

is made of bounties to enrich the whole nation. Protection is a phrase which has come to have a definite meaning in politics. No voter would understand it to signify the same thing as a pension. Therefore, we may assume that Judge Kelley, so far from intending to "largely reduce this tax," as Senator Sherman proposed at Springfield, and to substitute a bounty in place of it, would perhaps increase it, to the end of enriching the whole nation by making it worth while to plant sugarcane in Florida. There are other signs of coming disagreement among the champions of protection, but this one relating to sugar is the most threatening. Some of them favor the repeal of the whole internal-revenue system as a means of getting rid of the Treasury surplus. This plan is opposed by the greater number, who apprehend trouble with the temperance men, and fear lest the tariff reformers should raise the cry of "free whiskey against taxed sugar." We shall not attempt to decide between them, but we think that the next Presidential campaign will not be devoid of interest if it shall require from those who talk magisterially about protection to American industry some definitions of that phrase, and some particular applications of it to particular industries.

THE QUESTION OF CHURCH UNION.

THE annual meetings of several denominations have been held since the Episcopalians and the Congregationalists were in conjunction—or collision, it is hard to say which—at Chicago last fall, and in all of them, we believe, the question of church union came up in one form or another. The enthusiastic advocates of union will no doubt see in this new and widespread interest in the matter a proof that their hopes are speedily to be realized; but to an outsider it seems difficult to decide whether the various deliverances of official bodies, and the different bases of union put forward, are really parleyings before a truce or sparring before a fight. In a similar way, it is uncertain whether the announcement that the Congress of Churches—that recent organization devised for the very end of church coöperation—will hold no meeting this year, is an indication that its managers consider its work done, or that they see serious obstacles in the way even of such harmony as in the past.

This new movement for coöperation among the churches as a first step and for union as the final result, springs from two classes of impulses. Sentiment of one sort and another has much to do with it. There is a feeling of shame on the part of many at the divided condition of Protestant Christendom, especially at the fact that its divisions are almost wholly traditional, as they believe, and without a present justifying ground. This feeling sometimes emerges in regretful comparisons of fragmentary Protestantism with the solidarity of the Catholic world. Sometimes it arises from a sense of the vast forces in the modern world opposed to the Church, or at least indifferent to it, and of the need of uniting against a common enemy. With some this sentimental longing for a consolidation of the sects is due to their studies in the history of the Church, and their conviction of its essential one-

ness through all the centuries; in others it is caused by their conception of a National Church, embracing all Christians, as essential to the idea of a church at all. In Mr. Maurice this tendency of thought was clearly marked, and from him it seems to have passed to many others. Practical considerations are also behind the movement. The unnecessary cost of maintaining several distinct and antagonistic churches where one would suffice, is beginning to be felt. The business sense of the managers of church boards and missionary societies is rebelling against the manifest waste involved in present methods. The business men in the churches, so far as their attention has been drawn to this aspect of the case, are unanimous in thinking that a remedy should be sought for the extravagance of the existing competitive system in a scheme of comity, alliance, or, if need be, union.

With such a two-fold force back of it, it is not surprising that the movement should be gathering headway and gaining importance. It seems to us, however, that one vital element in the whole problem has been for the most part curiously overlooked. We mean the thoroughly different attitudes, towards the question of church union, of churches in the city and of those in the country. The former, as a class, are for union, or something approaching it; the latter, as a class, are against it. This difference springs, of course, out of the different conditions of social and thus of religious life, to be encountered in city and country. The great massing of people in the large cities has of itself done much to obliterate denominational distinctions there, and to bring about a state of general tolerance and good feeling. With such a vast population in reach, especially with such great numbers not reached at all, the rivalry of churches along the old lines becomes absurd. And practically it is far less the denomination of a church than its location, the eminence of its pastor, or the attractiveness of its choir, that operates in its favor. In the small towns, however, of stationary or diminishing population, the case is wholly different. Denominational preference is there a matter of inheritance as truly as the family name. The stratified prejudices of generations are built into the foundations of the separate churches. Open strife between the sects is now rare, it is true, even in the country, but a keen rivalry, a suspicious watchfulness, a petty jealousy, are still common. More than this, it is a frequent thing for church relationships to accompany and mark rank in the social scale. To belong to a given church is to be in "society," to be a member of another is to be under social disqualification.

All this is well known, we presume, and it is clear that to substitute for such a state of things a union of churches would be equivalent to a sweeping social revolution. Any new idea is proverbially slow in finding lodgment in the rural mind, and that mind would be simply aghast at the prospect of a change of the nature proposed. As the villages of the country, stranded at one side of the stream of population, are exactly the places where the need for church union is most crying, so they are also the places where opposition to such union is and will be the most intense. Anything to exalt

and emphasize denominational peculiarities the country may be depended upon to advocate; anything to minimize them it is certain to oppose. It was noteworthy at the Episcopal Convention that the dioceses whose delegates voted most solidly for the change of the name of the Church into something which would be generally taken as exclusive, were the feeblere and less populous ones. Of like significance is the fact that the *Chicago Interior*, the organ of the provincial Presbyterian churches of the Northwest, fairly foams at the mouth when it speaks of the action of the New York Presbytery ("ministers with rich wives, and professors," it calls that body) in "hailing" the action of the Bishops looking towards church union.

We refer to these matters only to remind those interested that they will have to be reckoned with. It seems plain to us that it will be long before the social traditions of the country churches can be so broken up as is implied in the proposition to wipe out sectarian lines. As the strength of church life at present is dependent in a very large degree upon social relations, it is evident that a great social obstacle in the way of a church movement such as is the one we refer to, must be a serious obstacle.

THE PRESENT CONDITION OF IRELAND.

DUBLIN, May 21, 1887.

A RAILWAY journey in the south of Ireland, with a sojourn of a few days in Cork and Waterford, has set me thinking much upon the actual condition of the country, especially as compared with the past. It is the cue of the inhabitants of most countries to make the best of the spot of earth "wherein it has pleased Providence to cast their lot." Here the opposite tendency prevails, and I cannot but think it has a materially depressing effect upon our fortunes. All parties speak as if it were their interest to represent affairs in the most miserable condition possible, and worse now than ever before. Nationalists desire to show the blighting effects of British rule; Protestants maintain that real progress is impossible in a country where priestcraft prevails; and adherents of the Government generally throw all the blame upon the machinations of a horde of needy agitators distracting a naturally well-inclined people from their legitimate occupations. "Bad as the state of Ireland has been since the Union, it never was worse than at present—has not our once happy population of 8,000,000 been reduced below 5,000,000 by landlord greed and alien rule?" "Infamous as has been the course of Irish agitation from O'Connell downwards, never before has Ireland been coerced as it is at the present moment by Parnell and his gang—little wonder that business is at a standstill, that our cities are falling into ruins, and that the life-blood of the country is leaving our shores."

The truth is, apart from political acerbities, Ireland was never, upon the whole, in a better condition for those living in it than it is at the present moment. There is much distress among evicted tenants and those who are holding on in despair to little pieces of land, from which under any Government or social arrangement they could hardly wring a living. The profits of farming are greatly reduced. There is no little distress among landowners—helpless ladies and the like—due to legal reductions of rent, and fair and unfair refusals to pay on the part of tenants. Consequent on the importation of American flour, and the increased output here by the

larger mills through the general adoption of roller machinery, the flour millers of Ireland (once the staple manufacturers of the country) are in considerable difficulties. Most of the smaller mills have been permanently closed, and with the larger mills, unless some unlooked-for turn comes in the flour trade, it has almost become a question of the survival of the fittest. Nevertheless, upon the whole, the mass of the inhabitants of Ireland are in a happier condition than before. We cannot reasonably wish to recall our population of 8,000,000 living in the squalor and wretchedness which prevailed within my memory between 1840 and the famine of 1846-47. Ruined homesteads and depopulated villages may appear mournful, but how did their inhabitants live? How could they ever have lived here; and how are their descendants now living by the Hudson and the St. Lawrence? That the change was beneficial for them and their descendants in no wise justified the coercive legislation and the agrarian oppression by which it was effected. There is something appalling in the depopulation which has gone on in Ireland during the Victorian era. It remains to be seen under home rule to what extent this has been due to natural causes, to what extent it can be prevented or modified by political institutions.

Meanwhile Ireland was never more profoundly discontented than at present, mainly because she never was stronger or better educated. An English statesman once proposed, as a panacea for Irish discontent, a bridge connecting her with England, or a steam ferry free at the expense of the Government. But, in fact, our discontent has increased with increased communication with Great Britain and the United States. Political subjection has become intolerable to the Irish peasant and artisan since they have been enabled to compare the institutions under which they live with those which their expatriated fellow-countrymen enjoy elsewhere. The Irish land system has been doomed since the peasant-proprietary and simple-transfer systems of your country have been brought within ten days of our shores.

I saw nothing in the south of Ireland indicative of widespread and general distress. I was impressed with the superiority of the poorer class generally in and about Cork to the more mixed race here in Dublin; the former striking me as more pure-blooded and capable. I particularly noticed the comfortable, decent appearance of the emigrants who, at Mallow and other stations, were taking the train for Queenstown—pleasing, bright, well-dressed girls; fine, able young men clad in strong garments. I could not but contrast them with the wretched-looking Irish emigrants of twenty years ago, and contrast the short and well appointed ocean passage of today with the long weeks of misery endured in the "coffin" sailing ships that, in the famine times, took in their human cargoes at our ports. The cheerfulness of our present emigrants contrasted strikingly with the anguish which used to characterize our departing exiles. America is, in truth, now as near to us in idea as Belfast was to Cork a few years ago. The voyage is little dreaded, and America is, in familiar thought, almost a part of Ireland.

What is the cause of the increased exodus which has marked this spring? The Unionist papers say that some are fleeing from the tyranny of the National League, and others because they dread the baneful operations of the Crimes Act. It is really due to various causes: the apparent revival of trade in the United States, the continued agricultural depression here, the deferment of the hope of a speedy settlement of the agrarian and national question. No doubt, this continued depopulation of our country arises largely from causes beyond our control; no doubt, most

of these emigrants will be far happier with you than would be possible in Ireland; but it is hard to bear philosophically the permanent departure from us of our young men and women, such as crowded the cars in which I travelled from Thurles to Cork.

The Irish Catholics ought to feel proud of the beautiful churches, cathedrals, monasteries, and schools with which they have covered the country since their emancipation under O'Connell. We Protestants cannot like the system, but to them it is everything elevated, pure, and holy, and we should try to regard it from their standpoint and remember the good effect it has had upon them. Probably no other people so poor, entirely out of their own pockets, and without Government assistance, ever in like time erected so many beautiful buildings. Fifty years ago Catholic churches, as a rule, were slated, meeting-house-like buildings—in towns, generally hidden away in back streets; now they are handsome cut-stone erections, often of stately proportions, crowning hill-tops and dominating our villages and towns. They have cost much money. They have withdrawn millions sterling from reproductive investment. I have heard Catholic priests and laymen question the good results of such outlay upon the economic condition of the country. Yet, no doubt, on the whole it has had an elevating and educating influence and added to the people's self respect. It would be hard to foretell the results of such an establishment of the religious orders as has been going on and is still going on over Ireland. Protestants may safely leave it to be dealt with by the Catholic people themselves. If by Catholics considered desirable, the Church will be curbed here as it has been in other Catholic countries, and this will be done all the sooner and more effectually if Protestants only have the sense not to interfere.

It would be hard to estimate the educational effect which the establishment of the National League branches is producing in Ireland. Our people generally never had any previous similar training. They form little parliaments, where the people learn and are learning the conduct of affairs. They are carried on for the most part by the people themselves—often, it is true, with the help of the Catholic clergy of the locality (not always the men most apt for worldly affairs); generally without any assistance from the upper or better-educated classes. These societies are often crude and narrow; their proceedings are sometimes rather wild, liable to be mixed up with all sorts of affairs, and frequently, no doubt, are turned to private ends by designing individuals. If passing resolutions could remedy the ills of humanity, there would be little to complain of in Ireland. Membership in these branch societies would be intolerable to many Nationalists who are members of the Central League in Dublin; still, they have, upon the whole, a most beneficial effect.

One sign of the increasing spirit of the people is the general establishment of foot ball and hurling clubs, and the Gaelic athletic associations. Our old games had almost died out; we never, as a people, took to the close playing necessary for cricket and such amusements. Within the last few years hurling has been revived, and the thud of the foot-ball is now a common sound in spare hours, and on Sundays and holidays, all over the country. It was most interesting in Cork to see the thousands who poured out every Sunday to the race-course to witness play between clubs from neighboring districts. Shut out from any general military discipline and volunteering, and from the management of our affairs, we are, of all the peoples I know, most untrained, the least accustomed to meeting and learning to contest and differ without loss of temper. The increase of manly exer-

cises among the people is to be regarded as a distinct gain, and in itself a moral discipline. Another old Irish, or Anglo-Irish, game is (under the present policy of the police to interfere as little as possible with ordinary offences not savoring of agrarian-agitation or politics) coming again into vogue. I refer to the bowling by opposing parties along the roads from one town or village to another, especially in the south of Ireland. Iron balls of one-pound to two-pound weight are used. It is a game requiring great skill and dexterity, frightfully dangerous to vehicles and foot-passengers when a proper lookout ahead is not kept, and strictly forbidden by law, but universally practised. The balls are openly sold in our country towns.

So long as I can remember, it has been the tendency of the trading and mercantile classes here to make out that they were on the verge of ruin. This discourages possible competitors and applications for subscriptions. They now declare themselves worse than ever—"Parnell and the National League have undone the country;" yet during all these years the requirements and style of living of these classes have been rising, and the men who now say they are being ruined are living in a way that to their grandfathers would have appeared princely. Compared to what is called "progress" in other countries, there is little in Ireland. Upon the whole, nevertheless, I fail to see that the classes to which I refer, and among whom I live, are in a worse condition than they have been. We cannot be always increasing our scale of comfort, we cannot expect greater and greater luxuries, and the many distractions now within our reach, without paying for them. Our sons and daughters cannot avoid the competition in life now inevitable with the sons and daughters of our workpeople, who by their education at the national schools are as well qualified, and by their rougher bringing up in some respects better adapted, for the battle of life.

With reference to this outcry of general ruin, I have been interested in looking up the latest available statistics:

	Total profits of the business, mercantile, and professional classes in Ireland returned for income tax.	Total poor-law expenditure in Ireland, considerably increased of late years by the freer distribution of outdoor relief.
1877.....	£8,382,823	£ 780,326
1878.....	8,642,722	845,608
1879.....	8,711,456	847,955
1880.....	8,365,578	920,967
1881.....	8,210,397	965,128
1882.....	8,192,482	967,483
1883.....	8,288,571	1,042,845
1884.....	8,536,104	945,930
1885.....	8,588,948	887,906
1886.....	Not published	904,018

From these figures it would appear that upon the whole the better class of traders who pay income tax have not suffered appreciably; while the poor are better off than they were a few years ago.

Dublin, where for the most part the non-absentee aristocracy and landowners deal, is said in especial to have been ruined by the agitation. I cannot see it, either in the general appearance of the city or in the mode of life of those around me. The condition of the poor in Dublin mainly depends upon that of the middle and upper classes. The following figures show the average

rate per pound on the valuation for poor relief in the city for the past ten years. No alteration has occurred in the valuation of the city or the incidence of the tax to take away from the value of these figures for comparison.

1878.....	2s. 4d.	1883.....	2s. 9d.
1879.....	2s. 3d.	1884.....	2s. 9d.
1880.....	2s. 4d.	1885.....	2s. 5d.
1881.....	2s. 4d.	1886.....	2s. 1d.
1882.....	2s. 9d.	1887.....	1s. 10d.

According to this table there is now less poverty in Dublin than for the past ten years. D. B.

FRANCE AND THE ARMED PEACE.

PARIS, May 19.

WE have just gone through a second war panic, and this time it may be said without exaggeration that the emotion, though of shorter duration than that which accompanied the late elections in Germany, was even more acute. In truth, the state of Europe is most painful. It is probably difficult for an American to realize the condition of a country like France, where military service has become obligatory, where every man between twenty and twenty-five belongs to the active army, every man between twenty-five and thirty to the reserve of the active army, every man between thirty and thirty-five to what is called the Territorial Army, and, finally, every man between thirty-five and forty to the reserve of the Territorial Army. And this reserve, this Territorial Army, are not myths, they are not merely on paper: the reservists must serve terms of twenty-eight days, the territorials terms of thirteen days. Every man has his *livret*, a little pocket-book in which his duty is set down; he knows where he has to go in case of a mobilization, after how many days he is expected to be in the ranks. The work of mobilization has been prepared in the minutest details; it is thought that the first combatant ready will have great advantages over his adversary, and in consequence everything has been arranged in view of this sudden preparation.

It is hardly possible to imagine what would be the social effects of a mobilization. One of my friends, who is director of a coal mine, has just studied the effects of a mobilization merely in the mining districts. His statistics show that more than half the miners would have to leave their work immediately, the youngest and the strongest, those who work in the depths of the mine; he calculates that the home product of all the French coal districts would necessarily be diminished more than half; the importation of foreign coal might, in case of war, become an impossibility, and in that case there would not be coal enough in the country for the railroads and for the necessities of the special industries which war would not arrest. This is only one instance of the great trouble which a war would produce, and many others could be found.

Besides the economical and the social aspects of the question, there is the political aspect; and here I know that "*incedo per ignes*." But surely the history of the last war and of the Commune which followed it is not reassuring; and, if I speak of the Commune, it is necessary to say that, though this terrible and bloody movement of the Commune only broke out after the preliminaries of peace had been signed, the Commune had a virtual existence during the whole siege. I would advise all those who wish to have distinct proofs of it to read a very remarkable little volume, '*Mémoires de la dernière guerre*,' etc., by M. Sarazin, Head-Surgeon of the First Corps of the French Army. Sarazin followed the *corps d'armée* of Gen.

Ducrot; he was in the midst of Wissembourg, of Reichshoffen, of Sedan, and escaped by way of Belgium to Paris. His testimony is very valuable, being that of a brave soldier and a true patriot. He shows, for instance, that the only two regular regiments of the line which were left in Paris during the siege lost as many men and officers as the 350,000 national guards who paraded before Trochu. Would the male population of Paris, between twenty and forty, consent to leave the capital, in case of a new war? Would there not, at any rate, be a refractory nucleus, composed of the worst elements of Paris, and determined to remain near the centre of government, all ready for revolution and for disorder? It is impossible not to put such questions, nor to see their relation to the character of future events.

For the reasons which I have rapidly set forth, it may be affirmed that the French, as a nation, have no desire for war. It is asking too much to ask them to forget altogether what they suffered and lost in 1870; but, till a very recent period, it cannot be denied that the French, though they reorganized their army and altered their military institutions after the Prussian model, have not been a perturbing element in European politics, and have not shown an undue desire to form alliances, to foment intrigues, and to prepare difficulties for their neighbors. There has not been, in the complicated division and subdivision of French parties, a party which could be called a war party. We have lived, in some sense, very quietly for a number of years, and we have enjoyed for a long time a certain sense of security.

It must be confessed that this sense of security is gone; it would be difficult to explain exactly why. Such changes cannot be laid entirely to one man: they are somewhat like changes in the atmosphere. Of course some men have assumed responsibilities of a dangerous character, but would they have assumed them if they had not felt that they could do so? There is certainly no real war party in the country, but the generation now coming to the front is not exactly in the same state of mind as the generation which saw the war and the Commune. No man has ever learned much from another's experience. The youngest generations hardly believe in the possibility of a new Commune. They admit willingly that in time of war every man between the ages of twenty and forty would enter the ranks of the army, and that Paris, inhabited for a while only by older people, would be as easy to keep in order as any other town. They believe that France is better prepared for a war than she was in 1870; but the prevailing sentiment is a sort of wearying of the present uncertainty. It was thought after 1870, when France paid so readily the enormous ransom which had been put upon her, that her resources were almost endless; some foolish people went so far as to say that our milliards had not enriched Germany, but had impoverished her. It became a sort of axiom that the system of armed peace could be better and longer borne by France than by Germany; the two countries had to run a sort of race of expenditure, and we flattered ourselves that in this race we should be first in the end. But figures do not lie, and for some years our budgets have been less and less satisfactory. Certainly, the great armaments, the perpetual changes in the army, have not been the only cause of the decadence of our finances: the democratic government has not been a cheap government; the number of functionaries has augmented in an alarming proportion. Electric railways have been built in quiet districts which had excellent roads; every village has had a new school-house, built in the most pretentious style; expeditions have been made to distant countries; the experiments of the navy have been extremely costly. Still, it cannot be denied that

the chief cause of the deficit has been the perpetuation of what can only be called the system of armed peace.

At the present moment the financial question has become the most pressing; everybody feels that the weight has become too heavy, everybody speaks of retrenchment and reform, but there is no minister strong enough to impose a good financial policy. People speak of retrenchment in the abstract, but when it comes to any special and particular form of retrenchment, the Deputies are afraid to vote it. They keep promising all sorts of things to their electors, and every electoral district is willing that the promises made to other districts should not be kept, but it insists on the full execution of the promises made to itself. It would be unjust to say that the finances of the country are in complete disorder. There are fortunately old administrations which preserve certain traditions; the public functionaries are, on the whole, remarkably honest; the organism is still sound; the disorder is not in the executive department, it is in the Legislature. The Chamber of Deputies has no financial policy, it is constantly led away by political passions, it is in a state of complete anarchy as regards financial questions. The dangerous state of our finances is somewhat hidden to the eye by the high quotations of our public funds. A great banker told me only a few days ago that, for himself, he deplored these high quotations; they are due to the fact that the French have completely given up, even in the remote country districts, the habit of hoarding their money (a habit which, by the by, enabled the country to pay the five milliards of the war indemnity with a rapidity which surprised the world). Great banks of deposit exist now, which have agencies in all the departments; these banks receive all the small savings of the people, they constantly drain the country, and pay a certain interest on sums which in old times earned no interest. The saving disposition of the people has contributed to the success of these great banks; they have now enormous sums in their hands, and, so far, no great crisis has contributed to shake the confidence of the country in their solvability. In prosperous times, a great part of these deposits would be used by the banks for new enterprises, but nobody dares now to enter into any combinations which require time for their development; money is idle, and, as the banks are obliged to invest their deposits in order to pay interest to the depositors, they look for the safest investments, and they buy nothing but public funds, railway bonds guaranteed by the State, and treasury bonds. The banks have in this manner made an artificial price for the public funds, as a sudden crisis would soon show, and the fall in the public funds would become alarmingly rapid. The quotations of the Bourse cannot, therefore, deceive the economists; the state of the public finances is not sound, the burden of the French budget has become too heavy even for a frugal and laborious nation.

The danger of the situation which I have tried to describe, in a political sense, lies in this: a time may come when the nation will feel that war may be as easy to bear as armed peace. War does not last long. It may end in defeat; it may also end in victory; in any case it must bring a settlement, a period of rest during which the war establishment can be reduced. A man may be more willing to endure great sufferings for a few hours than to bear a constant pain; war can be looked upon by the nation as a dangerous operation is looked upon by a patient. There was a time when we believed that France could bear the burden of armed peace better than Germany; the study of the budget of the German Empire has dispelled this notion. All those who have examined this budget know that the burden of