

"as to this part of the struggle." But he leaves his readers in no doubt as to the side to which his opinion leans. "If you would strike only once and thus be more merciful in the end, you must strike hard—was Skobelev's motto in dealing with Orientals, as it has been that of all who have understood the Eastern character." There follows a playful allusion to the scarcity of bridegrooms for Turkoman brides consequent on the massacre.

Timur is, in Mr. Norman's estimation, "the mighty conqueror, one of the world's greatest dead." The epithets are well bestowed if devastation and massacre, both on the most hideous scale, are to be taken as proofs of greatness. The erection of triumphal pyramids of heads was Timur's particular fancy. On the ruins of Bagdad he erected a pyramid of ninety thousand. Covering a plain with children and seeing them trampled to death by his cavalry was another of his diversions. The great Jingo founded nothing permanent except the buildings of Samarcand—colossal, but, if we may judge from Mr. Norman's photographs, devoid of art.

How far will Jingoism go and how long will it last? Will it prevail, as some Jingoese seem to hope, till all the small nationalities have been absorbed by great predatory Powers? The answer to this and some other critical questions must greatly depend on the elaboration of a more settled basis for morality.

FINLAND'S LATEST TROUBLES.

For some months past the news from Finland has been of a disquieting character. The accounts of the riots in Helsingfors in April last were undoubtedly much exaggerated, particularly in the European press, but the cause—the calling out of the first army recruits conscripted under the law of July 12, 1901—continues to arouse universal ill feeling. According to the latest reports, between 70 and 80 per cent. of those designated for military service have failed to present themselves. Naturally there has been and is much anxiety throughout Finland as to the course the Russian authorities will take to punish the recalcitrants for what is undoubtedly a national protest against legislation plainly contrary to the Constitution of Finland. Fortunately, the only action on the part of the St. Petersburg authorities thus far announced, the appointment of an assistant to the Governor-General, bears on its face some evidence that a milder policy towards the unfortunate Finns is under consideration.

The law of July 12, 1901, which has caused the existing crisis, is but another step in the Russianizing of Finland which has gone on so rapidly under the present Czar. Prior to the so-

called reforms of last year, the organization of the Finnish troops was, on the whole, a pretty satisfactory one from the military point of view. Moreover, the policy by which Finns served next to and under their countrymen appealed particularly to a people whose Constitutional privileges are disappearing one by one. This has all been done away with, and the conscripts are now to be forced into Russian regiments, while the old organizations have been mustered out for all time. Since the Finns differ from the Russians in religion, habits, and customs of life, and speak a language of their own, it is much as if Hindus were forced to serve in Anglo-Saxon regiments. It is not surprising that, under these circumstances, the few Finns who have responded to the call have been hooted and jeered and regarded as cowards or traitors in more places than one.

But, more important than this and than the doubling of the quota required from Finland, is the fact that the law itself has been forced upon the country regardless of its Constitutional prerogatives. The first proposals for the Russianizing of the army in Finland were laid before the lower house of Parliament in 1899, and were rejected. At the same time some changes were made in the directions desired, which would, it was thought, appease the War Office. This did not, however, prove to be the case, and the Governor-General, Bobrikoff, succeeded, with the aid of the Czar, in forcing the present decree upon the people without the consent of Parliament. The first result was an immediate protest by half a million citizens in the shape of an address to the Czar, in which it was maintained that the decree could not be regarded as a legal enactment. There was also a petition for a return to the Constitutional method of enacting such laws. No attention whatsoever was paid to this appeal, and Bobrikoff set himself in hot haste to the disbandment of the troops, regardless of the consequences, personal and financial, to officers and men. The local recruiting boards having declined to act further, the general conscription commissions were empowered to select the new men needed—another unconstitutional action which fanned the growing flames of resentment.

So bitter was the feeling in Helsingfors that on the 17th of April only 56 of the city's 860 conscripts presented themselves in the presence of a large and ugly crowd, which protested, by word and deed, against their appearance. It was not difficult for the Governor of the province to find an excuse to let loose without warning a squadron of Cossacks upon the indignant people. These hated foreigners did not hesitate to ride down and beat men, women, and children wherever they could overtake them. For these valiant services they

were publicly highly praised by Governor-General Bobrikoff. An indignant protest to the Czar from the city fathers has met the same fate as the petition mentioned above.

Nobody can foretell what the outcome will be. There are still those who expect better days for Finland, despite the evident desire of Bobrikoff and his followers to destroy every vestige of popular government and wipe out every evidence of a separate nationality. The optimists base their hopes upon the resolute moral opposition of the entire people to the present Russian policy, and upon the hope that some day the Czar will see through the tissue of misstatements and falsehoods which now prevents his hearing and seeing the truth about Finland. Those who feel thus have taken fresh courage at the appointment, as assistant to the Governor-General, of Privy Councillor von Dietrich, hitherto president of a St. Petersburg court, and noted for his unusual knowledge of the law. When he assumes office this month, it is thought that he will represent a milder policy than that lately pursued, or at least a determination to Russianize Finland by Constitutional methods.

As Finland's case now stands, it is still another impressive object-lesson as to the folly of attempting to destroy nationalities by force. Poland was finally wiped off the map in 1868, yet the hope of a national existence has never died out among Poles. So strong is it in Polish Russia, that the Government has had to appropriate large sums of money for a campaign to keep its own influence from waning, and has begun a clever policy, with a view to dividing the Poles among themselves. In Austria-Hungary, the strife of the various nationalities is the story of each day. In South Africa, by permitting the use of the Dutch language in schools and courts, by declining to suspend the Cape Colony Constitution, by praise of their quondam enemies, and by liberal financial assistance, the English seem to have begun upon a far-sighted policy. For the United States in the Philippines there is but one proper action—the building up and welding together of the Philippine nation, that it may go its own way at an early day.

SALISBURY AND BALFOUR.

The personal interest which attaches to the Marquis of Salisbury, whose long-expected retirement is now an accomplished fact, is almost greater than the political. His public prominence for so many years served to exhibit in a strong light those qualities of private character which make the man a more fascinating study than the statesman. The real problem of his official career is, how such a personality as his—so proud, so aloof, so disdainful of the tendencies of his age, especially of its democratic

tendencies; no orator, no organizer; consistently a retired student by choice, and ever a reserved *grand seigneur* in a day of chattering familiarity—how such a man could have been leader of a great party in a great democracy for nearly a quarter of a century.

Lord Salisbury's natural tastes would have held him in the still air of delightful studies where his youth, as a younger son, was passed. Rosebery has given us one of his own boyhood's memories in recounting a glimpse he had at Hatfield House of "a tall bookish figure" stealing out of the library with a volume in his hand. It was Lord Robert Cecil. He was in his element as student, writer, *Saturday Reviewer*; and it was apparently only his unexpected accession to the headship of the family that made him turn his thoughts to public affairs. The Cecils had been a ruling house in England for three hundred years, and he took up that tradition with the title. It was, indeed, as a kind of hereditary ruler that he ever bore himself. No aristocrat could have hated and despised "popular movements" more than he did. One of his earliest speeches in the Commons breathed a sort of Coriolanus feeling as respects "the people." He was opposing a bill to remove the tax on newspapers, and "could it be maintained," asked Lord Robert, "that the people would learn anything from newspapers?" It was this lordly air of a Cecil that he carried into official life throughout. He had unquestionably great powers. It is probably not true that Bismarck said of him that he was a lath painted to look like iron; but if he did, it was a most mistaken characterization. The real metal was there. How he impressed so cool a head as Jowett may be seen in a letter of the latter's to Sir R. B. D. Morier:

"Salisbury," he wrote, "is a man of great ability and perhaps even genius, but impulsive, forgetting one day what he did the day before, and imprudent to the last degree without being aware of his imprudence. He will settle off his own bat things of which he knows nothing, and is very reckless of consequences."

Salisbury's cynicism, his air of entire detachment from all that interested his fellow-men, his scorn for "people's tribunes"—if he disliked Gladstone, he loathed Chamberlain—would have made his leadership of the Conservative party for two decades a hopeless puzzle, unless those unprepossessing qualities had been overbalanced, as they were, by commanding parts. Proud as he was, with a kind of mediæval pride, he was yet a thorough Englishman in submitting to the inevitable in politics, and in playing the game through without going off in a fit of the sulks. When Disraeli "dished the Whigs" in 1867, by outbidding them in an enlargement of the franchise, Salisbury (Lord Cranborne, as he then was) rated his leader openly, and accused him of being a traitor to Conservative principles; but he himself lived

to pass, as Premier, an Irish land bill more radical than any that Mr. Gladstone ever fathered, and to be denounced in turn as a swallower of his own words and a renegade. Even, however, with this ability reluctantly to compromise, he carried into domestic legislation, as a rule, a spirit of "haughty unwisdom"—to borrow a felicitous phrase used of him by John Bright in 1878. He made himself a necessary man to his party, but it never followed him with enthusiasm, and always lived in fear lest one of his "blazing indiscretions" should bring political disaster upon it.

It was in foreign affairs that Lord Salisbury left his deepest mark. "I feel," wrote Lord Lytton to him in 1878, when he first went to the Foreign Office, "that you are destined to be one of England's greatest Foreign Ministers." There was, of course, a dash of "Lucile" exuberance in this, but Salisbury's great achievements in foreign affairs have been admitted even by his enemies. Bright said of him that he "left his unwisdom for home consumption"; and the series of international agreements on vexed questions which he concluded in his last term of office—with Germany, with France, with the United States, with Japan—would alone be enough to establish his fame. It was perhaps as much his misfortune as his fault that the burden of years and of personal sorrow should have induced him to leave the negotiations with the Transvaal in 1899 in the hands of an astute and too little scrupulous Colonial Secretary. It is impossible, at any rate, to believe that if Lord Salisbury had kept his grasp upon that affair, he would have allowed a causeless war to mar a premiership which otherwise would have associated his name in history with many notable victories of peace.

His predestined successor in the Conservative leadership was Mr. Balfour. As long ago as 1891, Mr. Bryce predicted in these columns that Balfour would become Prime Minister if he lived. It was not simply that he belonged to one of the great families—he is Lord Salisbury's nephew—but that his intellectual and moral qualities had marked him out for the succession. He has, or assumes, a languid manner; and his uncle's cynicism, often unfeeling, has descended to him in the form of witty and good-humored sarcasm. He is no orator, though a very able speaker; his mind being analytic, and his most powerful speeches being a merciless dissection of the arguments of others. In exposition he is less happy; and, as leader of the House of Commons, he has often shown great vacillation, and even something that looked like ignorance of the matter in hand—the pending Education Bill, for example—in piloting bills through the troubled waters of debate. He is reputed to be averse to hard work, though this may be only a result of a studied intellectual superciliousness, which To-

ries like, and an unwillingness to sit out tedious discussions in the House. As an administrator, his talent is all to be proved, if we except his Irish Secretaryship, where his rôle was mainly the simple one of repression, not administration. Yet he impressed Mr. Bryce eleven years ago as having "a fund of self-reliance and composure equal to any emergency."

He will have to draw upon it at once. His succession to the premiership is natural and easy; but to maintain himself there will require powers greater than any he has yet displayed. Already we see, in the resignation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that there are serious differences and embittered factions in the Conservative party. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's prompt throwing up of his office will be interpreted as a result of Prime Minister Balfour's having to choose between him and Chamberlain, and having thrown himself into the arms of the latter. Chamberlain is undoubtedly the more influential political leader, but is a dangerous man for Balfour to tie to. In any case, extensive party readjustments are inevitable, and a dissolution of Parliament cannot be long delayed. An exciting political period in England will be too soon upon us to make prophecy about it at this time seem anything but an unusually gratuitous blunder. Enough to-day to note the passing of one great figure in English public life, and the accession of a Premier of fine gifts and high character, who is a good friend of the United States, and a statesman whose rise by sheer ability makes one hope that he will be level with the great opportunities now before him.

PRICES AND THE INCREASING GOLD SUPPLY.

The active resumption of gold-mining in the Transvaal, with the probability that before many months South Africa will again be enlarging the annual gold supply at the rate of three years ago, has revived in many quarters discussion of the effect which this increase in the world's output may have on commercial prices. So far as regards the gold supply itself, the position is rather curious. By the estimates of our mint, the world's gold production reached its maximum in 1899. Before the Boer war broke out in October of that year, the Transvaal was producing gold at the rate of some \$80,000,000 annually. During 1900 and 1901, its yearly production was cut down by the war blockade to less than eight millions annually. Had production in other quarters of the globe remained stationary, the world's yearly supply would have decreased correspondingly. In the United States, however, the annual gold production increased \$8,000,000 in 1900, and a million more in 1901. Canada produced \$6,500,000 more in 1900