so also ; if you have no understanding of the scope of their duty, they also will forget it ; they will listen,—they *can* listen,—to no other interpretation of it than that uttered from your lips. Bid them be brave ;—they will be brave for you : bid them be cowards ;—and how noble soever they be ;—they will quail for you. Bid them be wise, and they will be wise for you ; mock at their counsel, they will be fools for you : such and so absolute is your rule over them. You fancy, perhaps, as you have been told so often, that a wife's rule should only be over her husband's house, not over his mind. Ah, no! the true rule is just the reverse of that ; a true wife, in her husband's house, is his servant ; it is in his heart that she is queen. Whatever of best he can conceive, it is her part to be ; whatever of highest he can hope, it is hers to promise ; all that is dark in him she must purge into purity ; all that is failing in him she must strengthen into truth ; from her, through all the world's clamour, he must win his praise ; in her, through all the world's warfare, he must find his peace.

And, now, but one word more. You may wonder, perhaps, that I have spoken all this night in praise of war. Yet, truly, if it might be, I, for one, would fain join in the cadence of hammer-strokes that should beat swords into ploughshares ; and that this cannot be, is not the fault of us men. It is *your* fault. Wholly yours. Only by your command, or by your permission, can any contest take place among us. And the real, final, reason for all the poverty, misery, and rage of battle, throughout Europe is simply that you women, however good, however religious, however self-sacrificing for those whom you love, are too selfish and too thoughtless to take pains for any creature out of your own immediate circles. You fancy that you are sorry for the pain of others. Now I just tell you this, that if the usual course of war, instead of unroofing peasants' houses, and ravaging peasants' fields, merely broke the china upon your own drawing-room tables, no war in civilised countries would last a week. I tell you more, that at whatever moment you chose to put a period to war, you could do it with less trouble than you take any day to go out to dinner. You know, or at least you might know if you would think, that every battle you hear of has made many widows and orphans. We have, none of us, heart enough truly to mourn with these. But at least we might put on the outer symbols of mourning with them. Let but every Christian lady who has conscience toward God, vow that she will mourn, at least outwardly, for His killed creatures. Your praying is useless, and your church-going mere mockery of God, if you have not plain obedience in you enough for this. Let every lady in the upper classes of civilised Europe simply vow that, while any cruel war proceeds, she will wear *black* ;—a mute's black,—with no jewel, no ornament, no excuse for, or evasion into, prettiness—I tell you again, no war would last a week.

And lastly. You women of England are all now shrieking with one voice,—you and your clergymen together,—because you hear of your Bibles being attacked. If you choose to obey your Bibles, you will never care who attacks them. It is just because you never fulfil a single downright precept of the Book, that you are so careful for its credit: and just because you don't care to obey its whole words, that you are so particular about the letters of them. The Bible tells you to dress plainly,—and you are mad for finery; the Bible tells you to have pity on the poor,—and you crush them under your carriage wheels; the Bible tells you to do judgment and justice,—and you do not know, nor care to know, so much as what the Bible word "justice" means. Do but learn so much of God's truth as that comes to; know what He means when He tells you to be just: and teach your sons, that their bravery is but a fool's boast, and their deeds but a firebrand's tossing, unless they are indeed Just men, and Perfect in the Fear of God; —and you will soon have no more war, unless it be indeed such as is willed by Him, of whom, though Prince of Peace, is it also written, "In Righteousness He doth judge, and make war."

CALEB W. SALEEBY

(1878-   ).

THE name of Dr. Saleeby is a well-known one to-day in connection with Eugenics, and especially with Heliotherapy, the new branch of science whose chief advocate he is.

He began as a practising physician. Both his parents belonged to the medical profession, his father being the founder of the Mount Lebanon Schools. His scholastic career was exceptionally brilliant. He passed through the Royal High School and University at Edinburgh; gained his M.B. and Ch.B. in 1901, with first class honours; and became in succession Junior Demonstrator of Anatomy, resident physician in the Maternity Hospital and the Royal Infirmary, Edinburgh, and assistant to the late Sir J. Hutchinson at the London Polyclinic.

More recently, however, he has abandoned the practice of medicine to devote himself wholly to the cause of Eugenics, and has become indefatigable in his crusade against disease and dirt and all the enemies of race culture and race improvement.

He has held many important positions in public life; he has been Vice-President of the Divorce Law Reform Union, and Lecturer in Eugenics at the Royal Institution five times; he proposed the formation of the Ministry of Health in 1915 and became honorary Adviser to the Ministry of Food in 1917; he is now Chairman of the Sunlight League.

Among his publications may be mentioned "Biology and Progress," "Parenthood and Race-Culture," "The Progress of Eugenics," and "Sunlight and Health."

BIOLOGY AND HISTORY

YOU will not expect me to insult you this evening with any discussion of the garbage and gossip, records of scoundrels and courts and battles, murder and theft, which we were taught at school under the name of History. If history be, as nearly all historians have conceived it, and as Gibbon defined it, "little more than the register of the crimes, follies and misfortunes of mankind," it is an empty and contemptible study, save for the social pathologist. But if history, without by any means ignoring great men or underrating their influence, is, or should be, the record of the past life of mankind, of progress and decadence, the rise and fall of empires and civilisations, and their mutual reactions ; if it be the record of the intermittent ascent of man, " sagging but pertinacious " ; if this record be subject to the law of causation, and therefore susceptible, in theory at least, of explanation as well as description ; if its factors are at work to-day, and will shape the destiny of all the to-morrows ; if it be neither phantasmagoria, nor panorama, nor pageant, nor procession, but *process*—in short, an organic drama—then, indeed, it is a supreme study. Especially must it appeal to us, who boast a tradition greater than the world has ever yet seen, and kinship with men who represent the utmost of which the human spirit has yet shown itself capable—who speak the tongue that Shakespeare spake, but to whom the names of all our imperial predecessors, from Babylon to Spain, serve as a perpetual *memento mori*. My special question, this evening, is whether there are inherent and necessary reasons why our predecessors' fate must sooner or later be ours ? Must races die ?—or, if we are sceptical about races, and more especially about the so-called Anglo-Saxon race, must civilisations, states or nations die ?

Nations, races, civilisations rise, we shall all agree, because to inherent virtue of breed they add sound customs and laws, acquirements of discipline and knowledge. But, these acquirements made, power established, and crescent from year to year—why do they *then* fall ? If they can *make* a place for themselves, how much easier should it not be to *maintain* it ?

Two explanations, each asserting itself to be rooted in biological fact, have long been cited, and are still cited, in order to account for these supreme tragedies of history.

The first—cited by no less a thinker than Lord Balfour in an academic lecture—may claim Plato and Aristotle as its founders, and consists of an argument from analogy. Races may be conceived in similar terms to individuals. There are many resemblances between a society—a " social organism," to use Herbert Spencer's phrase—and an individual organism. Just then, as the individual is mortal, so is the race. Each has its beginning, its period of youth and growth, its maturity, and finally, its decadence, senility and death. So runs the common argument.

Biology, however, so far from confirming it, declares as the capital fact which contrasts the individual and the race, that whilst the individual is doomed to die from inherent causes, the race is naturally immortal. The tendency of life is not to die, but to live. If individuals die, that is doubtless because more life and fuller is thus attained than if life bodied itself in immortal forms; but the germ-plasm *is* immortal; it has no inherent tendency either to degenerate or to die. Species exist and flourish now which are millions of years older than mankind. "The individual withers, the race is more and more." The most conspicuously persistent of all races during the last two millennia, the Jews, have survived one empire after another of their oppressors, but have never had an empire of their own. Thus, so far as the historian is concerned, it is not races that die, but civilisations and empires. Plato's analogy between the individual and the race is therefore irrelevant, as well as untrue. The fatalistic conception to which it tempts us, saying that races must die, just as individuals must, and that therefore it is idle to repine or oppose, is utterly unwarrantable, and extremely unhealthy. To take our own case, despite the talk about our own racial decadence, our babies still come into the world fit and strong and healthy. We kill them in scores of thousands every year, but this infant mortality is not a sign that the race is dying, but a sign that even the most splendid living material can be killed or damaged, if you try hard enough. The babies do not die because races are mortal, but because individuals are —and we kill them. The babies drink poison, eat poison, and breathe poison, and in due course die. The theory of racial senility, inapplicable everywhere because untrue, is most of all inapplicable here. If a race became infertile, Plato and Aristotle would be right. There is no such instance in history apart from well-defined external, ***not inherent***, causes, as in the case of the Tasmanians. Dismissing this analogy, we may also dismiss, as based upon nothing better, the idea that the great tragedies of history were necessary events at all. We must look elsewhere than amongst the inherent and necessary factors of racial life for the causes which determine these tragedies; and we shall be entitled to assume as conceivable the proposition that, notwithstanding the consistent fall of all our predecessors, these causes are not inevitable, but being external and environmental, may possibly be controlled.

The second of the two interpretations of history in terms of biology is still, and always has been, widely credited. It is that, in consequence of success, a people become idle, thoughtless, unenterprising, luxurious; and that these *acquired characters are transmitted* to succeeding generations, so that finally there is produced a degenerate people unable to bear the burden of empire, and then the crash comes. The historian usually introduces the idea already dismissed, by saying that a "young and vigorous race" invaded the imperial territories, and so forth. The terms "young" and "old," applied to human races, usually mean nothing at all.

This doctrine of the transmission to children of characters acquired by their parents, is the explanation of organic evolution advanced by Lamarck rather more than a century ago. It is employed by historians for the explanation of both the processes they record, progress and retrogression. Thus they suppose that for many generations a race is disciplined, and so at last there is produced a race with discipline in its very bone ; or for many generations a nation finds it necessary to make adventure upon the sea, and so at last there is produced a generation of predestined sailors with blue water in its blood. And, in similar terms, moral and physical retrogression or degeneration are explained.

Let us consider the contrast between the interpretation which accepts the Lamarckian theory of the transmission of acquired characters and that which does not. Consider the babies of a new generation. According to Lamarck, they have in their blood and brain the consequences of the habits of their ancestors. If these have been idle and luxurious, the new babies are predestined to be idle and luxurious too. This, in short, is a " dying nation." But, if acquired characters are not transmitted, the new generation is, on the whole, not much better, not much worse, than its predecessors, so far as this supposed factor of change is concerned. Each generation makes a fresh start, as we see in the babies of our slums to-day.

Lamarck's theory is of uncertain, but certainly limited, application. The view of Francis Galton has until recently been accepted, that acquired characters are not transmitted, either for good or for evil. If there are no other factors of racial degeneration or racial advance, then races do not degenerate or advance, but make a fresh start every generation, and empires rise and fall without any relation to the breed of the imperial people—an incredible proposition.

Certain indisputable exceptions exist to the denial of the Lamarckian theory of the transmission of acquired characters. Certain of these exceptions are furnished by what I have called the *racial poisons*. Alcohol, for instance, is a substance, certainly poisonous in all but very small doses, which is carried by the blood to every part of the body, and may and does injure *its racial elements*. Thus a true racial degeneration may be caused. Other poisons, such as those of certain *diseases*, act similarly.

We must therefore note, in passing, a biological factor of historical importance, hitherto scarcely recognised by historians. Certain of our diseases, and especially consumption or tuberculosis, are at present making history by their extermination of aboriginal races. Minute living creatures, which we call microbes, are introduced into the new and favourable environment constituted by the blood and tissues of human races hitherto unacquainted with them, and the consequences are known to all. But, further, it has been suggested as highly probable, by Sir Ronald Ross, that the fall of Greece, that incalculable disaster for mankind, was due to the invasion not of human foes, but of the humble living species which are responsible for the disease miscalled malaria. Malaria, like alcohol, produces true racial degeneration, its poisons affecting *those racial elements* of which the individual body, as biologically conceived by Weismann, is merely the ephemeral host—recalling the great line of Lucretius, "*Et quasi cursores, vitai lampada tradunt.*" To lame the runner is not necessarily to injure the torch he bears—acquired characters are certainly not all transmitted; but the racial poison makes dim the lamp ere he passes it on.

But leaving poisons out of the question, races of men and animals *do* undergo change, progressive and retrogressive, in consequence of the action of another factor than that advanced by Lamarck; and this is the factor of "natural selection," so termed by Charles Darwin in 1858; or "survival of the fittest," to use Herbert Spencer's phrase. If, of any generation, individuals of a certain kind are chosen by the environment for survival and parentage, the character of the species will change accordingly. If what we call the best are chosen, their goodness will be transmitted in some degree, and the race will advance; if what we call the worst are chosen, their badness will be transmitted in some degree, and the race will degenerate.

Now in the case of all species other than man the only possible progress, apart from Lamarckian possibilities as yet undetermined, is this *racial or inherent progress,* which is dependent upon a choice or selection of the best for parents, and is comparable in some measure, as Darwin showed, with the change similarly produced by the selective breeding, or "artificial selection," of the lower animals by man. But in the case of man himself, there is a wholly different kind of progress also attainable, which is not inherent or racial progress at all, but yet is real progress; and which has the most important relation to the inherent or racial progress that may be achieved by the process of natural selection, or the choice of parents. The distinction between these two kinds of human progress is as cardinal as it is hitherto ignored.

It was said just now that acquired characters are not transmissible by heredity; but man has learnt to circumvent the laws of heredity by transmitting his spiritual acquirements through language and art. Even before writing, there was tradition passed on from mouth to mouth. As long as man was speechless he advanced, I believe, no faster than other creatures—we know that he has an undistinguished past of some hundreds of thousands of years: but with speech and writing came the transmission of acquirements in this special sense. The past education of a mother will not enlarge her baby's brain, but she can teach her daughter what she has learnt, and so the child can, in a sense, begin where the parent left off—in analogy with what Lamarck imagined to be the case with the young giraffe, that was rightly or wrongly, supposed to profit by the stretching of the parental necks. It is this transmission of spiritual acquirements—outside the germ-plasm, and notwithstanding its laws—that explains the amazing acquired progress of man in the last ten or twenty thousand years, as compared with many hundreds of thousands before them.

This kind of progress is peculiar to man; it is the gift of intelligence, and it may be called *traditional or acquired progress*. It is an utterly different thing from *inherent or racial progress*, an improvement in the breed dependent upon the happy choice of parents. And it is surely evident that *acquired progress is compatible with inherent decadence*. To use Coleridge's image, a dwarf may see further than a giant if he sits on the giant's shoulders; yet he is a dwarf, and the other a giant. Any schoolboy now knows more than Aristotle, and that is true progress of one kind, but the schoolboy may well be a dwarf compared with Aristotle, and may belong to a race degenerate when compared with his; and that would be *inherent or racial decadence subsisting with acquired or traditional progress*.

Now whilst the accumulation of knowledge and art and invention from age to age is real progress, it evidently depends for its security upon the quality of the race. If the race degenerates—whether through a racial poison, alcohol or malaria, or through, say, the selection of the worst for parentage—the time will come when its heritage is too much for it. The pearls of the ancestral art are now cast before swine, and are trampled on; statues, temples, books, are destroyed, or burnt, or lost. If an empire has been built, the degenerate race cannot sustain it. *There is no wealth but life; and if the inherent quality of the life fails, neither battle-ships, nor libraries, nor symphonies, nor Free Trade, nor Tariff Reform, nor anything else, will save a nation.* Empires and civilisations, then, may have fallen, despite the strength and magnitude of the superstructure, because their living foundations became weak; and the bigger and heavier the superstructure, the less could it survive the failure of the foundations. If the Fiji islanders degenerate, there is little consequence; if the breed of Romans degenerate, all their vast mass of acquired progress and power crushes them into dramatic ruin. Acquired progress will not compensate for racial or inherent decadence. If the race is going down, it will not compensate to add another dependency to your empire; on the contrary, the bigger the empire, the stronger must be the race; the bigger the superstructure, the stronger the foundations. Acquired progress is real progress, but it is always dependent for its maintenance upon racial or inherent progress—or, at least, upon racial maintenance.

It is submitted that civilisations and empires have succumbed because they represented only acquired or traditional progress; and this availed not at all when, for instance, the races that built them up began to degenerate. And, apart from the action of racial poisons, the only explanation of racial degeneration yet considered by the historians is the Lamarckian one of the transmission of acquired habits of luxury and idleness from parent to child: an explanation which the modern study of heredity requires us to qualify. What theory of this alleged degeneration is there to offer in its place? and especially what theory which explains racial degeneration amongst not the conquered but the conquerors, amongst the successful, the imperial, the cultured, the leisured—the well-catered-for in all respects, bodily and mental? *Why is it that not enslaved, but imperial peoples degenerate? Why is it that nothing fails like success?*

The true and sufficient answer has been given by no academic historian: but the clue to it was given by the greatest historian of all time, Charles Darwin. The reason is that *no race or species, vegetable or animal or human, can maintain its organic level, let alone raise it, unless its best be selected for parentage.*

We know that, as individuals, we must struggle or we degenerate. "Work is the law," as Ruskin said, whether for a livelihood or for enjoyment. Living things are the product of the struggle for existence: we are thus evolved strugglers by constitution; and directly we cease to struggle, we forfeit the possibilities of our birth-right. "Thou, O God," said Leonardo, "hast given all good things to man at the price of labour."

The case is the same with races or nations. Directly the conditions become too easy, selection ceases: it is as successful to be incompetent or lazy or vicious as to be worthy. The hard conditions that kept weeding out the unworthy are now relaxed, and the fine race they made goes back again. There even occurs the phenomenon of *reversed selection*, when it is positively fitter to be bad than good, cowardly than brave—as when religious persecution murders all who are true to themselves, and spares hypocrites and apostates; or when healthy children are killed in factories, or by their mother's work in factories, whilst feeble-minded children or deaf-mutes are carefully tended until maturity and then sent into the world to reproduce their maladies. Under reversed selection such results are obtained as a breeder of racehorses or plants would obtain if he went to work on similar lines; the race degenerates rapidly, and if it be an imperial race its empire comes crashing down about its ears. All empires and civilisations hitherto have involved the risk of partial or complete arrest or reversal of the process of natural selection; and, in the cases where their doom has been irretrievable, it is the racial degeneration so produced that has been its cause.

When a race is making its early way, selection is stringent. The weak, cowardly, diseased, stupid, are ruthlessly expunged from generation to generation. As civilisation advances, a higher ethical level is reached—all true civilisation tending to abrogate and ameliorate the struggle for existence. The diseased and weakly and feeble-minded are no longer left to pay the penalty sternly exacted by Nature for unfitness: they are allowed to *survive*, which is well; and to *multiply*, which is ill. A successful race can apparently afford to permit this, as a race that is fighting for its existence cannot. *But in reality no race can afford this absolutely fatal process*, especially when unchallenged success comes, and even interferes with the natural process of selection to the extent of not merely abrogating, but actually reversing it, as modern war does, so that it may be more advantageous—more fit—to be a coward, or an idler, or diseased, or feeble-minded, than the reverse.

The fittest survive in any case: but fitness is not goodness. It may be, but it may be badness. Fitness is merely the capacity to fit—to fit the environment. That society in which it is fittest to be best is safe; that society in which it is equally fit to be good, bad, or indifferent is doomed; that society in which it is fittest to be worst is already damned. A nation will ascend, under the influence of selection which is such that the fittest selected are also the best; a nation will degenerate, under the influence of selection which is such that the fittest selected are also the worst. A nation will even degenerate if selection be merely abrogated, and universal survival or indiscriminate survival be substituted for any process of selection at all.

If a nation can ascend in any sure way (its surety being dependent upon the fact that the ascent is in the very blood of the people) only when natural selection actively operates in the choice of the best for survival and parentage, then we begin to realise why it is that in the whole course of history hitherto this sure ascent has scarcely been realised. Babylon may have lasted for 4000 years, as the historians tell us, yet at last it fell. If selection had been operating in Babylon throughout that time, choosing only the best, the noblest and the wisest, conferring upon them, and upon them alone, the supreme privilege and duty of parentage, could Babylon have fallen ?

Hence the explanation of the truth expressed by Gibbon, " All that is human must retrograde if it do not advance." Why should this be so ? Why should it not be possible merely to maintain a position gained ? The answer is, that the civilisation which merely maintains its position is one in which selection has ceased ; if selection had not ceased, the position would be more than maintained, there would be advance. But without selection the breed will certainly degenerate, the lower individuals multiplying more rapidly than higher ones, in accordance with Spencer's law that the higher the type of the individual the less rapidly does he multiply ; and thus the race which is not advancing is retrograding, as Gibbon declared.

The selection of the best for parentage is the sole factor of inherent or racial progress ; but the traditional or acquired progress, which we call civilisation, tends to thwart or abrogate or even invert this process. Thus the conditions necessary for the *secure* ascent of any race, an ascent secured in its very blood, made stable in its very bone, have not yet been achieved in history ; *and this is the reason why history records no enduring empire.*

It is not for a moment asserted that there are no other causes of imperial failure than the arrest or inversion of selection. But if this is not the cause, then, in the absence of the transmission of acquired characters, the race has not degenerated, and is capable of reasserting itself. Only by the arrest or inversion of selection can a race degenerate —apart from alcohol and certain diseases. If, then, a civilisation or empire has fallen through causes altogether non-biological—through carelessness, or neglect of motherhood or alteration of ideals—the changes in character so produced are not transmitted to the children, and the race is not degenerate, but merely deteriorated in each generation.

For instance, we have been brought up to believe that there is no possible future for Spain—it is a dying nation, a senile individual, a people of degenerates ; it has had its day, which can never return. The historian explains this by a fallacious use of the analogy between a race and an individual. But the biologist believes that since Spain has not been subjected—or, at any rate, not subjected long enough—to the only process which can rapidly ensure real degeneration, viz., the consistent and stringent selection of the worst, she is yet capable of regeneration. Regeneration is not really the word, because there has been no real degeneration, but only the successive deterioration of successive and undegenerate generations.

If we took an animal species that *has* degenerated, such as the intestinal parasites, and endeavoured to regenerate them, we should begin to realise the magnitude of our task. That is not the task for Spain, the biologist asserts. Merely the environment must be altered—not the mountain ranges and the rivers, Buckle notwithstanding, but the really potent factors in the environment, the spiritual and psychical and social factors—and the deterioration of each new generation, inherently undegenerate, will cease.

And the biologist is right. The "dying nation" alters its psychical environment. It introduces the practice of education, it begins to shake off the yoke of ecclesiasticism; and what are the consequences?

The new generation is found to be potentially little worse, and little better, than its predecessors of the sixteenth century. There has been no racial degeneration. The environment is modified for the better, *i.e.* so as to choose the better, and Spain, as they say in misleading phrase, "takes on a new lease of life."

But the historian might well write a volume upon the same thesis as applied to China and Japan. The popular belief used to be, that China illustrated the so-called law of nations. It was the decadent, though monstrous, relic of an ancient civilisation; it had had its day; inevitable degeneration, which must befall all peoples, had come upon it. Behold it in the paralysis which precedes death!

But in the light of the facts of Japan, and such a phrase as "the yellow peril," we have discarded our old theories. The metaphor must be changed. This is not paralysis, but merely stupor. It is suspense, not recuperation; but assuredly it is not paralysis. Who now would dare to say that China has had its day, even if he still clings to the old fictions about Spain?

There is another factor of history to which, I believe, the biologist must attach enormous importance, but which no historian yet has adequately reckoned with. The prime assumption of this lecture from beginning to end, is that "there is no wealth but life"; and, in the attempt to suggest interpretations of history based upon this truth, so little recked of by the historian, we have considered the life in question from the point of view of its determination by heredity, and its varying value according to the inherent and transmissible characters selected for perpetuation in each generation. But a word must be said as to the other factor which, with heredity, determines the character of every individual—and that factor is the environment. We must note the most important aspect of the environment of human beings, and observe that historians hitherto have wholly ignored it; yet its influence is incalculable. This is motherhood.

It is man's intelligence that has made him lord of the earth; it is qualities of intelligence that have largely determined the course of history as wrought out between human races and civilisations. Now intelligence is a limitless thing—it can learn everything; *but*, it has everything to learn. The lower animals have instincts—neither needing nor capable of education, but in order that intelligence shall be possible, instinct must make room for it. Thus, at birth we human beings have nothing; intellect being only potential, not actual, and instinct having yielded to it. We come into the world more helpless and incompetent than the young of any other living creature; the human baby is a fraction more helpless even than the baby ape. A later age may reveal a Newton or a Kelvin, a Shakespeare or a Goethe; but all were helpless ignorant babies at first, unable even to find their way to the mother's breast that was made for them. Thus motherhood, the importance of which has been steadily rising throughout the ages, and is enormous in all the mammals, is supremely important for the highest of the mammals, which is man. No motherhood, no intelligence. You may have the most perfect system of selection of the finest and highest individuals for parentage; but the babies whose potentialities—heredity gives no more—are so splendid, are always, will be always, dependent upon motherhood. What was the state of motherhood during the decline and fall of the Roman empire? This factor counts in history; and will always count, so long as three times in every century the only wealth of nations is reduced to dust, and begins again in helpless infancy. As to Rome we know little, whatever may be suspected; but we know that here, in the heart of the greatest empire in history—and it is at the heart that empires rot—thousands of mothers go out every day to tend dead machines, whilst their own flesh and blood, with whom lies the imperial destiny, are tended anyhow or not at all. To-day our historians and politicians think in terms of regiments, and tariffs, and "Dreadnoughts"; the time will come when historians think in terms of babies and motherhood. We must think in such terms, too, if we wish Great Britain to be much longer great. A history of motherhood is yet to seek. Meanwhile, who will not deplore the perennial slaughter of babies in this land, the deterioration of many for every one killed outright, the waste of mothers' travail and tears?

Had all Roman mothers been Cornelias, would Rome have fallen? Consider the imitation mothers—no longer mammalia—to be found in certain classes to-day—mothers who should be ashamed to look any tabby cat in the face; consider the ignorant and downtrodden mothers amongst our lower classes; and ask whether these things are not making history. Who will join the new party of one that calls itself *maternalist*?

These principles find their warrant and application in the unexampled riddle of the persistence and success, throughout more than two thousand years and a thousand vicissitudes, of the Jewish people. It is true that we have here no exception to the *apparent* law that empires are mortal, for there never was a Jewish empire; the Jews were never subject to the risk involved for racial or inherent progress, by the possession of great acquired powers leading to the arrest of struggle and selection. But just as the fall of empires has often not been the fall of races—various races having at various times carried on the same imperial tradition—so the persistence of the Jews, as contrasted with the impermanence of empires, has been the persistence of a race.

It has been asserted that that race of people decays in which selection ceases or is inverted; that in the absence of selection of the fittest for life and parentage, no species, vegetable, animal or human, can prosper, much less progress. Now the Jews, the one human race of which we know assuredly that it has persisted unimpaired, have been the most continuously and stringently selected of any race that can be named. Every measure of persecution and repression, practised against them by the peoples amongst whom they have lived, has directly tended towards the very end which those peoples least desired to compass. Other peoples found themselves prosperous through the efforts of their fathers; the struggle for existence abated; it was, so to say, as fit to be unfit as to be fit—with the inevitable result, racial decadence. But this has never been the case of the Jews. They have always had to struggle for life intensely, and their unexampled struggle has been a great source of their unexampled strength. The Jew who was a weakling or a fool had no chance at all; the weaklings and the fools being weeded out, intensity and strength of mind became the common heritage of this amazing people.

Secondly, there was everything to favour motherhood. Here religious precept and ethical tradition joined with stern necessity to the same end—the end which always meant a new and strong beginning for the next generation. Even to-day all observers are agreed that infant mortality is at a minimum among the Jews; their children are superior in height and weight and chest measurement to Gentile children brought up amidst poverty far less intense in our own great cities—*in a better material environment, but a far inferior maternal environment.* The Jewish mother is the mother of children innately superior, on the average, since they are the fruit of such long ages of stringent parental selection; and she makes more of them because she fails to nurse them only in the rarest cases, when she has no choice, and because in every detail her maternal care is incomparably superior to that of her Gentile sister.

Given a high standard of motherhood, in a highly selected race, what other result than that we daily witness and envy can we expect?

Thirdly, the Jews do not abuse alcohol; and thus avoid one of the few causes of true racial degeneration, apart from arrest of selection or selection of the worst, for parentage.

If these principles are valid, it is evident that our redemption from the fate of all our predecessors is to be found only in what Francis Galton called eugenics—the selection of the best for parentage.

Using the word environment in its widest sense, including, for instance, public opinion—and its use in any sense less wide is always erroneous and misleading—we must surely see that it is our business to provide the environment which selects the best for parenthood and discourages the parenthood of the worst: say, to begin with, the deaf and dumb, the feeble-minded, the insane, the epileptic, the inebriate, those afflicted with hereditary disease of other kinds, and so forth. Our principles should enable us, also, to define what we mean by good environment. Comprehensive and indiscriminate charity means a good environment for many in a sense, but it may also mean the selection of the worst for parenthood—*e.g.* the feeble-minded. This good environment, then, means the degeneration of the race. We must therefore *appraise environment in terms of its selective action.* A good environment is that which selects the good, and the best environment is that which selects the best; discovers them, makes the utmost of them, and confers upon them the supreme privilege and duty of parenthood. That, and that alone, is the best environment; and all other moral judgments upon environment are fallacious, and will be disastrous.

The new law of love need not go, the brutal struggle for existence need not be restored, we need not be damned to be saved. *The unfit must survive, but they must not multiply.* We need only follow those who care for the feeble-minded *all their days,* and thus serve the present and the future simultaneously.

Eugenics, or "good breeding," is Francis Galton's name for the science of race-culture, which assumes that there is no wealth but life, and that the first duty of all governments and patriots, and good citizens is, to quote Ruskin again, "the production and recognition of human worth, the detection and extinction of human unworthiness." The idea is not new-fangled, but was clearly laid down by Plato, and by Theognis two centuries before him. The modern expression of it is now nearly forty years old, and it has already passed the stage of ridicule, except by the ridiculous.

Eugenics is a project of the most elevated and provident morality, aiming at no object less sublime than the ennoblement of mankind; and if one may suggest its motto, it would be, *The products of progress are not mechanisms but men.* It aims at "working out the beast." It is based upon the principle of the selection or choice of the superior for parenthood, which has been the essential factor of all progress in the world of life, but which all civilisations have tended, in some degree, to abrogate, or even to invert—as when the feeble-minded child is cared for till maturity, and sent out into the world to produce its like, whilst healthy children are daily destroyed by ignorance and neglect.

"Through Nature only can we ascend," and the merit of the eugenic proposal is that it is built upon "the solid ground of Nature."

To the economist, it declares that *the culture of the racial life is the vital industry of any people.*

It is to work through marriage, an institution more ancient than mankind, and supremely valuable in its services to childhood—with which lies all human destiny. No serious eugenist countenances for a moment the insane and vicious proposals which falsely assume that the methods of the stud farm are applicable to man—who is not an erected horse.

Eugenics appeals to the individual, asking for a little imagination—to make us realise that the future will one day be the present, and that to serve it is to serve no fiction or phantom, but a reality as real as the present generation.

It teaches the responsibility of the noblest and most sacred of all professions, which is parenthood, and it makes a sober and dignified claim to be regarded as a constituent of the religion of the future.

It goes to the root of the matter: where the well-meaning, but short-sighted, pin their faith on the hospitals, the eugenist seeks to brand the transmission of heredity disease as a crime, and thus *literally* to extirpate it altogether.

That its methods are practicable is proved by the fact that it is practised—as by our laws for the "*permanent* care of the feeble-minded."

National eugenics offers, I submit, our sole chance of escape from the fate which has overtaken all previous civilisations; and suggests the principles of a New Patriot. It honours men and women, by declaring that human parenthood is crowned with responsibility to the unborn, and to all time coming; and that man, the animal in body, is also a self-conscious being, "looking before and after," who is human because he is responsible; and to whom the laws of nature have been revealed, not to satisfy an intellectual curiosity, but for the highest end conceivable—the elevation of his race.

Says Wordsworth :—

"Having brought the books
Of modern statists to their proper test,
Life, human life, with all its sacred claims ;

. . . .

And having thus discerned how dire a thing
Is worshipped in that idol proudly named
'The Wealth of Nations'; where alone that wealth
Is lodged, and how increased : and having gained
A more judicious knowledge of the worth
And dignity of individual man,

. . . .

I could not but inquire

. . . .

Why is this glorious creature to be found
One only in ten thousand ? What one is,
Why may not millions be ? What bars are thrown
By Nature in the way of such a hope ?"

Consider how far we have come, the base degrees by which we did ascend, and answer with Shakespeare, "There are many events in the womb of Time which will be delivered."

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PARENTHOOD

THE deeds of man proceed from certain radical elements of his nature, some evidently noble, others, when looked at askew, apparently ignoble. These elements are classed as instinctive. We are less intelligent than we think. Reason may occupy the throne, but the foundations upon which that throne is based are not of her making. To change the image, reason is the pilot, not the gale or the engine. She does not determine the goal, but only the course to that goal. We are what our nature makes us: our likes and our dislikes determine our acts, and we are guided to our self-determined ends by means of our intelligence. More often, indeed, we use our intelligence merely to justify to ourselves the likes and dislikes, the action and the inaction, which our instinctive tendencies have determined.

Many of our natural instincts, impulses and emotions bear only remotely upon the eugenic ideal: as, for instance, the instinct of flight and the emotion of fear, the instinct of curiosity and the emotion of wonder, the instinct of pugnacity and the emotion of anger. Certain others, however, are not merely radical and permanent parts of our nature, but determine human existence, the greater part of its failures and successes, its folly and wisdom, its history and its destiny. Two of these—the parental and racial instincts—I desire to consider in the present paper; and also, very briefly, a supposed third, the filial instinct. I am inclined to question whether such a specific entity as the filial instinct exists at all; it is rather, I believe, a product, by transmutation, of the parental instinct, which, in its various forms and potencies and through the tender emotion which is its counterpart in the affective realm of our natures, is the noblest, finest and most promising ingredient of our constitution.

Instinct and Emotion.—We must be sure, in the first place, that we have a sound idea of what we mean by the word "instinct." It is absurd, for instance, to speak of "acquiring a political instinct"—or any other. That is the most erroneous possible use of the word. An instinct is eminently something which cannot be "acquired"; it is native if anything is native; as native as the nose or the backbone. Instincts may be developed or repressed: it is the great mark of man that in him they may even be transmuted—but *acquired* never.

When we come to examine the laws of activity we find that, on the application of certain kinds of stimulus, there are certain very definite responses, and these we call instinctive. If the arm or the leg of a sleeper be stroked or touched, or a cold breath of air blows thereon, it will be withdrawn, and such withdrawal is what we call a reflex action. Now, an instinctive action, as Herbert Spencer saw long ago, is a "complex reflex action." It differs from a simple reflex, a mere twitch, such as winking, but it is a complicated, and possibly prolonged, action, which is, at bottom, of the nature of a reflex. One may instance the instinct of flight, which is correlated with fear. In crossing the street we hear "toot, toot," and we run. We do not ratiocinate, we run. All the primary instincts of mankind act similarly. Take, for contrast, the instinct of curiosity. Consider a child watching a mechanical toy: the impulse of this instinct of curiosity is such that he goes to the thing and examines it. By means of the transmutation, which it is the prerogative of man to effect, such an instinct works out into a lifetime devoted to the study of Nature. There is an unbroken sequence from the interest in the unknown which we see in a kitten or a child up to that which triumphs in a Newton or a Darwin.

Thus we begin to learn that human nature is largely a collection of instincts, more or less correlated; and that at bottom we act on our instincts—in accordance with certain innate predilections, likings and dislikings, with which we were born, and which we have inherited from our ancestors. Indissolubly associated therewith is what we call emotion. For instance, in the exercise of the instinct of curiosity we feel a certain emotion, which we call wonder. There is an ignoble wonder and there is a noble wonder : but whether it be an astronomer watching the stars, or the crowd the freaks in a circus, there exists association between the emotion of wonder and the instinct of curiosity. Dr. McDougall, of Oxford, elaborated some few years ago, and has now established,[1] an extremely important theory of the relation between instinct and emotion. He has shown that our emotions are correlated with our instincts; that the emotion is the inward or subjective side of the working of the instinct. Thus an instinct is more than a "complex reflex action"; it is more than merely that, on hearing something or seeing something, certain muscles are thrown into action, because along with the action there is emotion, and this is a natural and necessary correlation. We should do well to carry about with us, as part of our mental furniture, this idea of the correlation between instinct and emotion.

Now, if it be true that man is not primarily a rational animal, if he be rather, *au fond*, a bundle, an assemblage, *an organism of instincts*, it behoves us to recognise in ourselves and in others the primary instincts, because from them flows all that goes to make up human nature, whether it be good or evil. Amongst these, certainly, is the parental instinct.

The Parental Instinct.—Let us first consider its development in the individual, for this bears on the question when to begin eugenic education. We find it very early indeed. It is commonly asserted that the doll instinct is the precursor, the infantile and childish form, of the parental instinct. Some psychologists assure us that this is wrong, that a small child will be just as content to play with anything else as with a doll, that the child gets fond of its possession, and that what we are really witnessing is the instinct of acquisitiveness. The rest may reason and welcome, but we who are fathers know. You have only to watch a child to learn that it very soon differentiates its doll, or even the shapeless mass it calls its doll, from other things. Try with your own children and see if you can get them to like anything else as well as they like a doll. They will not. There are few settled questions, but if there is anything on earth of which a man may be sure it is that the parental instinct and its associated emotion may be unmistakably displayed as the master-passion in a child who is not yet two years old. In a case where the possibility of imitation was excluded I have seen a little girl adore a small baby, stroke its hands, whisper quasi-maternal sweet nothings to it—"mother it," in short—as plainly as I have seen the sun at noon: and I have no reason to suppose, though that little girl was my own, that this phenomenon was unique!

---

[1] *Social Psychology*, by W. McDougall, M.A., M.B. (Methuen, 1908).

Various interesting questions arise. For instance, can we discern in early childhood a difference between the two sexes? Psychology inclines to the view that small children are of neither sex. Of course, if we encourage—not to say create—differences, we may mislead ourselves. But in the adult, at any rate, we discern a marked difference between the sexes, for the parental instinct is much less potent in men than in women. Dr. McDougall supposes that men have acquired the paternal instinct by inheritance from women—from their mothers. We know that characters native in one sex may be transmitted to the other: indeed, there are some cases where they are transmitted only to the other. But it may also be fairly argued that a society in which there was some development of the paternal instinct, in which the father's love and care came to help the mother's—which I take to be the essence of marriage—would have superior survival value, and would triumph in the inter-societary struggle for existence. Thus the paternal instinct would grow stronger and stronger with time.

Some writers, by the way, have denied that the paternal instinct exists at all. What looks like it, they say, is mere imitation. Such a contention is hardly worth refuting. The paternal instinct may be seen amongst some fishes, many birds, many mammals; amongst the most fierce of existing men, such as the head-hunters of Borneo, and amongst the highest types of the highest races to-day. Doubtless there are many men in whom it is weak or absent—men who think of children as brats. On the assumption, warranted by everything we know of instincts, that they are markedly hereditary, I do not hesitate to affirm that upon such men, whether "able" or not, the supreme responsibility of parenthood ought not, in the general interest, to fall.

Other Kindred Instincts.—The parental instinct is connected subtly with the racial instinct, the name which I prefer to give to what we usually call the sexual instinct; and it is undisputed that, except in utterly degraded persons, the object of the feelings which are associated with the racial instinct becomes the object of the feelings which are associated with the parental instinct. The object of the emotion of sex becomes also the object of tender emotion. Thus "love" in its lower sense, becomes exalted by Love in the noble sense.

There is also in us an instinct of pugnacity, which especially appears when the working of any other instinct is thwarted. We know that the parental instinct when thwarted—as in the tigress robbed of her whelps

—shows itself in pugnacity, even in the female, which commonly has no pugnacity; and in the emotion of anger. It is a reasonable supposition that the fine anger, the passion for justice, the passion against, say, slavery, or cruelty to children—that these indignations which move the world are at bottom traceable to the workings of the thwarted parental instinct. When we have tender emotion towards a child, or towards an animal, whatever it be, this is really the subjective side of the working of the parental instinct. Now, tender emotion is what has made and makes everything that is good in the individual, and in human society. It is the basis of all morality—all morality that is real morality, —everything that permits us to hold up our heads at all, or to hope for the future of the race. That is why the study of the parental instinct, its correlate or source, is as important and serious as any that can be imagined.

This instinct and its emotion are amongst the most highly variable, I believe, of human characters. One man, even one woman, is much more sympathetic than another. These differences are unquestionably native and transmissible. The Mendelians have shown that there is in the hen a definite brooding instinct. Some hens will sit upon their eggs, others will not. This brooding instinct is a Mendelian unit, of the kind called a dominant, and is transmitted to the chickens according to the Mendelian ratio. To my mind these are immensely suggestive observations. Amongst ourselves there are persons in whom the parental instinct and the tender emotion are so slight as practically to be nonexistent. And as in the hen it is possible to be female and have no brooding instinct, so, perhaps, it is possible that a woman may be naturally without the parental instinct. It is certain that, in many cases, the instinct may be so weakly that wrong methods of education may practically extirpate it.

The Transmutation of Instinct.—The last thing I mean by the transmutation of instinct is that by any political alchemy it is possible—to quote Herbert Spencer's celebrated aphorism,—to get golden conduct out of leaden instincts. But it is the mark of man, the intelligent being, that in him the instincts are plastic, and even capable of amazing transmutations. In the lower animals there is instinct, but that instinct is an almost completely fixed, rigid, final thing. In ourselves, there is a limitless capacity for the development, the humanisation of instinct along many lines, as when the primitive infantile curiosity works out into the speculations of a thinker. In other words, *we* are educable, the lower animals are not, or only within very narrow limits.

Yet in one respect the lower animals have the advantage over us. Their instincts are often perfect. You cannot teach a cat anything about how to look after her kittens; but instincts amongst ourselves, for instance, though not less numerous or potent, are not perfected, not sharp-cut. In the cat there is no need for education, in woman there is eminent need for it. Indeed it is the lack of education that is largely responsible for our large infant mortality. Not that woman is inferior to the cat, but that, being not instinctive but intelligent, she requires education in motherhood.

Human instincts in general are capable of modification; sometimes they may take bizarre forms, and so we find that there are people, without children of their own, more commonly women, who will have twenty cats in the house and look after them, or who will devote their whole lives to the cause of the rat or the rabbit, or whatever it may be, while the children of men are dying around them. These things are indications of the parental instinct centred on unworthy objects. It is a common thing to laugh at these aberrations: thoughtlessly, as it seems to some of us. While orphans are to be found, we should do better if we tried to bring together the woman who needs to "mother" and the child who needs to be "mothered."

It is quite evident that the parental instinct is a thing pre-eminently indispensable for mankind, because man is born the most helpless and remains longest the most helpless of all living things, the most in need of parental care. It is interesting to find that its development increases as we approach man. The parental instinct is stronger in the higher apes than in any lower form of life. It is stronger still in ourselves. The increase of the allied emotion of tenderness is strictly correlated with this increase of helplessness in point both of intensity and duration, as life ascends along the main line.

The Parental Instinct and Eugenics.—All this, it will be said, may be true, but if we cannot make or acquire the parental instinct, has the knowledge of it any relation to practice? I answer, it is eminently practical. For this priceless possession, this parental instinct and tenderness, is inheritable. We know by observation amongst ourselves that hardness and tenderness are to be found running through families, are things which are transmissible. Let us, then, make parenthood the most responsible, the most deliberate, the most self-conscious thing in life, so that there should be children born to those who love children, and only to those who love children, to those who have the parental instinct strongly developed, and who will, on the average, transmit a high measure of it to their offspring. In a generation bred on these principles, a generation consisting only of babies who were loved before they were born, there would be a proportion of sympathy, of tender feeling, and of all those great, abstract, world-creating passions which are evolved from the tender emotion, such as no age hitherto has seen. The parental instinct, often ignored altogether by philosophers and psychologists, is the germ of everything that is good in human nature, of everything that makes it worth while for us to go on living at all. Thus our duty is to increase it to the utmost of our power.

The Racial Instinct.—Many thoughtful observers are coming to believe that one of the greatest advances of the near future will be the recognition that education must more directly include preparation for the supreme civic duty of parenthood. This presupposes some suitable instruction regarding those functions of the body which exist primarily for parenthood; though the fact is conventionally ignored. The exercise of these functions primarily depends on the instinct which, as I would suggest, it is not only convenient but illuminating to call *racial:* and this racial instinct should be represented to the possessor, not as something the satisfaction of which is an end of itself—but as weighted with a great responsibility to the race. Our young people must be trained to see that it is for man the self-conscious, made with " such large discourse, looking before and after," to estimate and deal with his instincts in terms of their purpose, as no creature but man can do. They must learn, and we must teach them, to recognise in the racial instinct no end, but means existing for the highest of ends—the continuance and ultimate elevation of the life of mankind.

One object of Eugenics is to secure by the co-operation of parents that so soon as the knowledge of new powers is acquired by young people, these shall be directly linked with the idea of responsibility and duty of a high order. Experience shows that too often information is sought from most undesirable sources, which ignore or despise the one truth that alone can ennoble the whole subject,—that these instincts and functions are a sacred trust for the life that is to come after us. To the eugenic education of girls, only a false and disastrous prudery, not to be confused with modesty, offers any great obstacles. The idea of motherhood is essentially natural to the normal girl and the civilisation in which the girls ceased to regard motherhood as an ideal would be assuredly doomed. The higher education of girls can only be lower, not higher, if it does not serve the future Mother, both by teaching her how to care for and guard her body, which is the temple of her future life on earth, and how afterwards to impart the same teaching to her children.

The "Filial Instinct."—Ever careful of the race, of which the individual would seem in her eyes to be little more than an organ, Nature determines the strength and direction of our instincts, and of the feelings associated with them, in due proportion to their survival-value. The "filial instinct" we should thus expect to find but feeble, in comparison with some others, for it is retrospective in the main, thus constituting an apparent exception to Nature's forward gaze. That dedication of present to future life which we find displayed throughout the whole organic world makes comprehensible the very late and feeble development of this so-called instinct and its accompanying emotion. Herbert Spencer long ago pointed out that one of the most conspicuous needs of society to-day, and one of the most to be desired advances in the future, was a great increase of filial emotion, leading to due care for aged parents, care such as, at its best, can scarcely be more than a pale shadow of that which, under the influence of the parental instinct, they bestowed upon their helpless children. I assent with all my heart to the Spencerian dictum: as I deplore that lack of respect for the elderly which is one of the least pleasing products of modern "education": and it seems to me that the capital contention for which this paper is a plea bears directly upon the question. I have no doubt that the so-called "filial instinct," a distinctively human trait, and none too common or powerful even amongst the highest races of men, is a product of the parental instinct, an instance of that evolution and transmutation of instinct which is our great characteristic. We care for our aged and helpless parents—and thus for the elderly in general—under the influence of that same tender emotion which urges us to care for our helpless children and childhood in general. I cannot doubt that, in general, the parents who love their children are the likeliest to have children who will love them: not only because of the love-creating power of love, but also because the parental and filial instincts are really one, and the children of those in whom the one is strong will be more likely to display the latter, since like tends to beget like.

Thus whilst we may approve or disapprove of Old Age Pensions and similar schemes, or may urge, perhaps, that the expenditure of money upon childhood would produce greater results per unit of expenditure, I should urge the essentially eugenic argument that the key to all social and moral problems is human nature; that, in the matter under discussion, the true course is to enhance the parental instinct, of which the filial instinct is simply a retrospective form; and that our principle therefore must be identical with that to which we were led by other lines,—the making of parenthood the most responsible, deliberate, provident thing in life: so that, as I have already said, children shall be born only to those who desire and love them, to those in whom the parental instinct and the tender emotion predominate and in whose children we may justly expect to find the same predominance repeated.

It may be suggested that all the above is but remotely eugenic: certainly I should have thought so when I began eugenic work. But our aim of bettering human nature must be achieved by human nature, and we must make ourselves acquainted with the facts of our instrument. That is why I have here departed somewhat from the ordinary track of eugenic discussion.

One last word: There is in our midst a political party—and that perhaps the nearest to the thinking party of the future and one's dreams—which aids and abets the many contemporary tendencies towards the abolition of parental responsibility. The State is to clothe and feed and educate; the mother, perhaps, is to remain responsible, but the father no longer. It is to me inconceivable that progress can be on these lines: that we shall advance by divesting of responsibility that which, as I hold, should be the most responsible of all acts. Our human lawgivers must reckon with Nature's decrees. In demanding that the responsibility of parenthood which she exacts of our humbler allies shall be made *transcendent* in man, the highest responsibility of his life, we may command Nature by the only possible method, namely, by obeying her. This is the open road, from which the feet of Eugenics must not stray.

Knowledge, wisdom, truth, can be used or abused. Fact is neither good nor evil; dynamite may entomb or untomb. All wisdom, of whatever order, is ultimately justified of her children: and the human capacity to humanise parenthood by making it provident and designed will yet be justified in the children of the generations that are to be.

SUNLIGHT AND DISEASE

(Delivered at the Royal Institution, 1923).

"IN the beginning God said, Let There Be Light." In or before the eighth century B.C., Zarathustra, foremost among many sun-worshippers in many ages, taught the cult of the sun and the green leaf and thrift, in place of pillage and murder. In the beginning of medicine, Hippocrates, practising at Cos in the temples of Æsculapius—son of Phœbus Apollo, god of the sun and medicine and music—practised the sun-cure. In the beginning of our era, Galen and Celsus used the sun. In the Dark Ages, by a pitiful misconception, the cult of the sun fell into desuetude as a species of pagan Nature-worship, and ill persons were treated alike in physical and in intellectual night. Tuberculosis and other ills were treated by the Sovereign touch, reputed to cure the "king's evil."

In the second half of the nineteenth century, we find certain heralds of the dawn. In 1856, Florence Nightingale vigorously but vainly protested against the orientation of Netley Hospital, observing that no sunlight could enter its wards. In 1876, Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson praised sunlight in his " Hygeia, The City of Health." In 1877, Downes and Blunt showed that sunlight will kill anthrax bacilli. In many writings at this period, John Ruskin upheld sunlight and declaimed against the " plague-cloud " of smoke above our cities. In 1890, Dr. Theobald Adrian Palm who still practises medicine at Aylesford, in the Garden of England, showed by the geographical method that lack of sunlight is the chief factor in the causation of rickets, and added an admirable series of recommendations accordingly. His paper was entirely ignored, and I found it in America, thanks to an American bibliographer. Robert Koch and others showed that sunlight kills tubercle bacilli. In 1893, Niels Finsen began to cure lupus, a form of cutaneous tuberculosis, by the local use of sunlight, and Sir James Crichton-Browne made observations to the same effect in this country. In 1900, on May 1, the London Hospital began the cure of lupus by the local use of sunlight, thanks to the really effective Sovereign touch of Queen Alexandra, who was instrumental in bringing her young fellow-countryman's idea from Copenhagen.

In 1903, Dr. A. Rollier opened at Leysin, in the Alpes Vaudoises, the first clinic for the treatment of so-called surgical tuberculosis by sunlight ; and in 1910 he applied his idea to prevention by the establishment of the " school in the sun," at Cergnat, just below Leysin. In 1914, he published his book, " La Cure de Soleil," but the world catastrophe of that year caused it to be overlooked. In this country his methods have been followed recently by Sir Henry Gauvain, at the Treloar Hospital at Alton and Hayling Island, where very simple sheds and solaria serve to achieve results never approached by Netley, the pretentious and misplaced architecture of which exists in the same county to point the contrast between its century—the last of the ages of darkness—and the dawn in our own. In a very few other places, also, such as the Queen Mary's Hospital for Children at Carshalton, under Dr. Gordon Pugh—photographs of which from the air show a series of three-sided solaria strongly resembling the health temple at Cos—at Leasowe near Liverpool, at Perrysburg near Buffalo in the United States, and, following a recent lecture of mine, at the Heritage Craft Schools, Chailey, Sussex, the sun-cure is employed. At several others, which I have visited, the sun-cure is said to be employed, but is not, the elements of the matter being unknown to the persons in charge.

The results of heliotherapy, as seen in person, or recorded in Rollier's radiographic and clinical atlas of 1914, or shown by means of illustrations, are unapproached for certainty, safety, ease, beauty, restoration of function, and happiness during and after treatment. No explanation of them, to be called intelligible or adequate, is offered by any of its practitioners. Being myself without patients or laboratories, I have used only the geographical method, and have found, at each place studied, a tendency to believe that the various factors there present are essential for the results obtained. In the mountains, altitude is insisted upon ; at the sea, the argument for "helio-Alpine" is replaced by an argument for "helio-Marine." In high latitudes, the Mediterranean is described as impossible for sun-cure ; on visiting the Mediterranean, I found the sun-cure gloriously successful on the French and Italian Riviera, and there are similar reports from Spain. The fundamental bases were lacking for a superlatively successful empirical practice, conducted by various clinicians under widely varying conditions and in ignorance, for the most part, of each other's methods. No rational statement of the scope of heliotherapy could be obtained, some strongly denying, while Rollier strongly averred, that tuberculosis is amenable to the treatment when it happens to be situated in the lungs, as it is amenable when situated elsewhere. In his volume of 1914, Rollier mentioned certain other conditions besides tuberculosis, such as rickets, a non-bacterial disease, but the only explanation of the sun-cure that he offered was based on the antiseptic action of sunlight, while Gauvain explicitly regarded the sunlight as only an adjuvant in his method.

Clearly the need was for a properly co-ordinated scientific inquiry into the action of sunlight upon the body in health and disease. We were using it as we used digitalis for the heart before pharmacology (to compare a great thing with one relatively trivial) ; we needed a true physio-pharmacology of this incomparable medicament. My demands for such an inquiry were met, after six months, by the Medical Research Council, early in 1922, and from the date of the appointment of the Special Committee, under the chairmanship of Sir William Bayliss, a new chapter in clinical and preventive medicine, I believe, will be seen to begin, its provisional opening being the new and largely re-written translation into English of "La Cure de Soleil," on which I resolved immediately after my first visit to Leysin.

Already we have at least made it clear to all critics that the action is due to the sun's light and not to its heat. So long ago as 1779, Ingenhouss showed that the dissociation of carbon dioxide by the green leaf is due to the sun's light and not to its heat. Yet, in several instances, the sun-cure has been tried, with calamitous results, by clinicians who, making no inquiry into the matter, have exposed the unaccustomed chests of phthisical patients to the mid-day sun, perhaps for an hour or two, with natural results in fever and hæmoptysis. Already, also, the idea that the light is less valuable in killing the infective agent than in raising the bodily resistance to it—an idea to which I invited attention nearly twenty years ago, at the death of Finsen—has come into the clinical mind. Since last August in the Light Department of the London Hospital—which has done such splendid though limited work on the older hypothesis, since 1900—the general light bath has been used as well as the local treatment, and cases which resisted the latter have been completely cured by general exposure of the nude skin to the electric arc lamp, without local irradiation. We must use a combination of light and cold, which I have been commending for some time on the evidence of visits to Canada, where a magnificent childhood, free from rickets, thrives in extreme cold, thanks, as I believe, to a brilliant sun.

In various American laboratories the subject is now being advanced; notably in Columbia University, New York, under Dr. Alfred F. Hess and his fellow-workers. They attribute the major part of the action of the sun to the ultra-violet rays, by which, in experimental animals, and also in infants, they are able to cure rickets with great speed, ease and certainty, and to increase very markedly the phosphorus in the blood of infants on a constant diet. When I saw this experimental and clinical work in New York last December, the result had already been reached of demonstrating an annual curve, from month to month, of phosphorus in the blood of infants, with a maximum in June-July, and a minimum in March, corresponding with the monthly height of the sun in New York. By radiographic study of the bones of infants, it has also been shown that no new cases of rickets occur in New York in June-July, and the maximum number occur in March. Dr. Hess now informs me that the calcium content of the blood follows the same curve as the phosphorus content. Among earlier noted seasonal effects of sunlight, quoted by Hess in his latest paper, are the presence of increased iodine in the thyroid of cattle from June to November, and the greater resistance of guinea-pigs to aceto-nitrile poisoning in summer.

Hess and his workers have also begun the study of various clothing materials in this connexion, and find that they vary in their power of permitting or obstructing the action of light. Specimens of a mercerised cotton, one white and the other black, otherwise identical, the former allowing light to act and the latter interfering with it, have been examined by me, and I find no difference, due to the black dye, in the spacing between the fibres of the material. But I understand that the Department of Applied Physiology of the Medical Research Council has found, in a series of observations as yet unpublished, that the biological action of light can be graded by temperature. I am in hope that these specimens of material may be studied by the delicate methods associated with the name of Prof. Leonard Hill, and that it may be found that the black material produces a higher temperature than the white of the subjacent skin, thus prejudicing those unknown and beneficent chemical reactions which appear to need light and cold for their development.

The belief grows upon me that the asserted futility of heliotherapy in phthisis is due to the overheating of the patients in the sun. I think that a new chapter will open in the treatment of that disease when practitioners acquaint themselves with the principles and practice of heliotherapy before exposing their patients to the sun.

The power of sunlight and of cod-liver oil in rickets seemed to indicate that the light may cause the skin to produce vitamin D for itself. Recent work at the Lister Institute supports this theory for it has been shown that young rats and rabbits are protected from rickets when one-fifth of a gram of irradiated cholesterol is applied daily to a small area of depilated skin. Miss Coward's work shows that vitamin A is present in the parts of flowers which contain carotin. Sir William Bayliss has suggested to me that the production of this vitamin in green plants is a function of the carotin rather than of chlorophyll, and that probably the carotin acts as a sensitiser for ultra-violet rays. In this connexion we must remember that pigmentation of the skin is a marked feature of the sun-cure, and that patients who do not pigment well do not progress well. No one who has seen and touched the typical pigmented skin of a heliotherapeutic patient can doubt that very active chemical processes are there occurring. Perhaps we should regard the skin less as a mere integument than as an organ of internal secretion. The pigmented skin under the sunlight is surely that; and we may ask whether it contributes, as Sheridan Delepine suggested, to the making of hæmoglobin. I owe also to Sir William Bayliss the information that Dr. H. H. Dale, a member of his committee, has shown that smooth muscle can be made to contract by ultra-violet rays.

Aerial and other photographs of Manchester, and the Potteries, and of Sheffield, taken at successive hours on Sunday and Monday, demonstrate the obstruction of sunlight by our urban smoke, the industrial and the domestic chimney being both responsible; but while Sheffield deprives itself of more than half its sunlight, Essen is absolutely smokeless, and Pittsburg, which I have visited for the purposes of this inquiry, has abolished 85 per cent. of its smoke. Sections of the lungs of an agricultural labourer and a typical urban inhabitant of our country, the latter being heavily infiltrated with smoke, illustrate a cognate aspect of our subject.

Yet another point is illustrated by recent work of Hess, which shows that the milk of cows fed on pasture in the sunlight maintains the growth and health of young animals, whereas the milk of cows fed in shadow and on vitamin-free fodder will not maintain life. Our children are thus disadvantaged in winter by light-starvation, and by the defect of the milk of light-starved cows.

Photographic study of houses and housing on both sides of the Atlantic illustrates the problem of urban light-starvation. Finding New York smokeless in 1919, I later made investigations with the aid of Dr. Royal S. Copeland, the Health Commissioner of that city, and found that the death-rate from pulmonary tuberculosis had been reduced by one-half in the period, 1905-1919, of the operation of the sanitary regulation against smoke. The restoration of sunlight to our urban lives is the next great task of public health in this country.

"There is no darkness but ignorance," as Shakespeare said. In every sense we need "more light." Then we must apply our knowledge, less for heliotherapy than heliohygiene, until we have banished what I call the diseases of darkness, and it may be said of us that "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light, and they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined."

ARTHUR SCHOPENHAUER

(1788-1860).

THE philosophy of Schopenhauer, no less than his life, was largely determined by his unfortunate heredity. He was born of ill-matched parents, and his father had inherited the seeds of madness. Much of his life was solitary, unhappy, and marred by the lack of public recognition of his writings.

Before settling down to his studies he had toured extensively with his father and visited England where he found our ways "dull and precise and the religious observances exacting." He studied at Göttingen and Berlin reading philosophy and classics, and in 1813 published his first book, which went unnoticed and unread.

He now became acquainted with oriental thought and with Goethe, the latter influence leading him to write a monograph on sight and colours. But this was a divagation from his true course, the direction of which was shown more clearly by his work on "The World as Will and Idea" which appeared in 1818. He received no appreciation. Germany was staunchly Hegelian at this time, and its neglect of the new philosopher served to deepen his pessimism and to increase his morbid fears. His contempt of the Hegelian philosophy is plainly expressed in his next book "The Will in Nature." "The Main Problems of Ethics" appeared in 1841.

From about this time onwards Schopenhauer began to receive some small recognition, an outline of his system even appearing in an English review in 1853, and new editions of his works were called for. But he did not long enjoy the fame which was coming to him, for he died in 1860.

His philosophy is an intensely individualist one, laying much stress on the primacy of the will.

STYLE

STYLE is the physiognomy of the mind, and a safer index to character than the face. To imitate another man's style is like wearing a mask, which, be it never so fine, is not long in arousing disgust and abhorrence, because it is lifeless; so that even the ugliest living face is better. Hence those who write in Latin and copy the manner of ancient authors, may be said to speak through a mask; the reader, it is true, hears what they say, but he cannot observe their physiognomy too; he cannot see their style. With the Latin works of writers who think for themselves, the case is different, and their style is visible; writers, I mean, who have not condescended to any sort of imitation, such as Petrarch, Bacon, Descartes, Spinoza, and many others. And affectation in style is like making grimaces. Further, the language in which a man writes is the physiognomy of the nation to which he belongs; and here there are many hard and fast differences, beginning from the language of the Greeks, down to that of the Caribbean islanders.

To form a provisional estimate of the value of a writer's productions, it is not directly necessary to know the subject on which he has thought, or what it is that he has said about it; that would imply a perusal of all his works. It will be enough, in the main, to know how he has thought. This, which means the essential temper or general quality of his mind, may be precisely determined by his style. A man's style shows the formal nature of all his thoughts—the formal nature which can never change, be the subject or the character of his thoughts what it may: it is, as it were, the dough out of which all the contents of his mind are kneaded. When Eulenspiegel was asked how long it would take to walk to the next village, he gave the seemingly incongruous answer: Walk. He wanted to find out by the man's pace the distance he would cover in a given time. In the same way, when I have read a few pages of an author, I know fairly well how far he can bring me.

Every mediocre writer tries to mask his own natural style, because in his heart he knows the truth of what I am saying. He is thus forced, at the outset, to give up any attempt at being frank or naïve—a privilege which is thereby reserved for superior minds, conscious of their own worth, and therefore sure of themselves. What I mean is that these everyday writers are absolutely unable to resolve upon writing just as they think; because they have a notion that, were they to do so, their work might possibly look very childish and simple. For all that, it would not be without its value. If they would only go honestly to work, and say, quite simply, the things they have really thought, and just as they have thought them, these writers would be readable and, within their own proper sphere, even instructive.

But instead of that, they try to make the reader believe that their thoughts have gone much further and deeper than is really the case. They say what they have to say in long sentences that wind about in a forced and unnatural way; they coin new words and write prolix periods which go round and round the thought and wrap it up in a sort of disguise. They tremble between the two separate aims of communicating what they want to say and of concealing it. Their object is to dress it up so that it may look learned or deep, in order to give people the impression that there is very much more in it than for the moment meets the eye. They either jot down their thoughts bit by bit, in short, ambiguous, and paradoxical sentences, which apparently mean much more than they say,—of this kind of writing Schelling's treatises on natural philosophy are a splendid instance ; or else they hold forth with a deluge of words and the most intolerable diffusiveness, as though no end of fuss were necessary to make the reader understand the deep meaning of their sentences, whereas it is some quite simple if not actually trivial idea,—examples of which may be found in plenty in the popular works of Fichte, and the philosophical manuals of a hundred other miserable dunces not worth mentioning ; or again, they try to write in some particular style which they have been pleased to take up and think very grand, a style, for example, par excellence profound and scientific, where the reader is tormented to death by the narcotic effect of long-spun periods without a single idea in them,—such as are furnished in a special measure by those most impudent of all mortals, the Hegelians ; or it may be that it is an intellectual style they have striven after, where it seems as though their object were to go crazy altogether ; and so on in many other cases. All these endeavours to put off the nascetur ridiculus mus—to avoid showing the funny little creature that is born after such mighty throes—often make it difficult to know what it is that they really mean. And then, too, they write down words, nay, even whole sentences, without attaching any meaning to them themselves, but in the hope that some one else will get sense out of them.

And what is at the bottom of all this ? Nothing but the untiring effort to sell words for thoughts ; a mode of merchandise that is always trying to make fresh openings for itself, and by means of odd expressions, turns of phrase, and combinations of every sort, whether new or used in a new sense, to produce the appearance of intellect in order to make up for the very painfully felt lack of it.

It is amusing to see how writers with this object in view will attempt first one mannerism and then another, as though they were putting on the mask of intellect ! This mask may possibly deceive the inexperienced for a while, until it is seen to be a dead thing, with no life in it at all : it is then laughed at and exchanged for another. Such an author will at one moment write in a dithyrambic vein, as though he were tipsy ; at another, nay, on the very next page, he will be pompous, severe, profoundly learned and prolix, stumbling on in the most cumbrous way and chopping up everything very small ; like the late Christian Wolf, only in a modern dress. Longest of all lasts the mask of unintelligibility; but this is only in Germany, whither it was introduced by Fichte, perfected by Schelling, and carried to its highest pitch in Hegel—always with the best results.

And yet nothing is easier than to write so that no one can understand; just as, contrarily, nothing is more difficult than to express deep things in such a way that every one must necessarily grasp them. All the arts and tricks I have been mentioning are rendered superfluous if the author really has any brains; for that allows him to show himself as he is, and confirms to all time Horace's maxim that good sense is the source and origin of good style:—

Scribendi recte sapre est et principium et fons.

But those authors I have named are like certain workers in metal, who try a hundred different compounds to take the place of gold—the only metal which can never have any substitute. Rather than do that, there is nothing against which a writer should be more upon his guard than the manifest endeavour to exhibit more intellect than he really has; because this makes the reader suspect that he possesses very little; since it is always the case that if a man affects anything, whatever it may be, it is just there that he is deficient.

That is why it is praise to an author to say that he is naïve; it means that he need not shrink from showing himself as he is. Generally speaking, to be naïve is to be attractive; while lack of naturalness is everywhere repulsive. As a matter of fact we find that every really great writer tries to express his thoughts as purely, clearly, definitely and shortly as possible. Simplicity has always been held to be a mark of truth; it is also a mark of genius. Style receives its beauty from the thought it expresses; but with sham-thinkers the thoughts are supposed to be fine because of the style. Style is nothing but the mere silhouette of thought; and an obscure or bad style means a dull or confused brain.

The first rule, then, for a good style is that the author should have something to say; nay, this is in itself almost all that is necessary. Ah, how much it means! The neglect of this rule is a fundamental trait in the philosophical writing, and, in fact, in all the reflective literature, of my country, more especially since Fichte. These writers all let it be seen that they want to appear as though they had something to say; whereas they have nothing to say. Writing of this kind was brought in by the pseudo-philosophers at the Universities, and now it is current everywhere, even among the first literary notabilities of the age. It is the mother of that strained and vague style, where there seem to be two or even more meanings in the sentence; also of that prolix and cumbrous manner of expression, called *le stile empesé*; again of that mere waste of words which consists in pouring them out like a flood; finally, of that trick of concealing the direst poverty of thought under a farrago of never-ending chatter, which clacks away like a windmill and quite stupefies one—stuff which a man may read for hours together without getting hold of a single clearly expressed and definite ideal. However, people are easy-going, and they have formed the habit of reading page upon page of all sorts of such verbiage, without having any particular idea of what the author really means. They fancy it is all as it should be, and fail to discover that he is writing simply for writing's sake.

On the other hand, a good author, fertile in ideas, soon wins his reader's confidence that, when he writes, he has really and truly something to say; and this gives the intelligent reader patience to follow him with attention. Such an author, just because he really has something to say, will never fail to express himself in the simplest and most straightforward manner; because his object is to awake the very same thought in the reader that he has in himself, and no other. So he will be able to affirm with Boileau that his thoughts are everywhere open to the light of day, and that his verse always says something, whether it says it well or ill:—

> Ma pensée au grand jour partout s'offre et s'expose,
> Et mon vers, bien ou mal, dit toujours quelque chose:

while of the writers previously described it may be asserted, in the words of the same poet, that they talk much and never say anything at all—qui parlant beaucoup ne disent jamais rien.

Another characteristic of such writers is that they always avoid a positive assertion wherever they can possibly do so, in order to leave a loophole for escape in case of need. Hence they never fail to choose the more abstract way of expressing themselves; whereas intelligent people use the more concrete; because the latter brings things more within the range of actual demonstration, which is the source of all evidence.

There are many examples proving this preference for abstract expression; and a particularly ridiculous one is afforded by the use of the verb to condition in the sense of to cause or to produce. People say to condition something instead of to cause it, because being abstract and indefinite it says less; it affirms that A cannot happen without B, instead of that A is caused by B. A back door is always left open; and this suits people whose secret knowledge of their own incapacity inspires them with a perpetual terror of all positive assertion; while with other people it is merely the effect of that tendency by which everything that is stupid in literature or bad in life is immediately imitated—a fact proved in either case by the rapid way in which it spreads. The Englishman uses his own judgment in what he writes as well as in what he does; but there is no nation of which this eulogy is less true than of the Germans. The consequence of this state of things is that the word cause has of late almost disappeared from the language of literature, and people talk only of condition. The fact is worth mentioning because it is so characteristically ridiculous.

The very fact that these commonplace authors are never more than half-conscious when they write, would be enough to account for their dullness of mind and the tedious things they produce. I say they are only half-conscious, because they really do not themselves understand the meaning of the words they use: they take words ready-made and commit them to memory. Hence when they write, it is not so much words as whole phrases that they put together—phrases banales. This is the explanation of that palpable lack of clearly-expressed thought in what they say. The fact is that they do not possess the die to give this stamp to their writing; clear thought of their own is just what they have not got. And what do we find in its place?—a vague enigmatical intermixture of words, current phrases, hackneyed terms, and fashionable expressions. The result is that the foggy stuff they write is like a page printed with very old type.

On the other hand, an intelligent author really speaks to us when he writes, and that is why he is able to rouse our interest and commune with us. It is the intelligent author alone who puts individual words together with a full consciousness of their meaning, and chooses them with deliberate design. Consequently, his discourse stands to that of the writer described above, much as a picture that has been really painted to one that has been produced by the use of a stencil. In the one case, every word, every touch of the brush, has a special purpose; in the other, all is done mechanically. The same distinction may be observed in music. For just as Lichtenberg says that Garrick's soul seemed to be in every muscle in his body, so it is the omnipresence of intellect that always and everywhere characterises the work of genius.

I have alluded to the tediousness which marks the works of these writers; and in this connection it is to be observed, generally, that tediousness is of two kinds: objective and subjective. A work is objectively tedious when it contains the defect in question; that is to say, when its author has no perfectly clear thought or knowledge to communicate. For if a man has any clear thought or knowledge in him, his aim will be to communicate it, and he will direct his energies to this end; so that the idea he furnishes are everywhere clearly expressed. The result is that he is neither diffuse, nor unmeaning, nor confused, and consequently not tedious. In such a case, even though the author is at bottom in error, the error is at any rate clearly worked out and well thought over, so that it is at least formally correct; and thus some value always attaches to the work. But for the same reason a work that is objectively tedious is at all times devoid of any value whatever.

The other kind of tediousness is only relative: a reader may find a work dull because he has no interest in the question treated of in it, and this means that his intellect is restricted. The best work may, therefore, be tedious subjectively, tedious, I mean, to this or that particular person; just as, contrarily, the worst work may be subjectively engrossing to this or that particular person who has an interest in the question treated of, or in the writer of the book.

It would generally serve writers in good stead if they would see that, whilst a man should, if possible, think like a great genius, he should talk the same language as everyone else. Authors should use common words to say uncommon things. But they do just the opposite. We find them trying to wrap up trivial ideas in grand words, and to clothe their very ordinary thoughts in the most extraordinary phrases, the most far-fetched, unnatural, and out-of-the-way expressions. Their sentences perpetually stalk about on stilts. They take so much pleasure in bombast, and write in such a high-flown, bloated, affected, hyperbolical and acrobatic style that their prototype is Ancient Pistol, whom his friend Falstaff once impatiently told to say what he had to say like a man of this world.

There is no expression in any other language exactly answering to the French *stile empesé*; but the thing itself exists all the more often. When associated with affectations, it is in literature what assumption of dignity, grand airs and primness are in society; and equally intolerable. Dullness of mind is fond of donning this dress; just as in ordinary life it is stupid people who like being demure and formal.

An author who writes in the prim style resembles a man who dresses himself up in order to avoid being confounded or put on the same level with the mob—a risk never run by the gentleman, even in his worst clothes. The plebeian may be known by a certain showiness of attire and a wish to have everything spick and span; and, in the same way, the commonplace person is betrayed by his style.

Nevertheless, an author follows a false aim if he tries to write exactly as he speaks. There is no style of writing but should have a certain trace of kinship with the epigraphic or monumental style, which is, indeed, the ancestor of all styles. For an author to write as he speaks is just as reprehensible as the opposite fault, to speak as he writes; for this gives a pedantic effect to what he says, and at the same time makes him hardly intelligible.

An obscure and vague manner of expression is always and everywhere a very bad sign. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it comes from vagueness of thought; and this again almost always means that there is something radically wrong and incongruous about the thought itself—in a word, that it is incorrect. When a right thought springs up in the mind, it strives after expression and is not long in reaching it; for clear thought easily finds words to fit it. If a man is capable of thinking anything at all, he is also always able to express it in clear, intelligible, and unambiguous terms. Those writers who construct difficult, obscure, involved, and equivocal sentences, most certainly do not know aright what it is that they want to say: they have only a dull consciousness of it, which is still in the stage of struggle to shape itself as thought. Often, indeed, their desire is to conceal from themselves and others that they really have nothing at all to say. They wish to appear to know what they do not know, to think what they do not think, to say what they do not say. If a man has some real communication to make, which will he choose—an indistinct or a clear way of expressing himself? Even Quintilian remarks that things which are said by a highly educated man are often easier to understand and much clearer; and that the less educated a man is, the more obscurely he will write.

An author should avoid enigmatical phrases; he should know whether he wants to say a thing or does not want to say it. It is this indecision of style that makes so many writers insipid. The only case that offers an exception to this rule arises when it is necessary to make a remark that is in some way improper.

As exaggeration generally produces an effect the opposite of that aimed at; so words, it is true, serve to make thought intelligible—but only up to a certain point. If words are heaped up beyond it, the thought becomes more and more obscure again. To find where the point lies is the problem of style, and the business of the critical faculty; for a word too much always defeats its purpose. This is what Voltaire means when he says that the adjective is the enemy of the substantive. But, as we have seen, many people try to conceal their poverty of thought under a flood of verbiage.

Accordingly, let all redundancy be avoided, all stringing together of remarks which have no meaning and are not worth perusal. A writer must make a sparing use of the reader's time, patience and attention; so as to lead him to believe that his author writes what is worth careful study, and will reward the time spent upon it. It is always better to omit something good than to add that which is not worth saying at all. This is the right application of Hesiod's maxim,—the half is more than the whole. Le secret pour être ennuyeux, c'est de tout dire. Therefore, if possible, the quintessence only! mere leading thoughts! nothing that the reader would think for himself. To use many words to communicate few thoughts is everywhere the unmistakable sign of mediocrity. To gather much thought into few words stamps the man of genius.

SIR THOMAS NOON TALFOURD

(1795-1854).

SIR THOMAS NOON TALFOURD, author of "Ion," was a lawyer of great ability, as well as a poet and essayist. In 1841 when Moxon, the London bookseller, was indicted for publishing Shelley's works, Talfourd defended him in a speech which is one of the most remarkable in its way ever delivered in a law court. Its searching analysis of the motives which inspired Milton in writing "Paradise Lost" has had a marked influence on the minds of the critics of that great poem. Moxon was charged with being "an evil-disposed and wicked person, wickedly and profanely devising and intending to bring the Holy Scriptures and religion into disbelief and contempt" by publishing such passages from Shelley as: "They have three words—well tyrants know their use; well pay for them the loan with usury, torn from a bleeding world—God, Hell, and Heaven!" The prosecution against Moxon seems to have been inspired by trade jealousies, and it was one of the last of its kind that disgraced the English courts. Talfourd was born at Doxey, near Stafford, January 26th, 1795. He was educated for the bar, and in 1849 he was made Judge of the Court of Common Pleas where he served with credit. He also served in Parliament where he made a number of speeches in support of international copyright. His dramatic works are numerous and while as a rule they are not well known, his tragedy of "Ion" has become a classic. Among his prose works are a "Life of Charles Lamb" and a "History of Greek Literature." He died March 13th, 1854.

THE QUEEN AGAINST MOXON—SHELLEY AS A BLASPHEMER

(From the Speech in the Court of Queen's Bench, June 23rd, 1841).

THE passages selected as specimens of the indicted libel are found in a complete edition of the works of Percy Bysshe Shelley,—a work comprising more than twenty thousand lines of verse,—and occupy something less than the three-hundredth part of the volume which contains them. The book presents the entire intellectual history—

true and faithful, because traced in the series of those works which were its events—of one of the most extraordinary persons ever gifted and doomed to illustrate the nobleness, the grandeur, the imperfections, and the progress of human genius—whom it pleased God to take from this world while the process harmonizing his stupendous powers was yet incomplete, but not before it had indicated its beneficent workings. It is edited by the widow, a lady endowed with great and original talent, who, as she states in her preface, hastens "to fulfil an important duty, that of giving the productions of a sublime genius to the world, with all the correctness possible, and of, at the same time, detailing the history of these productions as they sprang, warm and living, from his heart and brain." And, accordingly, the poems are all connected together by statements as to the circumstances under which they were written, and the feelings which inspired them. The "alterations (says Mrs. Shelley) his opinions underwent ought to be recorded, for they form his history."

The first of these works is a poem, written at the age of eighteen, entitled "Queen Mab"; a composition marked with nothing to attract the casual reader—irregular in versification, wild, disjointed, visionary; often difficult to be understood even by a painful student of poetry, and sometimes wholly unintelligible even to him; but containing as much to wonder at, to ponder on, to weep over, as any half-formed work of genius which ever emanated from the vigour and the rashness of youth. This poem, which I shall bring before you presently, is followed by the marvellous series of works of which "Alastor," "The Revolt of Islam," the "Prometheus Unbound," and "The Cenci," form the principal, exhibiting a continuous triumph of mellowing and consecrating influences, down to the moment when sudden death shrouded the poet's career from the observation of mortals. Now the question is, whether it is blasphemy to present to the world—say rather to the calm, the laborious, the patient searcher after wisdom and beauty, who alone will peruse this volume—the awful mistakes, the mighty struggles, the strange depressions, and the imperfect victories of such a spirit, because the picture has some passages of frightful gloom. I am far from contending that everything which genius has in rashness or in wantonness produced, becomes, when once committed to the press, the inalienable property of mankind. Such a principle, indeed, seems to be involved in an argument which was recently sanctioned by the authority of a Cabinet Minister more distinguished even as a profound thinker and an eloquent and accomplished critic than by political station. When I last urged the claim of the descendants of men of genius to be the guardians of their fame, as well as the recipients of its attendant rewards, I was met with denial on the plea that, from some fastidiousness of taste, or some over-niceness of moral apprehension, the hereditary representative of a great writer may cover his works with artificial oblivion. I have asked whether, if a poet has written "some line which, dying, he may wish to blot," he shall not be allowed by the insatiate public to blot it dying; and I have asked in vain! Fielding and Richardson have been quoted as writers whose works, multiplying as they will through all time the sources of innocent enjoyment, might have been suppressed by some too dainty moralist. Now, admitting that the tendency of Fielding's works, taken as a whole, is as invigorating as it is delightful, I fear there are chapters which, if taken from their connection—apart from the healthful atmosphere in which their impurities evaporate and die—and printed at some penny cost for dissemination among the young, would justly incur the censure of that law which has too long withheld its visitations from those who have sought a detestable profit by spreading cheap corruption through the land. It may be true, as Doctor Johnson ruled, that Richardson "had taught the passions to move at the command of virtue"; and, as was recently asserted, that Mrs. Hannah More "first learned from his writings those principles of piety by which her life was guided"; but (to leave out of consideration the adventures of Pamela, which must sometimes have put Mrs. Hannah More to the blush) I fear that selections might be made, even from the greatest of all prose romances, "Clarissa Harlowe," which the Society for the Suppression of Vice would scarcely endure. Do I wish them therefore suppressed? No! Because in these massive volumes the antidote is found with the bane; because the effect of Lovelace's daring pleas for vice, and of pictures yet more vicious, is neutralized by the scenes of passion and suffering which surround them; because the unsullied image of heroic purity and beautiful endurance rises fairer from amidst the encircling pollutions, and conquers every feeling but those of admiration and pity. Yet if detached scenes were, like these passages of Shelley, selected for the prosecution, how could they be defended—but, like them, by reference to the spirit, and intent, and tendency of the entire work from which they were torn? And yet the defence would be less conclusive than that which I now offer; as descriptions which appeal to passion are far less capable of correction by accompanying moralities, than the cold speculations of a wild infidelity by the considerations which the history of their author's mind supplies. In the wise and just dispensations of Providence great powers are often found associated with weakness or with sorrow; but when these are not blended with the intellectual greatness they countervail, but merely affect the personal fortunes of their possessors,—as when a sanguine temperament leads into vicious excesses,—there is no more propriety in unveiling the truth, because it is truth, than in exhibiting the details of some physical disease.

But when the greatness of the poet's intellect contains within itself the elements of tumult and disorder—when the appreciation of the genius, in all its divine relations and all its human lapses, depends on a view of the entire picture, must it be withheld? It is not a sinful Elysium, full of lascivious blandishments, but a heavy chaos of mighty elements, that the publisher of the early productions of Shelley unveils. In such a case, the more awful the alienation, the more pregnant with good will be the lesson. Shall this life, fevered with beauty, restless with inspiration, be hidden; or, wanting its first blind but gigantic efforts, be falsely, because partially, revealed? If to trace back the stream of genius, from its greatest and most lucid earthly breadth to its remotest fountain, is one of the most interesting and instructive objects of philosophic research, shall we—when we have followed that of Shelley through its majestic windings, beneath the solemn glooms of "The Cenci," through the glory-tinged expanses of "The Revolt of Islam," amidst the dream-like haziness of the "Prometheus"—be forbidden to ascend with painful steps its narrowing course to its furthest spring, because black rocks may encircle the spot whence it rushes into day, and demon shapes—frightful but powerless for harm—may gleam and frown on us beside it?

Having thus endeavoured to present to you the foundation of my defence,—that the volume in which these passages appear is in its substance historical, and that, so far from being adopted by the compiler, they are presented as necessary to historical truth,—I will consider the passages themselves, and the poem in which they appear, with a view to inquire whether they are of a nature capable of being fairly regarded as innoxious in their connection with Shelley's life. Admitting, as I do, that if published with an aim to commend them to the reader as the breathings or suggestions of truth, nay, that if recklessly published in such a manner as to present them to the reader for approval, they deserve all the indignation which can be lavished on them, I cannot think, even then, they would have power to injure. They appeal to no passion—they pervert no affection—they find nothing in human nature, frail as it always is, guilty as it sometimes becomes—to work on. Contemplated apart from the intellectual history of the extraordinary being who produced them, and from which they can never be severed by any reader of this book, they would excite no feelings but those of wonder at their audacity and pity for their weakness. Not only are they incapable of awakening any chords of evil in the soul, but they are ineffectual even to present to it an intelligible heresy. "We understand a fury in the words—but not the words." What do they import? Is it atheism?—or is it mad defiance of a God by one who believes and hates, yet does not tremble? To the first passage, commencing, "They have three words"—"God, Hell, and Heaven!"—the prosecutor does not venture to affix any meaning at all, but tears them from their context, and alleges that they are part of a libel on the Holy Scriptures, though there is no reference in them to the Bible, or to any Scripture doctrine; nor does the indictment supply any definite meaning or reference to explain or to answer. To the second paragraph—

Is there a God?—aye, an Almighty God,
And vengeful as almighty! Once his voice
Was heard on earth: earth shudder'd at the sound;
The fiery-visaged firmament express'd
Abhorrence, and the grave of nature yawn'd
To swallow all the dauntless and the good
That dared to hurl defiance at his throne,
Girt as it was with power—

the indictment does present a most extended innuendo: "Thereby meaning and referring to the Scripture history of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram; and meaning that the said Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, were dauntless and good, and were so dauntless and good for daring to hurl defiance at the throne of Almighty God." This is, indeed, a flight of the poetry of pleading—a construction which you must find as the undoubted sense of the passage—before you can sustain this part of the accusation. But again, I ask, is there any determinate meaning in these "wild and whirling words"? Are they more than atoms of chaotic thought not yet subsided into harmony—over which the Spirit of Love has not yet brooded, so as to make them pregnant with life, and beauty, and joy? But suppose, for a moment, they nakedly assert atheism—never was there an error which, thus incidentally exhibited, had less power to charm. How far it is possible that such a miserable dogma, dexterously insinuated into a perplexed understanding or a corrupted heart, may find reception, I will not venture to speculate, but I venture to affirm that thus nakedly presented, as the dream of a wild fancy, it can at most only glare for a moment, a bloodless phantom, and pass into kindred nothing! Or do the words rather import a belief in a God—the ruling Power of the universe—yet an insane hatred of his attributes? Is it possible to contemplate the creature of a day standing up amidst countless ages—like a shadowy film among the confused grandeur of the universe—thus propelled, with any other feeling than those of wonder and pity? Or do these words merely import that the name and attributes of the Supreme Being have been abused and perverted by "the oppressors of mankind," for their own purposes, to the misery of the oppressed? Or do they vibrate and oscillate between all these meanings, so as to leave the mind in a state of perplexity, balancing and destroying each other? In either case, they are powerless for evil. Unlike that seductive infidelity which flatters the pride of the understanding by glittering sophistry—or that still more dangerous infidelity which gratifies its love of power by bitter sarcasm—or that most dangerous of all which perverts the sensibilities and corrupts the affections—it resembles that evil of which Milton speaks, when, with a boldness which the fastidious might deem profane, he exclaims :—

Evil into the mind of God or man
May come and go, so unapproved, and leave
No spot or blame behind.

If, regarded in themselves, these passages were endowed with any power of mischief, the manner in which they are introduced in the poem—or rather phantasm of a poem—of "Queen Mab" must surely neutralize them. It has no human interest—no local affinities—no machinery familiar even to thought. It opens in a lyrical measure, wanting even the accomplishment of rhyme, with an apostrophe uttered, no one knows by whom or where, on a sleeping nymph—whether human or divine—the creature of what mythology—on earth or in some other sphere—is unexplained; all we know is, that the lady or spirit is called "Ianthe." Thus begins :—

  How wonderful is Death—
  Death and his brother Sleep!
One, pale as yonder waning moon,
  With lips of lurid blue;
  The other, rosy as the morn
When, throned in Ocean's wave,
  It blushes o'er the world;
Yet both so passing wonderful!

  Hath then the gloomy power
Whose reign is in the tainted sepulchres
  Seized on her sinless soul?
  Must then that peerless form,
Which love and admiration cannot view
Without a beating heart—those azure veins
Which steal like streams along a field of snow—
That lovely outline which is fair
  As breathing marble, perish?

Must putrefaction's breath
Leave nothing of this heavenly sight
But loathsomeness and ruin!
Spare nothing but a gloomy theme,
On which the lightest heart might moralize?
Or is it only a sweet slumber
Stealing o'er sensation,
Which the breath of roseate morning
Chaseth into darkness?
Will Ianthe wake again,
And give that faithful bosom joy,
Whose sleepless spirit waits to catch
Light, life, and rapture from her smile?

The answer to the last question is, that Ianthe will awake,—which is expressed in terms appropriately elaborate and mystical. But while she is thus sleeping, the Fairy Mab descends—invites the soul of the nymph to quit her form—and conveys it through systems, suns, and worlds to the temple of "The Spirit of Nature," where the Fairy and the Soul enter "The Hall of Spells," and a kind of phantasmagoria passes before them, in which are dimly seen representations of the miseries, oppressions, and hopes of mankind. Few, indeed, are the readers who will ever enter the dreary portals of that fane, or gaze on the wild intermixture of half-formed visions and theories which gleam through the hazy prospects seen from its battlements. The discourse of the Fairy —to the few who have followed that dizzy career—is an extraordinary mixture of wild rhapsody on the miseries attendant on humanity, and the supposed errors of its faith, and of fancies "of the moonshine's watery beams." After the "obstinate questioning" respecting the existence of a God, this Fairy—who is supposed to deny all supernatural existence—calls forth a shape of one whose imaginary being is entirely derived from Christian tradition—Ahasuerus, the Jew, who is said to have scoffed at our Saviour as he bore his cross to Calvary, and to have been doomed by him to wander on the earth until his second coming. Of this phantom the question is asked, "Is there a God?" and to him are the words ascribed in answer which form the second and third portions of the prosecutor's charge. Can anything be conceived more inconsistent —more completely self-refuted—and therefore more harmless? The whole machinery, indeed, answers to the description of the Fairy:—

The matter of which dreams are made,
Not more endow'd with actual life
Than this phantasmal portraiture
Of wandering human thought.

All, indeed, is fantastical—nothing clear except that atheism, and the materialism on which alone atheism can rest, are refuted in every page. If the being of God is in terms denied—which I deny—it is confessed in substance; and what injury can an author do, who one moment deprecates the "deifying the Spirit of the universe," and the next himself deifies "the spirit of nature,"—speaks of her "eternal breath," and fashions for her "a fitting temple"? Nay, in this strange poem, the spiritual immunities of the soul and its immortal destinies are distinctly asserted amidst all its visionary splendours. The spirit of Ianthe is supposed to arise from the slumbering body and to stand beside it, while the poet thus represents each:—

'Twas a sight
Of wonder to behold the body and soul.
The self-same lineaments, the same
Marks of identity were there,
Yet, Oh how different! One aspires to heaven.
Pants for its sempiternal heritage,
And ever changing, ever rising, still
Wantons in endless being;
The other for a time the unwilling sport
Of circumstance and passion, struggles on,
Fleets through its sad duration rapidly;
Then, like a useless and worn-out machine,
Rots, perishes, and passes.

Now, when it is found that this poem, thus containing the doctrine of immortality, is presented with the distinct statement that Shelley himself in maturer life departed from its offensive dogmas—when it is accompanied by his own letter in which he expresses his wish for its suppression—when, therefore, it is not given even as containing his deliberate assertions, but only as a feature in the development of his intellectual character—surely all sting is taken out of the rash and uncertain passages which have been selected as indicating blasphemy! But is it not antidote enough to the poison of a pretended atheism, that the poet who is supposed to-day to deny Deity, finds Deity in all things!

I cannot proceed with this defence without feeling that I move tremulously among sacred things which should be approached only in serene contemplation; that I am compelled to solicit your attention to considerations more fit to be weighed in the stillness of thought than amidst the excitements of a public trial; and that I am able only to suggest reasonings which, if woven into a chain, no strength of mine could utter, nor your kindest patience follow. But the fault is not mine.

I cannot otherwise even hint the truth—the living truth—of this case to your minds as it fills and struggles in my own, or protect my client and friend from a prosecution without parallel in our legal history. If the prosecutor, in return for his own conviction of publishing some cheap and popular work of alleged blasphemy—prepared, calculated, and intended by the author to shake the religious principles of the uneducated and the young—has attempted to assail the efforts of genius and to bring into question the relations, the uses, the tendencies of the divinest faculties, I must not shrink from entreating you to consider those bearings of the question which are essential to its justice. And if you feel unable fully to examine them within the limits of a trial, and in the atmosphere of a court of justice, yet if you feel with me that they are necessary to a just decision, you cannot doubt what your duty to the defendant and to justice is, on a criminal charge! Pardon me, therefore, if I now seek to show you, by a great example, how unjustly you would deal with so vast and so divine a thing as the imagination of a poet, if you were to take his isolated passages which may seem to deal too boldly with sacred things and—without regard to the process of the faculty by which they are educed—to brand them as the effusions of a blasphemous mind, or as tending to evil issues. That example will also show you how a poet,—devoting the noblest powers to the loftiest themes,—when he ventures to grapple with the spiritual existences revealed by the Christian faith, in the very purpose of vindicating "the ways of God to men," may seem to incur a charge like the present, and with as much justice, and may be absolved from it only by nice regard to the tendencies of the divine faculty he exerts. I speak not of a "marvellous boy," as Shelley was at eighteen, but of Milton, in the maturity of his powers, when he brought all the "spoils of time," and the clustered beauty hoarded through a long life, to the deliberate construction of a work which should never die. His case is the converse of that of Shelley—he begins from an opposite point; he falls into an opposite error; but he expatiates in language and imagery out of which Mr. Hetherington might shape a charge as specious as that which he has given you to decide. Shelley fancies himself irreligious, and everywhere falters or trembles into piety; Milton, believing himself engaged in a most pious work, is led by the tendencies of his imagination to individualize—to adorn—to enthrone—the Enemy of God; and to invest his struggles against Omnipotence with all the nobleness of a patriotic resistance to tyranny, and his suffering from Almighty justice with the graces of fortitude. Let it not be urged that the language which his Satan utters is merely to be regarded with reference to dramatic proprieties—it is attributed to the being in whom the interest of his poem centres; and on whom admiration and sympathy attend as on a sufferer in the eternal struggle of right against power. Omnipotence becomes tyranny in the poet's vision, and resistance to its requisitions appears the more generous even because hopelessly vain. Before I advert to that language, and ask you to compare it with the expressions selected for prosecution, let me call to your recollection the grandeurs—nay, the luxuries of thought with which the "Lost Archangel" is surrounded;—the magic by which even out of the materials of torture dusky magnificence is created in his place of exile, beyond "the wealth of Ormus and of Ind"; and the faded glory and unconquerable spirit attributed to those rebel legions who still sustain him in opposition to the Most High. Observe the hosts, still angelic, as they march at his bidding!—

Anon they move
In perfect phalanx to the Dorian mood
Of flutes and soft recorders; such as raised
To height of noblest temper heroes old
Arming to battle; and, instead of rage,
Deliberate valour breathed, firm and unmoved
With dread of death, to flight or foul retreat;
Nor wanting power to mitigate and 'suage
With solemn touches troubled thoughts, and chase
Anguish, and doubt, and fear, and sorrow, and pain,
From mortal or immortal minds.

Whether we listen to those who—

More mild,
Retreated in a silent valley, sing,
With notes angelical, to many a harp
Their own heroic deeds and hapless fall
By doom of battle—

or those with whom the moral philosopher sympathizes yet more—who

Sat on a hill retired
In thoughts more elevate, and reason'd high
Of providence, foreknowledge, will and fate,
Fix'd fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute—

or expatiate over the muster roll of their chiefs, in which all the splendours of the East, the gigantic mysteries of Egypt, and the chastest forms of Grecian beauty gleam on us—all reflect back the greatness of him who surveys them with "tears such as angels weep." His very armour and accoutrements glisten on us with a thousand beauties!

His ponderous shield,
Ethereal temper, massy, large, and round,
Behind him cast; the broad circumference
Hung on his shoulders like the moon——

And not only like the moon as seen to the upturned gaze of ordinary men, but as associated with Italian art, and discerned from places whose names are music—

——Like the moon whose orb
Through optic glass the Tuscan artist views
At evening, from the top of Fesolè,
Or in Valdarno, to descry new lands,
Rivers, or mountains in her spotty globe.

"His spear" is not only likened to a pine hewn in the depth of mountain forests, but, as if the sublimest references to nature were insufficient to accumulate glories for the bearer, is consecrated by allusions to the thousand storms and thousand thunders which the mast of an imperial ship withstands.

His spear (to equal which the tallest pine
Hewn on Norwegian hills, to be the mast
Of some great admiral, were but a wand)
He walk'd with, to support uneasy steps
Over the burning marle; not like those steps
On heaven's azure.

Now, having seen how the great Christian poet has lavished all the glories of his art on the attendant hosts and personal investiture of the brave opponent of Almighty Power, let us attend to the language in which he addresses his comrade in enterprise and suffering:—

Into what pit thou seest,
From what height fallen—so much the stronger proved
He with his thunder: and till then who knew
The force of those dire arms? Yet not for those,
Nor what the potent Victor in his rage
Can else inflict, do I repent or change,
Though changed in outward lustre, that fix'd mind,
And high disdain, from sense of injured merit,
That with the Mightiest raised me to contend,
And to the fierce contention brought along
Innumerable force of spirits arm'd,
That durst dislike his reign, and, me preferring,
His utmost power with adverse power opposed
In dubious battle on the plains of heaven,
And shook his throne!

Such is the force of the poet's enthusiastic sympathy with the speaker, that the reader almost thinks Omnipotence doubtful; or, if that is impossible, admires the more the courage that can resist it! The chief proceeds:—

What though the field be lost?
All is not lost; the unconquerable will,
And study of revenge, immortal hate,
And courage never to submit or yield,
And what is else not to be overcome;
That glory never shall his wrath or might
Extort from me. To bow and sue for grace
With suppliant knee, and deify his power,
Who from the terror of this arm so late
Doubted his empire; that were low indeed,
That were an ignominy, and shame beneath
This downfall!

This mighty representation of generous resistance, of mind superior to fortune, of resolution nobler than the conquest, concludes by proclaiming "eternal war" against him—

Who now triumphs, and in the excess of joy,
Sole reigning, holds the tyranny of heaven.

Surely, but for the exquisite grace of the language compared with the baldness of Shelley's, I might parallel from this speech all that the indictment charges about "an Almighty Fiend" and "Tyrannous Omnipotence." Listen again to the more composed determination and sedate self-reliance of the archangelic sufferer!

"Is this the region? this the soil, the clime?"
Said then the lost archangel, "this the seat
That we must change for heaven? this mournful gloom
For that celestial light? Be it so, since he,
Who now is Sovran, can dispose and bid
What shall be right; farthest from him is best,
Whom reason hath equal'd, force hath made supreme
Above his equals. Farewell, happy fields
Where joy forever dwells! Hail, horrors, hail!
Infernal world, and thou, profoundest hell,
Receive thy new possessor; one who brings
A mind not to be changed by place or time.
The mind is its own place, and in itself
Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven.

What matter where, if I be still the same?
And what I should be, all but less than he
Whom thunder hath made greater. Here at least
We shall be free; the Almighty hath not built
Here for his envy, will not drive us hence;
Here we may reign secure, and in my choice
To reign is worth ambition, though in hell;
Better to reign in hell than serve in heaven!"

I might multiply passages of the same kind; but I dare only allude to the proposition made of assaulting the throne of God "with Tartarean sulphur and strange fire, his own invented torments"; and to the address of Satan to the newly-created sun, in which he actually curses the love of God. Suppose that last passage introduced into this indictment—suppose that instead of the unintelligible lines beginning: "They have three words, God, Hell, and Heaven," we had these—"Be then his love accursed," with the innuendo, "Thereby meaning the love of Almighty God," how would you deal with the charge? How! but by looking at the object of the great poem of which those words are part; by observing how the poet, incapable of resting in a mere abstraction, had been led insensibly to clothe it from the armoury of virtue and grandeur; by showing that although the names of the Almighty and Satan were retained, in truth, other ideas had usurped those names, as the theme itself had eluded even Milton's grasp? I will not ask you whether you agree with me in the defence which might be made for Milton; but I will ask, do you not feel with me that these are matters for another tribunal? Do you not feel with me that except that the boldness of Milton's thoughts comes softened to the ears by the exquisite beauty of Milton's language, I may find parallels in the passages I have quoted from the "Paradise Lost" for those selected for prosecution from "Queen Mab"? Do you not feel with me that, as without a knowledge of the "Paradise Lost," you could not absolve the publisher of Milton from the prosecution of "some mute inglorious" Hetherington; so neither can you, dare you, convict Mr. Moxon of a libel on God and religion, in publishing the works of Shelley, without having read and studied them all? If rashly you assail the mighty masters of thought and fantasy, you will, indeed, assail them in vain, for the purpose of suppression, though not for the purpose of torture: all you can do is to make them suffer, as, being human, they are liable to corporal suffering; but, like the wounded spirits of Milton, "they will soon close," "confounded, though immortal!"

If, however, these are considerations affecting the exercise of human genius on themes beyond its grasp, which we cannot discuss in this place, however essential to the decision of the charge, there is one plain position which I will venture to assert: that the poetry which pretends to a denial of God or of an immortal life must contain its own refutation in itself, and sustain what it would deny! A poet, though never one of the highest order, may "link vice to a radiant angel"; he may diffuse luxurious indifference to virtue and to truth; but he cannot inculcate atheism. Let him strive to do it, and like Balaam, who came to curse, like him he must end in blessing! His art convicts him; for it is "Eternity revealing itself in Time!" His fancies may be wayward, his theories absurd, but they will prove, no less in their failure than in their success, the divinity of their origin and the inadequacy of this world to give scope to his impulses. They are the beatings of the soul against the bars of its clay tenement, which, though they may ruffle and sadden it, prove that it is winged for a diviner sphere! Young has said, "An undevout astronomer is mad"; how much more truly might he have said, an atheist poet is a contradiction in terms! Let the poet take what range of associations he will—let him adopt what notions he may—he cannot dissolve his alliance with the Eternal. Let him strive to shut out the vistas of the future by encircling the present with images of exquisite beauty; his own forms of ideal grace will disappoint him with eternal looks, and vindicate the immortality they were fashioned to veil! Let him rear temples, and consecrate them to fabled divinities, they will indicate in their enduring beauty "temples not made with hands, eternal in the heavens!" If he celebrates the delights of social intercourse, the festal reference to their fragility includes the sense of that which must endure; for the very sadness which tempers them speaks the longing after that "which prompts the eternal sigh." If he desire to bid the hearts of thousands beat as one man at the touch of tragic passion, he must present "the future in the instant"—show in the death-grapple of contending emotions a strength which death cannot destroy—vindicate the immortality of affection at the moment when the warm passages of life are closed against it; and anticipate in the virtue which dares to die, the power by which "mortality shall be swallowed up of life!" The world is too narrow for us. Time is too short for man,—and the poet only feels the sphere more inadequate, and pants for the "all-hail hereafter," with more urgent sense of weakness than his fellows:—

> Too—too contracted are these walls of flesh,
> This vital heat too cold; these visual orbs,
> Though inconceivably endow'd, too dim
> For any passion of the soul which leads

To ecstacy, and all the frigid bonds
Of time and change disdaining, takes the range
Along the line of limitless desires!

If this prosecution can succeed, on what principle can the publishers of the great works of ancient times, replete with the images of idolatrous faith, and with immoralities only to be endured as historical, escape a similar doom? These are the works which engage and reward the first labours of our English youth,—which, in spite of the objections raised to them, practically teach lessons of beauty and wisdom—the sense of antiquity—the admiration of heroic daring and suffering,—and refine and elevate their lives. It was destined in the education of the human race, that imperfect and faint suggestions of truth, combined with exquisite perceptions of beauty, should in a few teeming years give birth to images of grace which, untouched by time, people the retreats which are sought by youthful toil, and make learning lovely. Why shall not these be brought, with the poetry of Shelley, within the range of criminal jurisdiction? Because, with all their beauty, they do not belong to the passions of the present time,—because they hold their dominion apart from the realities which form the business of life,—because they are presented to the mind as creations of another sphere, to be admired, not believed. And yet, without prosecution—without offence—one of the greatest and purest of our English poets, wearied with the selfishness which he saw pervading a Christian nation, has dared an ejaculated wish for the return of those old palpable shapes of divinity, when he exclaimed:—

Great God! I'd rather be
A Pagan suckled in a creed outworn,
So might I, standing on some pleasant lee,
Have glimpses which may make me less forlorn,
Have sight of Proteus coming from the sea,
Or hear old Triton blow his wreathèd horn!

And the fantasies of "Queen Mab," if not so compact of imagination are as harmless now as those forms of Grecian deities which Wordsworth thus invokes! Pure—passionless—they were while their author lived; they have grown classic by that touch of death which stopped the generous heart and teeming fancy of their fated author. They have no more influence on living opinion, than that world of beauty to which Shelley adverts, when he exclaims in "Hellas:"—

But Greece and her foundations are
Built below the tide of war,
Based on the crystalline sea
Of thought and its eternity.

Having considered this charge chiefly as affecting poetry, I must not forget that the last passage selected by the prosecutor is in prose, culled from the essay which was appended to the poem of "Queen Mab," disclaimed by the editor,—disclaimed by Shelley long before he reached the prime of manhood,—but rightly preserved, shocking as it is in itself, as essential to the just contemplation of his moral and intellectual nature. They form the darkground of a picture of surpassing interest to the philosopher. There shall you see a poet whose fancies are most ethereal, struggling with a theory gross, material, shallow, imaging the great struggle by which the Spirit of the Eternal seeks to subdue the material world to its uses. His genius was pent up within the hard and bitter rind of his philosophy, as Ariel was in the rift of the cloven pine; and what wonder if a Spirit thus enthralled should send forth strange and discordant cries? Because the words which those strange voices syllabled are recorded here, will you say the record is a crime? I recollect in the speech of that great ornament of our profession, Mr. Erskine, an illustration of the injustice of selecting part of a conversation or of a book, and because singly considered it is shocking, charging a criminal intent on the utterer or the publisher; which, if at first, it may not seem applicable to this case, will be found essentially to govern it. He refers to the passage in the Bible, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God," and shows how the publisher of the Book of God itself might be charged with atheism, by the insertion only of the latter division of the sentence. It is not surely by the division of a sentence only that context may be judged; but by the general intent of him who publishes what is in itself offensive, for the purpose of curious record—of controversy—of evidence—of example. The publisher of Shelley has not, indeed, said, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God"; but he has in effect said, the poet has tried to say with his lips, "There is no God," but his genius and his heart belied his words! What, indeed, does the publisher of Shelley's works virtually say, where he thus presents to his readers this record of the poet's life and death? He says—Behold! Here is a spectacle which angels may admire and weep over! Here is a poet of fancy the most ethereal—feelings the most devout—charity the most Christian—enthralled by opinions the most cold, hollow, and debasing! Here is a youth endowed with that sensibility to the beautiful and the grand which peoples his minutes with the perceptions of years—

who, with a spirit of self-sacrifice which the oldest Christianity might exult in if found in one of its martyrs, is ready to lay down that intellectual being—to be lost in loss itself—if by annihilation he could multiply the enjoyments and hasten the progress of his species—and yet, with strange wilfulness, rejecting that religion in form to which in essence he is imperishably allied! Observe these radiant fancies—pure and cold as frostwork—how would they be kindled by the warmth of Christian love! Track those " thoughts that wander through eternity," and think how they would repose in their proper home! And trace the inspired, yet erring youth, poem after poem—year after year, month after month—how shall you see the icy fetters which encircle his genius gradually dissolve; the wreaths of mist ascend from his path; and the distance spread out before him peopled with human affections and skirted by angel wings! See how this seeming atheist begins to adore—how the divine image of suffering and love presented at Calvary, never unfelt, begins to be seen—and in its contemplation the softened, not yet convinced poet exclaims, in his " Prometheus," of the followers of Christ:—

> The wise, the pure, the lofty, and the just,
> Whom thy slaves hate—for being like to thee!

And thus he proceeds—with light shining more and more towards the perfect day, which he was not permitted to realize in this world. As you trace this progress, alas! Death veils it—veils it, not stops it—and this perturbed, imperfect, but glorious being is hidden from us—" Till the sea shall give up its dead!" What say you now to the book which exhibits this spectacle, and stops with this catastrophe? Is it a libel on religion and God? Talk of proofs of Divine existence in the wonders of the material universe, there is nothing in any—nor in all—compared to the proof which this indicted volume conveys! What can the telescope disclose of worlds, and suns, and systems, in the heavens above us, or the microscope detect in the descending scale of various life, endowed with a speech and a language like that with which Shelley, being dead, here speaks? Nor even do the most serene productions of poets, whose faculties in this world have attained comparative harmony,—strongly as they plead for the immortality of the mind which produced them,—afford so unanswerable a proof of a life to come, as the mighty embryo which this book exhibits;—as the course, the frailty, the imperfection, with the dark curtain dropped on all! It is, indeed, when best surveyed, but the infancy of an eternal being; an infancy wayward but gigantic; an infancy which we shall never fully understand, till we behold its development " when time shall be no more "—when doubt shall be dissolved in vision—" when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and when this mortal shall have put on immortality! "

EDMUND WALLER

(1605-1687).

THE poet Waller played a prominent if ignominious part in the revolution against the Stuarts. He entered Parliament at the age of sixteen, and before the close of the Short Parliament of 1640 he had already acquired such prominence as an advocate of parliamentary supremacy that the Long Parliament chose him to impeach Justice Crawley, one of the judges whose subserviency to the King had made possible the Ship Money decision under which the King sought to collect taxes that had not been levied by law. Waller's speech against Crawley shows great ability, and the reader ought not to allow the force of its argument to be impaired by the tradition that when Waller and others formed a combination to check the Radical leaders in Parliament, he behaved with "abject meanness" when arrested, saving his own life by informing against his associates. He was banished by Parliament, but Cromwell allowed him to return, and he was in considerable favour at court after the restoration of the Stuarts. He showed his moral and intellectual versatility by a poem lamenting the death of Cromwell, followed not very long afterwards by an ode rejoicing at the "happy return" of Charles II. Charles, who, because Vane had a conscience, sent him to the scaffold, laughed at Waller for his lack of it, took him into favour and allowed him to be returned to Parliament, where it is said his wit made him "the delight of the House." He died in 1687, in his eighty-second year.

"THE TYRANT'S PLEA, NECESSITY"

(Impeaching Justice Crawley in the Case of Ship Money between the King and John Hampden, delivered July 6th, 1641).

I AM commanded by the House of Commons to present you with these articles against Mr. Justice Crawley, which when your lordships shall have been pleased to hear read, I shall take leave according

to custom, to say something of what I have collected from the sense of that House, concerning the crimes therein contained.

[Then the charge was read, containing his extrajudicial opinions subscribed, and judgment given for Ship Money; and after a declaration in his charge at an assize, that Ship Money was so inherent a right in the Crown, that it would not be in the power of a Parliament to take it away].

My lords, not only my wants, but my affections, render me less fit for this employment; for though it has not been my happiness to have the law a part of my breeding, there is no man honours that profession more, or has a greater reverence towards the grave judges, the oracles thereof. Out of Parliament, all our courts of justice are governed or directed by them; and when a Parliament is called, if your lordships were not assisted by them, and the House of Commons by other gentlemen of that robe, experience tells us it might run a hazard of being styled *Parliamentum indoctorum*. But as all professions are obnoxious to the malice of the professors, and by them most easily betrayed, so, my lords, these articles have told you how these brothers of the coif are become *fratres in malo;* how these sons of the law have torn out the bowels of their mother; but the judge, whose charge you last heard, in one expression of his excels no less his fellows than they have done the worst of their predecessors in this conspiracy against the Commonwealth. Of the judgment for Ship Money, and those extrajudicial opinions preceding the same (wherein they are jointly concerned) you have already heard; how unjust and pernicious a proceeding that was, in so public a cause, has been sufficiently expressed to your lordships; but this man, adding despair to our misery, tells us from the bench that Ship Money was a right so inherent in the Crown, that it would not be in the power of any act of Parliament to take it away. Herein, my lords, he did not only give as deep a wound to the Commonwealth as any of the rest, but dipped his dart in such a poison, that, as far as in him lay, it might never receive a cure. As by those abortive opinions, subscribing to the subversion of our property, before he heard what could be said for it, he prevented his own; so by this declaration of his he endeavours to prevent the judgment of your lordships too, and to confine the power of a Parliament, the only place where this mischief might be redressed. Sure, he is more wise and learned than to believe himself in this opinion, or not to know how ridiculous it would appear to a Parliament and how dangerous to himself; and therefore, no doubt, but by saying no Parliament could abolish this judgment, this meaning was, that this judgment had abolished Parliaments.

This imposition of Ship Money springing from a pretended necessity, was it not enough that it was now grown annual, but he must entail it upon the state forever,—making necessity inherent to the Crown, and slavery to the subject? Necessity which, dissolving all law, is so much more prejudicial to his Majesty than to any of us, by how much the law has invested the royal state with a greater power and ample fortune: for so undoubted a truth it has ever been, that kings as well as subjects are involved in the confusion which necessity produces, that the heathen thought their gods also obliged by the same: *Pareamus necessitati, quam nec homines nec dii superant.* This judge, then, having in his charge at the assize declared the dissolution of the law, by this supposed necessity, with what conscience could he, at the same assize, proceed to condemn and punish men, unless, perhaps, he meant the law was still in force for our destruction, and not for our preservation; that it should have power to kill, and none to protect us? A thing no less horrid than if the sun should burn without lighting us, or the earth serve only to bury, and not to feed and nourish us. But, my lords, to demonstrate that it was a supposititious, imposed necessity, and such as they could remove when they pleased, at the last convention in Parliament, a price was set upon it; for twelve subsidies you may reverse this sentence. It may be said that so much money would have removed the present necessity; for twelve subsidies you shall never suffer necessity again, you shall forever abolish that judgment. Here this mystery is revealed, this visor is pulled off; and now it appears that this Parliament of judges hath very frankly and bountifully presented his Majesty with twelve subsidies, to be levied on your lordships and the commons. Certainly there is no privilege which more properly belongs to us than to open the purse of a subject; and yet these judges, who are neither capable of sitting amongst us in the House of Commons, nor with your lordships otherwise than as your assistants, have not only assumed to themselves the privilege of Parliament, but presumed at once to make a present to the Crown of all that either your lordships or the Commons of England do or shall hereafter possess.

And because this man has had the boldness to put the power of Parliament in balance with the opinion of the judges, I shall entreat your lordships to observe, by way of comparison, the solemn and safe proceeding of the one, with the precipitate dispatch of the other. In Parliament (as your lordships know well) no new law can pass, or old be abrogated, till it has been thrice read with your lordships, thrice in the Commons House, then it receives the royal assent; so that it is like gold seven times purified; whereas these judges, by this one resolution of theirs, would persuade his Majesty that by naming necessity, he might at once dissolve (at least suspend) the Great Charter, thirty-two times confirmed by his royal progenitors, the Petition of Right, and all other laws provided for the maintenance of the right and property of the subject. A strange force, my lords, in the sound of this word necessity, that like a charm it should silence the laws, while we are despoiled of all we have; for that but a part of our goods were taken was owing to the grace and goodness of the King; for so much as concerns these judges, we have no more left than they, perhaps, may deserve to have, when your lordships shall have passed judgment upon them for this neglect of their oaths, and betraying that public trust, which, for the conservation of our laws, we reposed in them.

Now for the cruelty and unmercifulness of this judgment you may please to remember that in the old law they are forbid to seethe a kid in his mother's milk; of which the received interpretation is, that we should not use that to the destruction of any creature, which was intended for its preservation. Now, my lords, God and nature have given us the sea as our best guard against our enemies; and our ships as our greatest glory above other nations; and how barbarously would these men have let in the sea upon us at once to wash away our liberties, and to overwhelm, if not our land, all the property we have therein, making the supply of our navy a pretence for the ruin of our nation! For observe, I beseech you, the fruit and consequence of this judgment, how this money has prospered, how contrary an effect it has had to the end for which they pretended to take it. On every county a ship is annually imposed; and who would not expect but our seas by this time should be covered by the number of our ships? Alas, my lords, the daily complaints of the decay of our navy tell us how ill Ship Money has maintained the sovereignty of the sea; and by the many petitions which we receive from the wives of those miserable captives at Algiers (being between four and five thousand of our countrymen) it does too evidently appear that to make us slaves at home is not the way to keep us from being made slaves abroad. So far has this judgment been from relieving the present, or preventing the future necessity, that as it changed our real property into a shadow of a property, so of a feigned it is made a real necessity.

A little before the approach of the Gauls to Rome, while the Romans had yet no apprehension of that danger, there was heard a voice in the air, louder than ordinary: "The Gauls are come"; which cry, after they had sacked the city and besieged the capitol, was held so ominous that Livy relates it as a prodigy. This anticipation of necessity seems to have been no less ominous to us. These judges, like ill-boding birds, have called necessity upon the State in a time, when I daresay they thought themselves in greatest security. But if it seem superstitious to take this as an omen, sure I am we may look on it as a cause of the unfeigned necessity we now suffer. For what regret and discontent had this judgment bred among us? And as when the noise and tumult in a private house grows so loud as to be heard in the streets and calls in the next dwellers, either kindly to appease, or to make their own use of domestic strife, so in all likelihood our known discontentments at home have been a concurrent cause to invite our neighbours to visit us, so much to the expense and trouble of both these kingdoms.

And here, my lords, I cannot but take notice of the most sad effect of this oppression, the ill influence it has had upon the ancient reputation and valour of the English nation ; and no wonder, for if it be true that oppression makes a wise man mad, it may well suspend the courage of the valiant. The same happened to the Romans, when, for renown in arms, they most excelled the rest of the world ; the story is but short. It was in the time of the Decemviri (and I think the chief troublers of our state may make up that number). The Decemviri, my lords, had subverted the laws, suspended the courts of justice, and (which was the greatest grievance both to the nobility and people) had, for some time, omitted to assemble the senate, which was their Parliament. This, says the historian, did not only deject the Romans, and make them despair of their liberty, but caused them to be less valued by their neighbours. The Sabines take the advantage, and invade them ; and now the Decemviri are forced to call a long-desired senate, whereof the people were glad, "*hostibus belloque gratiam habuerunt.*" This assembly breaks up so in discontent ; nevertheless, the war proceeds ; forces are raised, led by some of the Decemviri, and with the Sabines they meet in the field. I know your lordships expect the event ; my author's words of his countrymen are these : "*Nequid ductu aut auspicio decemvirorum prospere gereretur, vinci se patiebantur?*"—They chose rather to suffer a present diminution of their honour than by victory to confirm the tyranny of their new masters. At their return from their unfortunate expedition, after some distempers and expostulations of the people, another senate, that is, a second Parliament, is called ; and there the Decemviri are questioned, deprived of their authority, imprisoned, banished, and some lose their lives : and soon after this vindication of their liberties, the Romans, by their better success, made it appear to the world that liberty and courage dwell always in the same breast and are never to be divorced. No doubt, my lords, but your justice shall have the like effect upon this dispirited people. It is not the restitution of our ancient laws alone, but the restoration of our ancient courage, which is expected from your lordships. I need not say anything to move your just indignation, that this man should so cheaply give away that which your noble ancestors, with so much courage and industry, had so long maintained. You have often been told how careful they were, though with the hazard of their lives and fortunes, to transmit those rights and liberties as entire to posterity as they received them from their fathers: what they did with labour, you may do with ease; what they did with danger, you may do securely. The foundation of our laws is not shaken with the engine of war; they are only blasted with the breath of these men, and by your breath they may be restored.

What judgment your predecessors have given, and what punishment their predecessors have suffered for offences of this nature, your lordships have already been so well informed, I shall not trouble you with a repetition of those precedents. Only, my lords, something I shall take leave to observe of the person with whose charge I have presented you, that you may the less doubt of the wilfulness of his offence. His education in the Inns of Court, his constant practice as a counsellor, and experience as a judge, considered with the mischief he has done, make it appear that this progress of his through the law has been like that of a diligent spy, through a country into which he meant to conduct an enemy.

To let you see he did not offend for company, there is one crime so peculiar to himself, and of such malignity, that it makes him at once incapable of your lordships' favour, and his own subsistence incompatible with the right and property of the subject. For if you leave him in a capacity of interpreting the laws, has he not declared his opinion that your votes and resolutions against Ship Money are void, and that it is not in the power of Parliament to abolish that judgment? To him, my lords, that has thus played with the power of Parliament, we may well apply what was once said to a goat browsing on a vine.

"*Rode, caper, vitem, tamen hinc cum stabis ad aras,*
In tua quod fundi cornua possit, erit."

He has cropt and infringed the privileges of a banished Parliament; but now it is returned, he may find it has power enough to make a sacrifice of him to the better establishment of our laws; and in truth, what other satisfaction can he make his injured country than to confirm by his example those rights and liberties which he had ruined by his opinion? For the proofs, my lords, they are so manifest that they will give you little trouble in the disquisition; his crimes are already upon record; the delinquent and the witness is the same; having from several seats of judicature proclaimed himself an enemy to our laws and nation *ex ore suo judicabitur*. To which purpose I am commanded by the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the House of Commons to desire your lordships that a speedy proceeding may be had against Mr. Justice Crawley, as the course of Parliament will permit.

SIR ROBERT AND HORACE WALPOLE

(1676-1745; 1717-1797).

SIR ROBERT WALPOLE, Prime Minister of England from 1721 to 1742, stands in the history of his time for the idea which inspired the Sacheverell impeachment—that of "the lawfulness of resistance to unlawful authority." This central idea of the English Whigs of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was not a democratic idea, but rather the modern manifestation of the same impulse under which the English barons forced King John to sign Magna Charta. The English Whigs of the school to which Walpole belonged believed in the use of force to expel any King who violated the Constitution, but they were as much opposed to Cromwell, backed by his Ironsides, as they were to Charles in the assertion of his prerogative.

Sir Robert Walpole was born at Houghton in Norfolk, and educated at Cambridge. He entered Parliament in 1701. In 1705 he was appointed to the Council of Queen Anne's husband, Prince George of Denmark. In 1708 he became Secretary for War ("Secretary-at-War") and in 1710 Treasurer of the Navy. It is said that he did not approve the impeachment of Sacheverell, but he acted as one of the managers for the House of Commons in conducting it. On the defeat of the Whigs which followed it, he became one of the leaders of the opposition in the House of Commons, and made himself so formidable to the Tories that they expelled him from the House and sent him to the Tower on charges of personal corruption now admitted to have been false. After the return of the Whigs to power under George I., Walpole was advanced until he became First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer (1715-17 and 1721-42). On the ninth of February, 1742, he was raised to the peerage as Earl of Orford. Two days later he retired from office and lived in privacy at his country seat in Norfolk until his death, March 18th, 1745.

Horace Walpole, his third son, was born in London, October 5th, 1717. Entering Parliament in 1741, he attracted attention, not only because of his father's position, but of his own marked talent. His career as a public man did not satisfy him, however, and he retired in 1768, devoting the rest of his life to literature. He became fourth Earl of Orford in 1791, and died in London, March 2nd, 1797. Of his numerous works his letters have been most admired by the critical, but his romance "The Castle of Otranto," is perhaps the best known to the general public. As orators, the Walpoles do not compare with the elder and younger Pitt, but Sir Robert Walpole occupied a position in English history by reason of which he must always command attention among parliamentary speakers, while Horace is entitled to a similar if less marked consideration, if for no other reason than that he provoked Pitt to one of his first great outbursts of eloquence.

THE DEBATE WITH PITT IN 1741

(House of Commons, March 10th, 1741).

[In the celebrated debate with the elder Pitt, the speech which provoked Pitt's reply has been attributed to Sir Robert Walpole, but in Dr. Samuel Johnson's "Parliamentary Debates" for 1741, from the text of which (in the original edition) the debate is here re-published, the speech to which Pitt replied is attributed to Horatio. The debate was on a proposition to limit the wages of sailors to thirty-five shillings a month.]

SIR ROBERT WALPOLE:—Sir, the present business of this assembly is to examine the clause before us; but to deviate from so necessary an inquiry into loud exclamations against the whole bill is to obstruct the course of the debate, to perplex our attention, and interrupt the House in its deliberation upon questions in the determination of which the security of the public is nearly concerned. The war, sir, in which we are now engaged, and, I may add, engaged by the general request of the whole nation, can be prosecuted only by the assistance of the seamen, from whom it is not to be expected that they will sacrifice their immediate advantage to the security of their country. Public spirit, where it is to be found, is the result of reflection, refined by study and exalted by education, and is not to be hoped for among those whom low fortune has condemned to perpetual drudgery. It must be therefore necessary to supply the defects of education and to produce by salutary coercions those effects which it is vain to expect from other causes. That the service of the sailors will be set up to sale by auction, and that the merchants will bid against the government, is incontestable; nor is there any doubt that they will be able to offer the highest price, because they will take care to repay themselves by raising the value of their goods. Thus, without some restraint upon the merchants, our enemies, who are not debarred by their form of government from any method which policy can invent, or absolute power put in execution, will preclude all our designs, and set at defiance a nation superior to themselves.

WILLIAM PITT, ESQUIRE, spoke to the following purport:—Sir, it is common for those to have the greatest regard to their own interest who discover the least for that of others. I do not, therefore, despair of recalling the advocates of this bill from the prosecution of their favourite measures by arguments of greater efficacy than those which are founded on reason and justice. Nothing, sir, is more evident than that some degree of reputation is absolutely necessary to men who have any concern in the administration of a government like ours; they must either secure the fidelity of their adherents by the assistance of wisdom, or of virtue; their enemies must either be awed by their honesty, or terrified by their cunning. Mere artless bribery will never gain a sufficient majority to set them entirely free from apprehensions of censure. To different tempers different motives must be applied: some, who place their felicity in being accounted wise are in very little care to preserve the character of honesty; others may be persuaded to join in measures which they easily discover to be weak and ill-concerted, because they are convinced that the authors of them are not corrupt, but mistaken, and are unwilling that any man should be punished for natural defects or casual ignorance. I cannot say, sir, which of these motives influence the advocates for the bill before us; a bill in which such cruelties are proposed as are yet unknown among the most savage nations, such as slavery has not yet borne, or tyranny invented, such as cannot be heard without resentment, nor thought of without horror. It is, sir, perhaps, not unfortunate that one more expedient has been added, rather ridiculous than shocking, and that these tyrants of the administration, who amuse themselves with oppressing their fellow-subjects, who add without reluctance one hardship to another, invade the liberty of those whom they have already overborne with taxes, first plunder and then imprison, who take all opportunities of heightening the public distresses, and make the miseries of war the instruments of new oppressions, are too ignorant to be formidable, and owe their success, not to their abilities, but to casual prosperity or to the influence of money.

The other clauses of this bill, complicated at once with cruelty and folly, have been treated with becoming indignation; but this may be considered with less ardour of resentment, and fewer emotions of zeal, because, though perhaps equally iniquitous, it will do no harm; for a law that can never be executed can never be felt. That it will consume the manufacture of paper and swell the books of statutes is all the good or hurt that can be hoped or feared from a law like this; a law which fixes what is in its own nature mutable, which prescribes rules to the seasons and limits to the wind. I am too well acquainted, sir, with the disposition of its two chief supporters, to mention the contempt with which this law will be treated by posterity, for they have already shown abundantly their disregard of succeeding generations; but I will remind them that they are now venturing their whole interest at once, and hope they will recollect before it is too late that those who believe them to intend the happiness of their country will never be confirmed in their opinion by open cruelty and notorious oppression; and that those who have only their own interest in view will be afraid of adhering to those leaders, however old and practised in expedients, however strengthened by corruption, or elated with power, who have no reason to hope for success from either their virtue or abilities.

SIR ROBERT WALPOLE rose, and spoke as follows:—Sir, every law which extends its influence to great numbers in various relations and circumstances must produce some consequences that were never foreseen or intended, and is to be censured or applauded as the general advantages or inconveniences are found to preponderate. Of this kind is the law before us, a law enforced by the necessity of our affairs, and drawn up with no other intention than to secure the public happiness, and produce that success which every man's interest must prompt him to desire. If in the execution of this law, sir, some inconveniences should arise, they are to be remedied as fast as they are discovered; or, if not capable of a remedy, to be patiently borne in consideration of the general advantage. That some temporary disturbances may be produced is not improbable; the discontent of the sailors may for a short time rise high, and our trade be suspended by their obstinacy; but obstinacy, however determined, must yield to hunger, and when no higher wages can be obtained, they will cheerfully accept of those which are here allowed them. Short voyages, indeed, are not comprehended in the clause, and therefore the sailors will engage in them upon their own terms; but this objection can be of no weight with those that oppose the clause, because, if it is unjust to limit the wages of the sailors, it is just to leave those voyages without restriction; and those that think the expedient here proposed equitable and rational may perhaps be willing to make some concessions to those who are of a different opinion. That the bill will not remove every obstacle to success, nor add weight to one part of the balance without making the other lighter; that it will not supply the navy without incommoding the merchants in some degree; that it may be sometimes evaded by cunning, and sometimes abused by malice, and that at last it will be less efficacious than is desired may, perhaps, be proved; but it has not yet been proved that any other measures are more eligible, or that we are not to promote the public service as far as we are able, though our endeavours may not produce effects equal to our wishes.

Mr. Attorney-General spoke next to this purport:—Sir, the clause before us cannot, in my opinion, produce any such dreadful consequences as the learned gentleman appears to imagine. However, to remove all difficulties, I have drawn up an amendment which I shall beg leave to propose: "That the contracts which may be affected as the clause now stands shall be void only as to so much of the wages as shall exceed the sum to which the House shall agree to reduce the seamen's pay"; and as to the forfeitures, they are not to be levied upon the sailors, but upon the merchants or trading companies who employ them and who are able to pay greater sums without being involved in poverty and distress. With regard, sir, to the reasons for introducing this clause, they are, in my judgment, valid and equitable. We have found it necessary to fix the rate of money at interest, and the rate of labour in several cases; and if we do not in this case, what will be the consequence? A second embargo on commerce, and perhaps a total stop to all military preparations. Is it reasonable that any man should rate his labour according to the immediate necessities of those that employ him? Or that he should raise his own fortune by the public calamities? If this has hitherto been a practice, it is a practice contrary to the general happiness of society, and ought to prevail no longer. If the sailor, sir, is exposed to greater dangers in time of war, is not the merchant's trade carried on likewise at greater hazard? Is not the freight, equally with the sailors, threatened at once by the ocean and the enemy? And is not the owner's fortune equally impaired, whether the ship be dashed upon a rock or seized by a privateer? The merchant, therefore, has as much reason for paying less wages in time of war as the sailor for demanding more, and nothing remains but that the legislative power determine a medium between their different interests, with justice, if possible, at least with impartiality.

Horatio Walpole, Esquire, who had stood up several times, but was prevented by other members, spoke next: Sir, I was unwilling to interrupt the course of this debate while it was carried on with calmness and decency, by men who do not suffer the ardour of opposition to cloud their reason, or transport them to such expressions as the dignity of this assembly does not admit. I have hitherto deferred to answer the gentleman who declaimed against the bill with such fluency of rhetoric, and such vehemence of gesture, who charged the advocates for the expedients now proposed with having no regard to any interest but their own, and with making laws only to consume paper, and threatened them with the defection of their adherents and the loss of their influence upon this new discovery of their folly and their ignorance. Nor, sir, do I now answer him for any other purpose than to remind him how little the clamours of rage and petulancy of invectives contribute to the purposes for which this assembly is called together; how little the discovery of truth is promoted, and the security of the nation established by pompous diction and theatrical emotions. Formidable sounds, and furious declamations, confident assertions, and lofty periods, may affect the young and inexperienced, and, perhaps, the gentleman may have contracted his habits of oratory by conversing more with those of his own age than with such as have had more opportunities of acquiring knowledge and more successful methods of communicating their sentiments. If the heat of his temper, sir, would suffer him to attend to those whose age and long acquaintance with business give them an indisputable right to deference and superiority, he would learn, in time, to reason rather than declaim, and to prefer justness of argument, and an accurate knowledge of facts, to sounding epithets and splendid superlatives, which may disturb the imagination for a moment, but leave no lasting impression on the mind. He will learn, sir, that to accuse and prove are very different, and that reproaches unsupported by evidence affect only the character of him that utters them. Excursions of fancy and flights of oratory are, indeed, pardonable in young men, but in no other; and it would surely contribute more, even to the purpose for which some gentlemen appear to speak, that of depreciating the conduct of the administration, to prove the inconveniences and injustice of this bill, than barely to assert them, with whatever magnificence of language, or appearance of zeal, honesty, or compassion.

William Pitt, Esquire, replied:—Sir, the atrocious crime of being a young man, which the honourable gentleman has with such spirit and decency charged me, I shall neither attempt to palliate, nor deny, but content myself with wishing that I may be one of those whose follies may cease with their youth, and not of that number who are ignorant in spite of experience. Whether youth can be imputed to any man as a reproach, I will not, sir, assume the province of determining; but surely age may become justly contemptible, if the opportunities which it brings have passed away without improvement, and vice appears to prevail when the passions have subsided. The wretch that, after having seen the consequences of a thousand errors, continues still to blunder, and whose age has only added obstinacy to stupidity, is surely the object of either abhorrence or contempt, and deserves not that his gray head should secure him from insults. Much more, sir, is he to be abhorred, who, as he has advanced in age, has receded from virtue, and becomes more wicked with less temptation; who prostitutes himself for money which he cannot enjoy, and spends the remains of his life in the ruin of his country. But youth, sir, is not my only crime; I have been accused of acting a theatrical part. A theatrical part may eithe imply some peculiarities of gesture, or a dissimulation of my real sentiments and an adoption of the opinions and language of another man

In the first sense, sir, the charge is too trifling to be confuted, and deserves only to be mentioned that it may be despised. I am at liberty like every other man, to use my own language; and though I may, perhaps, have some ambition to please this gentleman, I shall not lay myself under any restraint, nor very solicitously copy his diction, or his mien, however matured by age, or modelled by experience. If any man shall by charging me with theatrical behaviour imply that I utter any sentiments but my own, I shall treat him as a calumniator and a villain; nor shall any protection shelter him from the treatment which he deserves. I shall, on such an occasion, without scruple, trample upon all those forms with which wealth and dignity intrench themselves, nor shall anything but age restrain my resentment; age, which always brings one privilege, that of being insolent and supercilious without punishment. But with regard, sir, to those whom I have offended, I am of opinion that if I had acted a borrowed part, I should have avoided their censure; the heat that offended them is the ardour of conviction, and that zeal for the service of my country which neither hope nor fear shall influence me to suppress. I will not sit unconcerned while my liberty is invaded, nor look in silence upon public robbery. I will exert my endeavours at whatever hazard to repel the aggressor and drag the thief to justice, whoever may protect them in their villainy, and whoever may partake of their plunder. And if the honourable gentleman—

Here Thomas Winnington, Esquire, called to order, and (William Pitt, Esquire, sitting down) spoke thus:—It is necessary, sir, that the order of this assembly be observed, and the debate resumed without personal altercations. Such expressions as have been vented on this occasion become not an assembly intrusted with the liberty and welfare of their country. To interrupt the debate on a subject so important as that before us is, in some measure, to obstruct the public happiness and violate our trust. But much more heinous is the crime of exposing our determinations to contempt, and inciting the people to suspicion and mutiny by indecent reflections or unjust insinuations. I do not, sir, undertake to decide the controversy between the two gentlemen, but must be allowed to observe that no diversity of opinion can justify the violation of decency and the use of rude and virulent expressions; expressions dictated only by resentment, and uttered without regard to—

Here William Pitt, Esquire, called to order, and said:—Sir, if this be to preserve order, there is no danger of indecency from the most licentious tongue; for what calumny can be more atrocious, or what reproach more severe than that of speaking with regard to anything but truth. Order may sometimes be broken by passion, or inadvertency, but will hardly be re-established by monitors like this who cannot govern his own passion, whilst he is restraining the impetuosity of others. Happy, sir, would it be for mankind if everyone knew his own province; we should not then see the same man at once a criminal and a judge, nor would this gentleman assume the right of dictating to others what he has not learned himself. That I may return in some degree the favour which he intends me I will advise him never hereafter to exert himself on the subject of order; but whenever he finds himself inclined to speak on such occasions to remember how he has now succeeded, and condemn in silence what his censures will never reform.

ON PATRIOTS

(Delivered in Parliament by Sir Robert Walpole in 1740 on a Motion to dismiss him from the Council).

IT has been observed, Mr. Speaker, by several gentlemen, in vindication of this motion, that if it should be carried, neither my life, liberty nor estate, will be affected. But do the honourable gentlemen consider my character and reputation as of no moment? Is it no imputation to be arraigned before this House in which I have sat forty years, and to have my name transmitted to posterity with disgrace and infamy? I will not conceal my sentiments, that to be named in Parliament as a subject of inquiry is to me a matter of great concern; but I have the satisfaction, at the same time, to reflect that the impression to be made depends upon the consistency of the charge and the motives of the prosecutors. Had the charge been reduced to specific allegations, I should have felt myself called upon for a specific defence. Had I served a weak or wicked master, and implicitly obeyed his dictates, obedience to his commands must have been my only justification. But, as it has been my good fortune to serve a master who wants no bad ministers, and would have hearkened to none, my defence must rest on my own conduct. The consciousness of innocence is sufficient support against my present prosecutors.

Survey and examine the individuals who usually support the measures of Government, and those who are in opposition. Let us see to whose side the balance preponderates. Look round both houses, and see to which side the balance of virtue and talents preponderates. Are all these on one side, and not on the other? Or are all these to be counterbalanced by an affected claim to the exclusive title of patriotism ? Gentleme have talked a great deal about patriotism. A venerable word, whe duly practised ! But I am sorry to say that of late it has been s much hackneyed about that it is in danger of falling into disgrac The very idea of true patriotism is lost ; and the term has bee prostituted to the very worst of purposes. A patriot, sir ! Why, patriot spring up like mushrooms ! I could raise fifty of them within th four-and-twenty hours. I have raised many of them in one night. I is but refusing to gratify an unreasonable or an insolent demand, an up starts a patriot. I have never been afraid of making patriots ; bu I disdain and despise all their efforts. This pretended virtue proceed from personal malice and from disappointed ambition. There is not man amongst them whose particular aim I am not able to ascertain and from what motive he has entered into the lists of opposition.

ON THE PEERAGE BILL

(Delivered in Parliament by SIR ROBERT WALPOLE).

AMONG the Romans the temple of fame was placed behind th temple of virtue, to denote that there was no coming to th temple of fame, but through that of virtue. But if this bill is passed into a law, one of the most powerful incentives to virtue would be taken away, since there would be no arriving at honour, but through th winding sheet of an old decrepit lord, or the grave of an extinct nobl family ; a policy very different from that glorious and enlightened nation who made it their pride to hold out to the world illustrious examples of merited elevation.

It is very far from my thoughts to depreciate the advantages, or detract from the respect due to illustrious birth ; for though the philosopher may say with the poet,

Et genus et proavos, et quæ non fecimus ipsi vix ea nostra voco :

yet the claim derived from that advantage, though fortuitous, is so generally and so justly conceded, that every endeavour to subvert the principle, would merit contempt and abhorrence. But though illustrious birth forms one undisputed title to pre-eminence, and superior consideration, yet surely it ought not to be the only one. The origin of high titles was derived from the will of the sovereign to reward signal services, or conspicuous merit, by a recompense which, surviving to posterity, should display in all ages the virtues of the receiver, and the gratitude of the donor. Is merit then so rarely discernible, or is gratitude so small a virtue in our days, that the one must be supposed to be its own reward and the other limited to a barren display of impotent good-will ? Had this bill originated with some noble peer of distinguished ancestry, it would have excited less surprise ; a desire to exclude others from a participation of honours, is no novelty in persons of that class.

But it is a matter of just surprise, that a bill of this nature, should either have been projected, or at least promoted by a gentleman who was, not long ago, seated amongst us, and who, having got into the House of Peers, is now desirous to shut the door after him.

When great alterations in the constitution are to be made, the experiment should be tried for a short time before the proposed change is finally carried into execution, lest it should produce evil instead of good ; but in this case, when the bill is once sanctioned by Parliament, there can be no future hopes of redress, because the upper House will always oppose the repeal of an Act, which has so considerably increased their power. The great unanimity with which this Bill has passed the Lords, ought to inspire some jealousy in the Commons, for it must be obvious that whatever the Lords gain, must be acquired at the loss of the Commons, and the diminution of the regal prerogative ; and that in all disputes between the Lords and Commons, when the House of Lords is immutable, the Commons must, sooner or later, be obliged to recede. The view of the Ministry in framing this bill, is plainly nothing but to secure their power in the House of Lords. The principal argument on which the necessity of it is founded, is drawn from the mischief occasioned by the creation of twelve peers during the reign of Queen Anne for the purpose of carrying an infamous peace through the House of Lords ; that was only a temporary measure, whereas the mischief to be occasioned by this bill will be perpetual. It creates thirty-one peers by authority of Parliament : so extraordinary a step cannot be supposed to be taken without some sinister design in future. The Ministry want no additional strength in the House of Lords, for conducting the common affairs of the government, as it is sufficiently proved by the unanimity with which they have carried through this bill. If, therefore, they think it necessary to acquire additional strength, it must be done with views and intentions more extravagant and hostile to the constitution, than any which have yet been attempted.

The bill itself is of a most insidious and artful nature. The immediate creation of nine Scotch peers, and the reservation of six English peers for a necessary occasion, is of double use; to be ready for the House of Lords if wanted, and to engage three times the number in the House of Commons by hopes and promises. To sanction this attempt the King is induced to affect to waive some part of his prerogative; but this is merely an ostensible renunciation; unfounded in fact or reason. I am desirous to treat of all points relating to the private affairs of his Majesty, with the utmost tenderness and caution, but I should like to ask the House, and I think I can anticipate the answer: Has any such question been upon the tapis, as no man would forgive the authors, that should put them under the necessity of voting against either side? Are there any misfortunes, which every honest man secretly laments and bewails, and would think the last of mischiefs, should they ever become the subject of public and parliamentary conversations? Cannot numbers that hear me testify, from the solicitations and whispers they have met with, that there are men ready and determined to attempt those things if they had a prospect of success? If they have thought, but I hope they are mistaken in their opinion in this House, that the chief obstacle would arise in the House of Lords, where they have always been tender upon personal points, especially to any of their own body, does not this project enable them to carry any question through the House of Lords? Must not the twenty-five Scotch peers accept upon any terms, or be for ever excluded? Or will not twenty-five be found in all Scotland that will? How great will the temptation be likewise to six English, to fill the present vacancies? And shall we then, with our eyes open, take this step, which I cannot but look upon as the beginning of woe and confusion; and shall we under these apprehensions break through the Union and shut up the door of honour? It certainly will have that effect; nay, the very argument advanced in its support that it will add weight to the Commons by keeping the rich man there, admits that it will be an exclusion.

But we are told that his Majesty has voluntarily consented to this limitation of his prerogative. It may be true; but may not the King have been deceived? Which, if it is ever to be supposed, must be admitted in this case. It is incontrovertible, that kings have been over-ruled by the importunity of their ministers to remove, or to take into administration, persons who are disagreeable to them. The character of the King furnishes us also a strong proof that he has been deceived; for although it is a fact, that in Hanover, where he possesses absolute power, he never tyrannised over his subjects, or despotically exercised his authority, yet, can one instance be produced when he ever gave up a prerogative? If the constitution is to be amended in the House of

Lords, the greatest abuses ought to be first corrected. The abuse of the prerogative in creating an occasional number of peers, is a prejudice only to the Lords, it can rarely be a prejudice to the Commons, but must generally be exercised in their favour; and should it be argued, that in case of a difference between the two Houses, the King may exercise that branch of his prerogative, with a view to force the Commons to recede, we may rely, that upon a difference with the Commons, the King possesses his negative, and the exercise of that negative would be less culpable than making peers to screen himself.

But the strongest argument against the bill is, that it will not only be a discouragement to virtue and merit, but would endanger our excellent constitution, for as there is a due balance between the three branches of the legislature, it will destroy that balance, and consequently subvert the whole constitution by causing one of the three powers, which are now dependent on each other, to predominate in the scale. The crown is dependent upon the Commons by the power of granting money; the Commons are dependent on the Crown by the power of dissolution. The Lords will now be made independent of both. The sixteen elective Scotch peers, already admit themselves to be a dead court-weight, yet the same sixteen are now to be made hereditary, and nine added to their number. These twenty-five, under the influence of corrupt ministers, may find their account in betraying their trust; the majority of the Lords may also find their account in supporting such ministers; but the Commons, and the Commons only, must suffer for all, and be deprived of every advantage. If the proposed measure destroys two negatives in the Crown, it gives a negative to these twenty-five united, and confers a power superior to that of the King himself, or the head of a clan, who will have the power of recommending many.

The Scotch Commoners can have no other view in supporting this measure but the expected aggrandizement of their own chiefs. It will dissolve the allegiance of the Scotch peers, who are not amongst the twenty-five, and who can only hope for the benefit of an election to be peers of parliament, and almost enact obedience from the Sovereign to the betrayers of the constitution.

The present view of the bill is dangerous; the view to posterity, personal and unpardonable; it will make the Lords masters of the King, according to their own confession, when they admit that a change of administration renders a new creation of peers necessary; for by precluding the King from making peers in future, it at the same time precludes him from changing the present administration, who will naturally fill the vacancies with their own creatures; and the new peers will adhere to the first minister, with the same zeal and unanimity, as those created by Oxford adhered to him.

If, when the parliament was made septennial, the power of dissolving it before the end of seven years had been wrested from the Crown, would not such an alteration have added immense authority to the Commons? And yet, the prerogative of the Crown in dissolving parliaments, may be, and has been oftener abused, than the power of creating peers.

But it must be observed, that the King, for his own sake, will rarely make a great number of peers, for they, being usually created by the influence of the first minister, soon become, upon a change of administration, a weight against the Crown; and had Queen Anne lived the truth of this observation would have been verified in the case of most of the twelve peers made by Oxford.

Let me ask, however, is the abuse of a prerogative a sufficient reason for totally annihilating that prerogative?

Under that consideration the power of dissolving parliaments ought to be taken away, because that power has been more exercised and more abused than any of the other prerogatives; yet in 1641 when the King had assented to a law that disabled him from proroguing or dissolving parliament, without the consent of both Houses, he was from that time under subjection to the parliament, and from thence followed all the subsequent mischiefs, and his own destruction. It may also be asked: Whether the prerogative of making peace and war has never been abused? I might here call to your recollection the peace of Utrecht, and the present war with Spain. Yet who will presume to advise that the power of making war and peace, should be taken from the Crown?

How can the Lords expect the Commons to give their concurrence to a bill by which they and their posterity are to be for ever excluded from the peerage? How would they themselves receive a bill which should prevent a baron being made a viscount, a viscount an earl, an earl a marquis, and a marquis a duke? Would they consent to limit the number of any rank of peerage? Certainly none—unless perhaps the dukes. If the pretence for this measure is, that it will tend to secure the freedom of parliament, I say that there are many other steps, more important and less equivocal, such as the discontinuation of bribes and pensions. That this bill will secure the liberty of parliament I totally deny; it will secure a great preponderance to the peers; it will form them into a compact impenetrable phalanx by giving them the power to exclude in all cases of extinction and creation, all such persons from their body, who may be obnoxious to them. In the instances we have seen of their judgment in some late cases, sufficient marks of partiality may be found to put us on our guard against committing to them the power they would derive from this bill, of judging the right of latent or dormant titles, when their verdict would be of such immense importance. If gentlemen will not be convinced by argument, at least, let them not shut their ears to the dreadful example of former times ; let them recollect that the overweening disposition of the great barons to aggrandize their own dignity, occasioned them to exclude the lesser barons, and to that circumstance may be fairly attributed the sanguinary wars which so long desolated the country.

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE

(1759-1833).

DURING the eighteenth century, until Wilberforce began his public career, the slave trade was one of the notable sources of English commercial revenue, and the colonial policies of the Empire were adapted to promote it. Wilberforce, who was born August 24th, 1759, and educated at Cambridge, entered Parliament in 1780. In 1787, in connection with Thomas Clarkson, and with Pitt's support, he began the agitation against the slave trade, which finally ended in its abolition in 1807, and in the emancipation bill of August, 1833, passed a month after his death. His speech of May 12th, 1789, is the keynote of English and American history for three quarters of a century. It voices the sentiment of Jefferson and Washington, which found expression in the prohibition of the slave trade embodied in the American Constitution, and it inspired Brougham in England as it did Seward in America to force issues against slavery, regardless of "vested rights."

HORRORS OF THE BRITISH SLAVE TRADE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

(Wilberforce's Resolutions Respecting the Slave Trade, in Parliament, May 12th, 1789).

IN opening, concerning the nature of the slave trade, I need only observe that it is found by experience to be just such as every man who uses his reason would infallibly conclude it to be. For my own part, so clearly am I convinced of the mischiefs inseparable from it, that I should hardly want any further evidence than my own mind would furnish, by the most simple deductions. Facts, however, are now laid before the House. A report has been made by his Majesty's privy council, which, I trust, every gentleman has read, and which ascertains the slave trade to be just such in practice as we know, from theory, it must be. What should we suppose must naturally be the consequence of our carrying on a slave trade with Africa? With a country vast in its extent, not utterly barbarous, but civilized in a very small degree? Does any one suppose a slave trade would help their civilization? Is it not plain that she must suffer from it? That civilization must be checked; that her barbarous manners must be made more barbarous; and that the happiness of her millions of inhabitants must be prejudiced with her intercourse with Britain? Does not every one see that a slave trade carried on around her coasts must carry violence and desolation to her very centre? That in a continent just emerging from barbarism, if a trade in men is established, if her men are all converted into goods, and become commodities that can be bartered, it follows they must be subject to ravage just as goods are; and this, too, at a period of civilization, when there is no protecting legislature to defend this their only sort of property, in the same manner as the rights of property are maintained by the legislature of every civilized country. We see then, in the nature of things, how easily the practices of Africa are to be accounted for. Her kings are never compelled to war, that we can hear of, by public principles, by national glory, still less by the love of their people. In Europe it is the extension of commerce, the maintenance of national honour, or some great public object, that is ever the motive to war with every monarch; but, in Africa, it is the personal avarice and sensuality of their kings; these two vices of avarice and sensuality, the most powerful and predominant in natures thus corrupt, we tempt, we stimulate in all these African princes, and we depend upon these vices for the very maintenance of the slave trade. Does the king of Barbessin want brandy? he has only to send his troops, in the nighttime, to burn and desolate a village; the captives will serve as commodities, that may be bartered with the British trader. What a striking view of the wretched state of Africa does the tragedy of Calabar furnish! Two towns, formerly hostile, had settled their differences, and by an intermarriage among their chiefs, had each pledged themselves to peace; but the trade in slaves was prejudiced by such pacifications, and it became, therefore, the policy of our traders to renew the hostilities. This, their policy, was soon put in practice, and the scene of carnage which followed was such, that it is better, perhaps, to refer gentlemen to the privy council's report than to agitate their minds by dwelling on it.

The slave trade, in its very nature, is the source of such kind of tragedies; nor has there been a single person, almost, before the privy council, who does not add something by his testimony to the mass of evidence upon this point. Some, indeed, of these gentlemen, and particularly the delegates from Liverpool, have endeavoured to reason down this plain principle: some have palliated it; but there is not one, I believe, who does not more or less admit it. Some, nay most, I believe, have admitted the slave trade to be the chief cause of wars in Africa. . . .

Having now disposed of the first part of this subject, I must speak of the transit of the slaves in the West Indies. This, I confess, in my own opinion, is the most wretched part of the whole subject. So much misery condensed in so little room is more than the human imagination had ever before conceived. I will not accuse the Liverpool merchants; I will allow them, nay I will believe them, to be men of humanity; and I will therefore believe, if it were not for the multitude of these wretched objects, if it were not for the enormous magnitude and extent of the evil which distracts their attention from individual cases, and makes them think generally, and therefore less feelingly on the subject, they never would have persisted in the trade. I verily believe, therefore, if the wretchedness of any one of the many hundred negroes stowed in each ship could be brought before their view, and remain within sight of the African merchant, that there is no one among them whose heart would bear it. Let any one imagine to himself six or seven hundred of these wretches chained two and two, surrounded with every object that is nauseous and disgusting, diseased, and struggling under every kind of wretchedness! How can we bear to think of such a scene as this? One would think it had been determined to heap on them all the varieties of bodily pain, for the purpose of blunting the feelings of the mind; and yet, in this very point (to show the power of human prejudice), the situation of the slaves has been described by Mr. Norris, one of the Liverpool delegates, in a manner which I am sure will convince the House how interest can draw a film over the eyes, so thick, that total blindness could do no more, and how it is our duty therefore to trust not to the reasonings of interested men, or to their way of colouring a transaction. "Their apartments," says Mr. Norris, "are fitted up as much for their advantage as circumstances will admit. The right ankle of one, indeed, is connected with the left ankle of another by a small iron fetter, and if they are turbulent, by another on their wrists. They have several meals a day; some of their own country provisions, with the best sauces of African cookery; and by way of variety, another meal of pulse, etc., according to European taste. After breakfast they have water to wash themselves, while their apartments are perfumed with frankincense and lime juice. Before dinner they are amused after the manner of their country. The song and the dance are promoted," and, as if the whole were really a scene of pleasure and dissipation, it is added that games of chance are furnished. "The men play and sing, while the women and girls make fanciful ornaments with beads, which they are plentifully supplied with." Such is the sort of strain in which the Liverpool delegates, and particularly Mr. Norris, gave evidence before the privy council. What will the House think when, by the concurring testimony of other witnesses the true history is laid open. The slaves, who are sometimes described as rejoicing at their captivity, are so wrung with misery at leaving their country, that it is the constant practice to set sail in the night, lest they should be sensible of their departure. The pulse which Mr. Norris talks of are horse beans; and the scantiness of both water and provision was suggested by the very legislature of Jamaica, in the report of their committee, to be a subject that called for the interference of Parliament.

Mr. Norris talks of frankincense and lime juice; when the surgeons tell you the slaves are stowed so close that there is not room to tread among them; and when you have it in evidence from Sir George Younge, that even in a ship which wanted two hundred of her complement, the stench was intolerable. The song and the dance are promoted, says Mr. Norris. It had been more fair, perhaps, if he had explained that word "promoted." The truth is, that for the sake of exercise, these miserable wretches, loaded with chains, oppressed with disease and wretchedness, are forced to dance by the terror of the lash, and sometimes by the actual use of it. "I," says one of the other evidences, "was employed to dance the men, while another person danced the women." Such, then, is the meaning of the word "promoted"; and it may be observed too, with respect to food, that an instrument is sometimes carried out, in order to force them to eat, which is the same sort of proof how much they enjoy themselves in that instance also. As to their singing, what shall we say when we are told that their songs are songs of lamentation upon their departure which, while they sing, are always in tears, insomuch that one captain (more humane as I should conceive him, therefore, than the rest) threatened one of the women with a flogging, because the mournfulness of her song was too painful for his feelings. In order, however, not to trust too much to any sort of description, I will call the attention of the House to one species of evidence, which is absolutely infallible. Death, at least, is a sure ground of evidence, and the proportion of deaths will not only confirm, but, if possible, will even aggravate our suspicion of their misery in the transit. It will be found, upon an average of all ships of which evidence has been given at the privy council, that, exclusive of those who perish before they sail, not less than twelve and one-half per cent. perish in the passage. Besides these, the Jamaica report tells you that not less than four and one-half per cent. die on shore before the day of sale, which is only a week or two from the time of landing. One-third more die in the seasoning, and this in a country exactly like their own, where they are healthy and happy, as some of the evidences would pretend. The diseases, however, which they contract on shipboard, the astringent washes which are to hide their wounds, and the mischievous tricks used to make them up for sale, are, as the Jamaica report says,—a most precious and valuable report, which I shall often have to advert to,—one principal cause of this mortality. Upon the whole, however, here is a mortality of about fifty per cent., and this among negroes who are not bought unless quite healthy at first, and unless (as the phrase is with cattle) they are sound in wind and limb. How then can the House refuse its belief to the multiplied testimonies, before the privy council, of the savage treatment of the negroes in the middle passage? Nay, indeed, what need is there of any evidence? The number of deaths speaks for itself, and makes all such inquiry superfluous. As soon as ever I had arrived thus far in my investigation of the slave trade, I confess to you, sir, so enormous, so dreadful, so irremediable did its wickedness appear, that my own mind was completely made up for the abolition. A trade founded in iniquity, and carried on as this was, must be abolished, let the policy be what it might,—let the consequences be what they would, I from this time determined that I would never rest till I had effected its abolition. . . .

When we consider the vastness of the continent of Africa; when we reflect how all other countries have for some centuries past been advancing in happiness and civilization; when we think how in this same period all improvement in Africa has been defeated by her intercourse with Britain; when we reflect that it is we ourselves that have degraded them to that wretched brutishness and barbarity which we now plead as the justification of our guilt; how the slave trade has enslaved their minds, blackened their character, and sunk them so low in the scale of animal beings that some think the apes are of a higher class, and fancy the orang-outang has given them the go-by. What a mortification must we feel at having so long neglected to think of our guilt, or attempt any reparation! It seems, indeed, as if we had determined to forbear from all interference until the measure of our folly and wickedness was so full and complete; until the impolicy which eventually belongs to vice was become so plain and glaring that not an individual in the country should refuse to join in the abolition; it seems as if we had waited until the person most interested should be tired out with the folly and nefariousness of the trade, and should unite in petitioning against it.

Let us then make such amends as we can for the mischiefs we have done to the unhappy continent; let us recollect what Europe itself was no longer ago than three or four centuries. What if I should be able to show this House that in a civilized part of Europe, in the time of our Henry VII., there were people who actually sold their own children?

What if I should tell them that England itself was that country? What if I should point out to them that the very place where this inhuman traffic was carried on was the city of Bristol? Ireland at that time used to drive a considerable trade in slaves with these neighbouring barbarians; but a great plague having infested the country, the Irish were struck with a panic, suspected (I am sure very properly) that the plague was a punishment sent from heaven for the sin of the slave trade, and therefore abolished it. All I ask, therefore, of the people of Bristol is, that they would become as civilized now as Irishmen were four hundred years ago. Let us put an end at once to this inhuman traffic—let us stop this effusion of human blood. The true way to virtue is by withdrawing from temptation; let us then withdraw from these wretched Africans, those temptations to fraud, violence, cruelty, and injustice, which the slave trade furnishes. Wherever the sun shines let us go, round the world with him, diffusing our beneficence; but let us not traffic, only that we may set kings against their subjects, subjects against their kings, sowing discord in every village, fear and terror in every family, setting millions of our fellow-creatures a-hunting each other for slaves, creating fairs and markets for human flesh through one whole continent of the world, and, under the name of policy, concealing from ourselves all the baseness and iniquity of such a traffic. Why may we not hope, ere long, to see Hanse-towns established on the coast of Africa as they were on the Baltic? It is said the Africans are idle, but they are not too idle, at least, to catch one another; seven hundred to one thousand tons of rice are annually bought of them; by the same rule why should we not buy more? At Gambia one thousand of them are seen continually at work; why should not some more thousands be set to work in the same manner? It is the slave trade that causes their idleness and every other mischief. We are told by one witness: "They sell one another as they can"; and while they can get brandy by catching one another, no wonder they are too idle for any regular work.

I have one word more to add upon a most material point; but it is a point so self-evident that I shall be extremely short. It will appear from everything which I have said, that it is not regulation, it is not mere palliatives, that can cure this enormous evil. Total abolition is the only possible cure for it. The Jamaica report, indeed, admits much of the evil, but recommends it to us so to regulate the trade, that no persons should be kidnapped or made slaves contrary to the custom of Africa. But may they not be made slaves unjustly, and yet by no means contrary to the custom of Africa? I have shown they may for all the customs of Africa are rendered savage and unjust through the influence of this trade; besides, how can we discriminate between the slaves justly and unjustly made ? or, if we could, does any man believe that the British captains can, by any regulation in this country, be prevailed upon to refuse all such slaves as have not been fairly, honestly, and uprightly enslaved ? But granting even that they should do this, yet how would the rejected slaves be recompensed ? They are brought, as we are told, from three or four thousand miles off, and exchanged like cattle from one hand to another, until they reach the coast. We see then that it is the existence of the slave trade that is the spring of all this internal traffic, and that the remedy cannot be applied without abolition. Again, as to the middle passage, the evil is radical there also ; the merchant's profit depends upon the number that can be crowded together, and upon the shortness of their allowance. Astringents, escarotis, and all the other arts of making them up for sale, are of the very essence of the trade ; these arts will be concealed both from the purchaser and the legislature ; they are necessary to the owner's profit, and they will be practised. Again, chains and arbitrary treatment must be used in transporting them ; our seamen must be taught to play the tyrant, and that depravation of manners among them (which some very judicious persons have treated of as the very worst part of the business) cannot be hindered, while the trade itself continues. As to the slave merchants, they have already told you that if two slaves to a ton are not permitted, the trade cannot continue ; so that the objections are done away by themselves on this quarter ; and in the West Indies, I have shown that the abolition is the only possible stimulus whereby a regard to population, and consequently to the happiness of the negroes, can be effectually excited in those islands.

I trust, therefore, I have shown that upon every ground the total abolition ought to take place. I have urged many things which are not my own leading motives for proposing it, since I have wished to show every description of gentlemen, and particularly the West India planters, who deserve every attention, that the abolition is politic upon their own principles also. Policy, however, sir, is not my principle, and I am not ashamed to say it. There is a principle above everything that is political ; and when I reflect on the command which says : "Thou shalt do no murder," believing the authority to be Divine, how can I dare to set up any reasonings of my own against it ? And, sir, when we think of eternity, and of the future consequences of all human conduct, what is there in this life that should make any man contradict the dictates of his conscience, the principles of justice, the laws of religion, and of God ? Sir, the nature and all the circumstances of this trade are now laid open to us ; we can no longer plead ignorance, we cannot evade it, it is now an object placed before us, we cannot pass it ; we may spurn it, we may kick it out of our way, but we cannot turn aside so as to avoid seeing it; for it is brought now so directly before our eyes that this House must decide, and must justify to all the world, and to their own consciences, the rectitude of the grounds and principles of their decision. A society has been established for the abolition of this trade, in which Dissenters, Quakers, Churchmen—in which the most conscientious of all persuasions have all united, and made a common cause in this great question. Let not Parliament be the only body that is insensible to the principles of national justice. Let us make reparation to Africa, so far as we can, by establishing a trade upon true commercial principles, and we shall soon find the rectitude of our conduct rewarded by the benefits of a regular and a growing commerce.

DATE OF ISSUE

This book must be returned within 3, 7, 14 days of its issue. A fine of ONE ANNA per day will be charged if the book is overdue.