

ber of positions in the civil service which are open to the educated lawyer in Prussia, and the number of "livings" from law practice, amount, according to our author, to about eight or nine thousand, about four hundred of which become vacant each year. The universities and courts are now turning out yearly about eight hundred and sixty assessors, as those are termed who have completed the second examination, making about four hundred and sixty more than can find positions in the Government service or openings in a practice. The author concludes that the number of students should decline by at least six or eight hundred before supply and demand will be fairly equalized.

Prof. Schulte concludes his article with the statement that certain measures, which, in the opinion of all who have studied the question, are imperatively necessary, should be immediately taken to check the enormous attendance. These measures he indicates to be (1) the lengthening of the period of university study by at least a half, and better by a whole, year; (2) the adoption of some means to secure the actual attendance of students at the lectures. The best means to do this would be to hand over the first examination entirely to the universities, so that the examiners in this test should be the professors themselves. A second means would be to introduce an examination at the end of the second year, and make the passing of it the condition of being promoted to the third year of the course. It is significant that both these changes would be in the direction of our American college system.

It may seem strange to an American that such universal complaints come to us from Germany that there are too many students at the universities; but such facts as are here given us make it clear why it should be so. If a man spends the years of his life from the sixth to the twenty-ninth in preparing himself for one career, he is very likely to be unfit for any other; and if there is no place for him in the one he has chosen, he is likely to make a poor showing in another calling where he must compete with men who have spent all the years he has given to the law to the work of preparation for that particular branch. A system which requires for each calling a special and long-continued technical training, is also a system in which a man cannot go from one branch to another: having been educated for one thing, he must stick to it. It is easy to see how, under such circumstances, a calling may be easily overcrowded without any hope of relief except by the comparatively slow process of discouraging young men from entering the preparatory stages. This is the state of things in Germany to-day, and the Government is actively exerting itself to discourage attendance at the universities. Another interesting fact about the German university is the class of considerations which determines whether a student shall enter one faculty or another. Unpleasant reflections are often made upon the devotion to the material side of life which is supposed to be characteristic of the American; but it may fairly be doubted whether any higher institution in the world affords a better example of a pure and undying devotion to the bread-and-butter aspects of life than a German university, where the mass of students rush this way or that, taking up law, medicine, theology, or teaching, indifferently, according to the prospect of finding Government employment soonest in one branch or the other. The only difference between Germany and other countries is that the Government of the former, with a wise fore-sight for the ideal side of life, has made a bread-and-butter employment of devotion to pure science, and has connected with this pursuit substantial rewards which are not to be had in other countries, and which have brought it about that

Germany now stands at the head of modern nations in nearly every line of scientific achievement.

THE IRISH HURLY-BURLY.

LONDON, May 13, 1886.

Is Mr. Gladstone riding for a fall, or is he going to save the second reading of his Irish Government Bill by some great stroke of policy at the last moment? Such is the problem on which every political mind is now at work. Your readers may perhaps be weary of following the turns and changes of this home-rule debate, but there is nothing else in which our people can be induced to take any interest. Bills which at any other time would have raised debates of some importance drag wearily through their successive stages; and on the nights appropriated to private members the House of Commons is counted out as a matter of course. Lord Rosebery is working away at the irrepressible "claims of Greece," not without credit to himself; but his proceedings are hardly noticed by the active politicians who used to rouse the echoes of Willis's Rooms in the days when the Eastern question was a question for every elector. Troubles are not wanting in Burma; there is a new fishery dispute (not a very serious dispute, I hope) in Canada; but these matters will hardly find their way into the question paper of the House of Commons until we know what is to happen to the Irish bills. All the prophets had made up their minds that the Prime Minister would make any effort and almost any concession to procure the acceptance of the principle of home rule. Mr. Chamberlain had formed his own estimate of the price that would be offered for his support. But all forecasts were falsified by Mr. Gladstone's speech of Monday night. He offered no concession; he made no special effort to convince or conciliate anybody except Lord Hartington—the one Liberal adversary whose vote is not to be had on any terms. As for Mr. Chamberlain, he was simply ignored; at one point he was brought within the scope of Mr. Gladstone's argument, but not by any personal reference; only by a backward wave of the hand which seemed to recognize him as a feature in the political landscape. This is not what Mr. Chamberlain is accustomed to, and he expresses his feelings and his intentions with even more than his usual frankness.

What does it all mean? It may mean that Mr. Gladstone feels that he has the country with him, and that he hopes to overcome the Liberal opposition, not by persuasion, but by the threat of having them ruled out of the party. Or it may mean that he no longer hopes to overcome; that he wishes to provoke defeat. If the Irish-Government Bill is rejected, he will be able to choose between several policies, any one of which affords him a hope of ultimate success. He may advise the Queen to dissolve Parliament. It is true that her Majesty is not bound to act on the advice; the constitutional rule is tolerably clear on this point, and it was laid down with emphasis by Mr. Gladstone himself in 1873. But if the Queen should prefer to send for Lord Hartington or Lord Salisbury, and if either of these gentlemen should undertake to form a Government, the dissolution must come, and that before long. Meantime Mr. Gladstone might hold the balance of power in the House of Commons, while enjoying leisure enough to make a series of great speeches out of doors in favor of home rule, and so to prepare a triumph for himself at the general election. Supposing (not a very extreme supposition) that the Queen is not strongly disposed to favor Mr. Gladstone and his bill, she may perhaps think it wise to dissolve. The Liberal party is now in complete confusion, and the Gladstonian section of the party could hardly succeed in ousting all

the good Liberals who oppose the bill. The transfer of the Irish vote would not quite make up for the loss caused by internal divisions; and if there were a loss of twenty or thirty seats to the Liberals, they would still have a majority, but they would have sustained a moral defeat sufficiently marked to justify the Lords in rejecting or modifying any measure of home rule. But the chance of a moral defeat for Mr. Gladstone, if we suppose it to be an inducement to dissolve, ought not to prevail against the strong reasons which forbid a dissolution in the middle of the first session of a new Parliament, and in the busiest season of the agricultural year.

The delays and doubts of British parties are putting a severe strain on the patience of the Irish members, and they are bearing the strain very well. In private as in public they take a rational and moderate tone; they seem to be sincerely desirous of putting an end to the long struggle in which they are engaged, and if they obtain a separate legislature, I believe they will do their best to make it work. They admit that the provisions, and especially the financial provisions, of Mr. Gladstone's bill are likely to cause serious difficulties; but they hold that difficulties may be overcome if Englishmen will only go a little way to meet the spirit that will be evoked in Ireland by the concession of independence. One member from Munster assures me that an "incalculable effect" has been produced on popular opinion in his neighborhood by the mere promise of home rule. He added a remark which is worth recording: "You must not think," he said, "that the Irish people follow a constitutional question as you follow it. They care very little for all this discussion about powers and limitations; if you give them something they can call a Parliament, why, you may draw its powers yourself, and they won't object." While the Parnellites display the cheerful moderation of a winning party, the Ulstermen are in a state of dangerous excitement. It is certain that some of them are buying gunpowder, and sensational newspapers do their best to aggravate the dangers of the situation by talking loud nonsense about civil war. It is very unlikely that there will be anything to call war; but it is quite possible that there may be firing of shots. For some time past the people who buy up old Government rifles have found a market in Ireland, and especially in Ulster. The Protestant farmers have become accustomed to attend political meetings with rifles and revolvers; and when Lord Iddesleigh was in Ireland he had to caution his friends against firing off their guns "in the lightness of their hearts." And now the editors of certain London papers are doing their best to persuade these excitable persons that if they rise against a Parnellite Parliament, Lord Wolseley, and Lord Charles Beresford, and a host of loyal officers will throw up their commissions to join the revolt. According to credible witnesses, the two noble lords specially named have used very strong language about the Irish Government Bill and its author, and about their own Parnellite countrymen. But before we have time to construct an Irish legislature they will probably see cause to moderate their zeal for the Union, and they may even do good service by showing their friends in Ulster what exactly is meant by war, and what responsibility rests on those who begin it.

In the eighteenth century, members of the House of Commons, if they travelled beyond the history and constitution of their own country, drew their examples and warnings from classical antiquity. In our day it is the fashion to refer to the laws of foreign countries and the policy of foreign statesmen. This home-rule controversy is constantly enlivened by the introduction of side issues from every unexpected quarter. Why

were Holland and Belgium separated in 1830? Is the present Constitution of Austria-Hungary a success? and (a question some omit to ask) what is the Constitution of Austria-Hungary? Does federal government work well in the United States? This last question receives various answers, according to the taste and fancy of the individual debater. Politicians of the Chamberlain school assure us that it works admirably, combining the maximum of national dignity with the maximum of local independence. Anti-federalists assure us that the system produces confusion and over-legislation; that no country can provide fit men for two sets of representative bodies. We are also told that the federal system gives too much importance to lawyers and to the legal element in politics. Our own experiments in constitution-building do not seem to help us much in the present difficulty. We know how to establish a self-governing colony; but then no British statesman will admit that Ireland can ever become as independent as New Zealand. We have tried our hands at confederation in Canada; but then it is just a little doubtful how far the experiment has succeeded. There certainly has been a good deal of litigation between the Dominion and the provinces; Quebec has more than once pursued what Scotch theologians call "divisive courses." Nova Scotia, which has welcomed Mr. Gladstone's bill with effusion, is itself in the act of proposing to secede from the Confederation. All these cases are now more or less in point, and they are cited freely on all sides. If this controversy has no other practical result, it will at least have made considerable additions to the legal and historical knowledge of our people. R.

THE HOME-RULE MOVEMENT.—I. ITS STRENGTH.

OXFORD, May 13, 1886.

THE revolution in England moves apace. But a month has passed since my last letter, and the movement for home rule has already entered on a new stage. My present object is to analyze, as dispassionately as may be possible to an opponent, the causes to which that movement owes its strength. In my next communication I shall say something of its weakness.

1. The primary condition on which depends the success of Mr. Gladstone's new policy is a peculiar state of English opinion.

For the first time in the course of our history our national policy is under the influence, not so much of democratic convictions, as of a much more formidable thing—democratic sentiment. Every idea which can rightly or wrongly be called popular, commands, even among persons who think themselves Conservatives, a ready assent. Hence (be it at once admitted) flow some of the best characteristics of our age. Hence the detestation of inhumanity; hence the growth of the conviction that property has at least as many duties as rights; hence the faith that by some means or other the toiling multitudes ought to share in the prosperity which is due, in part at least, to their ceaseless labor. Hence, too, arise a host of dubious, not to say ignoble, ideas, as that the voice of the majority is the voice of God; that it is useless to struggle with any prevalent phase of opinion; that any body of persons who claim to be united by a sentiment of nationality have an inherent right to be treated as an independent nation. It were needless to explain how the currency of democratic sentiment tells in favor of home rule. It is, however, worth pointing out that democratic ideas at the present day exert far less influence from any enthusiasm they excite, than from their singular capacity for dissolving the convictions by which the claims of every kind of revolutionists are opposed. The argument that if Irish house-

holders had votes, the majority of the United Kingdom must concede anything which the majority of Irish householders desire, is logically absurd; but, combined with other causes, it convinced a Conservative Government that in Ireland the executive was under no obligation to enforce the law of the land. The most curious, however, and the most alarming feature of the situation is the way in which democratic sentiment blends in the minds of modern Englishmen with feelings of a much less respectable order. Dislike of trouble, hatred to the performance of arduous political duties, indifference (one is constrained to add) to ordinary commonplace ideas of law and justice, are at the present moment influencing both members of Parliament and, it may be feared, the electors on whose wishes the conduct of members of Parliament depends. It is hardly too much to say that half the arguments used by politicians in favor of home rule amount simply to this: that five hundred and odd English gentlemen cannot be expected to resist the continuous pressure of the eighty-six Parnellites. Respectable members of Parliament yield, to the terror of being bored, what their fathers would not concede to armed rebellion.

2. No foreign observer can fully appreciate the immense influence exerted by Mr. Gladstone's personality. He represents in his person in a very singular way the best and the worst features of the sentiment of the day. He is also one of the few modern politicians who possess the energy which characterized the statesmen of the last generation. When you add to this that he is, to use his own language, an "old Parliamentary hand"—that is to say, a thoroughly trained and very skilful party manager—you understand part, at least, of the sources of his influence; but there is a good deal more in this influence than it is easy to sum up in a few words. High personal character has at all times told very strongly on the imagination of Englishmen. It was admittedly quite as much the superior morality as the genius of Chatham and his son which made the two Pitts the heroes of England. George the Third, with all his dulness and his cunning, was a popular idol because he was the "Good old King"; and Mr. Gladstone is to the electors the "good man" of English politics. In part by his merits and great powers, in part also, in my judgment, by his genuine sympathy with some of the weaker sides of English sentiment, Mr. Gladstone has obtained a hold on popular feeling which he can hardly lose. Fickleness, as Macaulay pointed out long ago, is not really the vice of the people. The masses cling to their idols; it is more doubtful whether they choose the objects of their admiration with perfect discretion. But the influence of the Premier is, it is fair to remember, due to a great extent to a circumstance independent of either the merits or the defects of his character. Modern democracies, in Europe at least, show a marked tendency, which is not in all respects a bad one, to place more store by persons than by principles. The people (they feel) can judge of a man's character; they cannot judge of his policy. The result is, that the one predominant idea which sways the conduct of thousands of electors is that Mr. Gladstone's policy must be supported simply because it is Mr. Gladstone's. No sensible person doubts that his present policy would not have had a hearing if proposed by any other politician. Few cool observers can, I suspect, doubt that if Mr. Gladstone were to vanish from the political arena, two-thirds of his followers would hasten to explain that they had never meant to favor home rule. I can easily believe that the Prime Minister himself would admit the difficulties besetting his policy far more readily than would his followers. It is quite possible that Mr. Gladstone is not a Gladstonian.

3. Many persons who are neither swayed by sentiment nor victims to the disease of Gladstonianism, are so impressed, and naturally enough, with the failure of all past attempts to govern Ireland; they are so disgusted with the weary round of concession following on coercion, and coercion again succeeding to concession, that they are willing to try almost any experiment which may give a chance of closing the secular feud between Great Britain and Ireland. This feeling harmonizes well with the kind of political hopelessness which prevails among many of the educated classes. Mr. Gladstone is the most sanguine of optimists; it is quite natural that he should exert exaggerated power over men who feel their own lack of hope. A moralist or statesman may condemn all forms of despair; but it is the merest justice to persons who are not likely to receive just treatment from partisans of any class, to recognize the fact that Mr. Gladstone's proposals are supported by men, who appreciate its dangers, because they see in it at least a chance of making a new departure in our Irish policy. Nothing is so idle as to suppose that statesmen such, for example, as Lord Spencer, are influenced by the spirit of vanity or affection. They may be taking a leap in the dark, but they are taking it to escape from what they deem to be an untenable and intolerable position.

4. English parties, and especially the Liberal party, have of recent years been organized on a plan which approaches the American model. We have our caucuses, our managers, our wire-pullers—in short, our "machine." At the present moment the Machine, as far as the Liberal party is concerned, is worked wholly in Mr. Gladstone's interest. There is no need of explaining to the citizens of New York all that this means, but they will easily perceive that the fact of Mr. Gladstone's supporters being in command of the party mechanism greatly favors the movement for home-rule, or indeed any movement which may be identified with the name of the Prime Minister. One curious result, however, of our new party organization may escape the attention of American observers. A new element of uncertainty is added to the numerous difficulties of ascertaining the true set of opinion among the electors. No one knows how far the resolutions of so-called public meetings do or do not express the feeling of the public. It is impossible to tell how far machine-made opinion may not pass current for the genuine article. In any case, members of Parliament are rendered extremely nervous about their seats should they oppose the party, and the party is at this moment identified with Mr. Gladstone. Here, however, I am nearly touching upon the weakness as well as the strength of the home-rule movement, and that topic I purposely reserve for my next letter.

A. V. DICEY.

THE DUC DE BROGLIE'S RECOLLECTIONS.

PARIS, May 6, 1886.

THE publication of the 'Souvenirs' of the late Duc de Broglie, the father of the present Duke, has begun. One volume has appeared, and I hear that it will be followed by the publication of two others. Among the men who have played some part in the affairs of their time, few have resisted the temptation to write such memoirs: "Ecce enim breves anni transeunt, et semitemper quam non revertar ambulo." The biographical notes which are now published were written when the Duc de Broglie was already advanced in years; they have not the form of a journal, you do not feel in them the spur of the occasion. They are wanderings over the past, but what a past!—the French Revolution, the Empire, the return of the old dynasty. The preface is written in a grave, solemn style: