

McLaren that a provision be inserted in the Parish Councils Bill giving the suffrage to women who would be entitled, if they were men, to vote in local governmental and Parliamentary elections; among those voting against the Government were Sir Charles Dilke, Justin McCarthy, John Burns, and William O'Brien.—The chief cashier of the Bank of England has been dismissed on account of improper conduct in the management of the Bank finances; of course the credit and stability of the Bank are not seriously affected.—Archduke Joseph Augustin of Austria and Princess Augusta of Bavaria were married in Munich last Friday.—Chauncey D. Ripley, a prominent lawyer of New York City and a man prominent in university and other educational matters, died last week.—The General Term of the New York Supreme Court has directed that Charles H. Gardner, the agent of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, who was some time since convicted of extortion, be set at liberty; the decision was made solely on the ground that Gardner's act was not literally extortion (as the money was given with the intention of entrapping him and not through fear), but rather attempt at extortion.



A Thanksgiving Homily

All believers in government of the people, by the people, and for the people may well give thanks this year; for government of the machine, by the machine, and for the machine has received this fall the severest blow it has received in any election since Andrew Jackson introduced into American politics the doctrine "to the victors belong the spoils."

In September there were men ready to despair of the Republic, and other men whose courage only got far enough to exhort their fellows not to despair of the Republic. There are illusions of despair as well as of hope, and one of them is the illusion that politics in America are more corrupt than in the Old World. The Gravesend ring is very bad; but the Russian bureaucracy is immeasurably worse: worse not merely because it is imperial, not local; not merely because it is rooted in traditions as old as the Empire on which it feeds; not merely because it is fostered by the Church, while our rings are always liable to have the Church leading an assault upon them; but worse because the Russian bureaucracy is legal and even constitutional, and liberty is in revolt, while in Gravesend it is liberty which is legal and constitutional, and the ring which is in revolt. And what is true of Gravesend is true of every ring-cursed community in the United States. In the Old World despotism is law and liberty is revolution. In the United States liberty is law and despotism is revolution.

In America, therefore, it does not take a prophet to see that they who are for us are more than they who are against us. All eyes save those which are blinded by a pessimism that is ignorant of the history of other lands may see the mountain-tops full of the chariots and horsemen of the Lord fighting for freedom and for purity. In these invisible forces are the great and honored names of the Republic, are its battle-fields and its past victories for purity and truth and freedom, are all its traditions and all its grand historic growth, are the liberated churches, a patriotic and practical ministry, the free press, the right of public assemblage, the public school, the Anglo-Saxon blood and breeding, and the American conscience.

Take courage and press forward: this is our Thanksgiving homily.

The New Political Situation in France

The new tendencies to which The Outlook has often called the attention of its readers are visible not only in the intellectual, the moral, and the religious, but also in the political, world of France. The oneness of a nation's life, and its vital connections with men, times, and things, have never been more visible than in the recent history of that nation. A deepening of knowledge, a new moral seriousness and increase of reverence for the great Power which shapes history could not but affect the political life. For more than twenty years that life was stunted in its development by the stupendous loss of energy in its struggle for existence, its full expansion was prevented by polemics, and its work was narrowed by militant legislation. To oppose the formidable attacks of united Monarchists, a union of all Republicans was imperatively demanded, but the Radicals granted this union only after pledges from the Moderates which were tantamount to making the Republic the property of a political coterie, and legislation an instrument against the Church. The Monarchists and the Radicals fought each other passionately, without recognizing the nobleness of purpose represented by their antagonists. Any apparent or implied concession of the Moderates to the one excited the loud protests of the other, and not infrequently occasioned the fall of the Ministry. The overthrow of cabinets, though an evil, has not in Italy and in France all the injurious consequences that it might have elsewhere, as the ministries are permanent institutions of which the minister is a sort of president. Furthermore, one policy has forced itself upon all cabinets—mainly a resultant of the respective programmes of the Opportunists and of the Radicals—a neo-radical one. Accordingly, the fairer were the prospects of Reactionaries, the nearer to the Radicals were the Moderates compelled to advance, and the more radical was the governmental programme. Hence, while, during the last twenty years, the Republic has done wonders for France, the country has had an organization of parties whose governmental action was the opposite of the popular will. When the Reactionaries gained popular favor, the Government was almost wholly in the hands of Radicals; and when the Radicals seemed to make popular gains, the Government became conservative.

To these political oscillations the French Republic doubtless owes its survival and its present strength. The influences which led Cardinal Lavigerie, in 1889, to break away from his former monarchical associations, and the firm attitude of the Pope in his stand for the Republic, brought a large number of devout Catholics into the ranks of Moderate Republicans. This political transition was greatly helped by the action of young men like M. Jonnart, a most promising Deputy of Pas-de-Calais, and by many others who represent moderation, a broad political liberalism, and a keen intelligence concerning the needs of our time. Strangers to the old political quarrels, imbued with the new spirit, they showed, in a dispassionate way, that the Republic was no longer in danger; that the militant policy was an anachronism, and that new conditions demanded new ideals. The violence of extreme men of both extreme parties brought out the calm, matter-of-fact utterances of the new men who pleaded for a steady ministry, for a national and not a sectional policy, for order and timeliness in reforms, and, above all, for the maintenance in French political life of the principles of freedom of 1789. This programme is not new, but its wide acceptance by the younger men is the novel feature in French politics, and the majority of votes which the Moderates

received at the last elections shows that these principles are fast gaining ground. Two hundred and ten out of 580 deputies are new men. A goodly number of them belong to the newer and healthier life of France. The election of the most conspicuous figure among the Neo-Christians, and of one of the most distinguished men of letters, M. Melchior de Vogüé, is full of significance. The disappearance from the Palais Bourbon of all the Boulangists but three—of Clemenceau, Floquet, Cassagnac, and their followers—means the exclusion of important elements of excitement and disorder. Now it is possible to see in the popular assembly men of great worth who have hitherto been eclipsed by noisy politicians, and whose social rank, character, and ability have been entirely placed in the background. The Dukes of Rohan, of Doudanville, the Princes of Broglie and of Arenberg, noblemen like MM. de Maillé, De la Ferranoy, De Moustier, De Montalembert, and De Jouffroy; a distinguished ecclesiastic like l'Abbé Hulst, men of letters like Mézières and De Vogüé, economists like Léon Say and Ynes Guyot, manufacturers like Schneider, the iron-king of France, and many others, must give to the House of Deputies an influence, and gain for it a confidence, which have been sadly wanting during the last twenty years. Still, while we rejoice at the elimination of extreme men, and at the prominence which the ancient elements of all parties will gain, the access of the new life seems the most positive advance. The few Monarchists left will, perhaps, attempt to play the game of despair, the Radicals and the Socialists will exhibit their uncompromising attitude, but, as the Moderates have a majority and their members have the largest parliamentary experience, they can doubtless give stability to the Ministry, prevent partisan legislation, elaborate better budgets, reduce the national debt, and give Frenchmen that liberty, tempered by a reasonable paternalism, which is the form of their choice. In this they will be helped by the new men. A broad survey of the political field will convince one that sound political intelligence and a healthier life have just won their way into the House of Deputies, and that the new Parliament, viewed as a center of future legislation, of executive control, or as an index of new political life, is certainly far in advance of its predecessors.



The Boycott in the Church

It is a curious illustration of the moral weakness, but also perhaps of the numerical strength, of the present majority in the Presbyterian Church, that some of its distinguished representatives should seriously propose to resort to the boycott in making war against the Union Theological Seminary. The boycott was first introduced into civilized society by the Church. It was called by another name; it was termed excommunication. It was supposed to carry with it other penalties in the future state, but on earth to cut the excommunicated person off from all fellowship with his fellow-men. It was borrowed from the Church by the trades-unions, who have made a vigorous effort to introduce it into American industrial society, but, on the whole, with such distinct ill success that they have about abandoned it. It is a curious anachronism that it should be taken up again in a Protestant Church as a weapon in ecclesiastical warfare.

The facts will be found given in some detail in *The Religious World*. A committee of the New York Presbytery seriously proposes that the Presbytery should forbid students under its care to pursue their studies in the Union Theological Seminary while under the ban of the General

Assembly, and should provide that no minister can present himself for license to the Presbytery if he has acquired his education in that Seminary. The broad humor of this proposition is best illustrated by supposing the same principle to be applied in other departments of education. Suppose, for example, that the College of Physicians and Surgeons should request the Legislature to refuse to allow a diploma to be given to any one who had studied in the New York University Medical College, or that Columbia College, from which two years ago three professors went out to found a new Law School down town, should ask the Legislature to enact that no men should be admitted to the Bar who studied in the new Law School. Such methods of conducting warfare are not less worthy of derision and contempt when introduced by doctors of divinity in ecclesiastical assemblages. The only function of a Presbytery is to ascertain whether the student who comes before it is competent to preach and is sufficiently in accord with the spirit and principles of the Presbyterian Church to be inducted into the Presbyterian pulpit; and they have no more business to inquire where he got his education than where he got his clothes. The proposition of the committee has gone over for consideration until next month. We print here the names of the committee who recommended to the Presbytery this extraordinary measure. They are:

The Rev. Charles S. Robinson, D.D.

The Rev. James G. Patterson, D.D.

The Rev. W. D. Buchanan.

George E. Sterry, Esq.

John J. McCook, Esq.



Not Athletics

On the eve of the annual Thanksgiving game of football between Yale and Princeton, the "Medical News," of Philadelphia, makes some very timely and telling comments on the brutality which is fast changing an athletic sport into a brutal pastime. It notes the trend toward professionalism, and says that the betting on the games grows more and more common. It declares that football is not athletics, and that the influence of the game is reducing the average due to athletics proper. Instead of the careful and intelligent training of a large body of students, there is a concentrated training upon one man out of a hundred. As a spectacle the game is one to make the Greek, whose presence is continually evoked on all athletic occasions, shudder. "The quilted, bepadded, disheveled, long-haired, begrimed, scarred football hero," after "a savage scrimmage in the mud," is anything but a heroic or inspiring figure. The beauty of the old heroic games is utterly lost in the rough-and-tumble fighting in which the present method of playing football culminates. Moreover, the physical injuries to players are becoming so numerous that the game must be included in the mortality tables as a prolific source of fatality. Last week two players were killed, and every week during the season there is a long list of serious injuries. The game, as now played, offers too great a temptation for "slugging," in which a group of fierce, dirty, disheveled young men contend in inextricable confusion. There was much to be said for the old open game; there is little to be said for the present game. The reaction against the game as at present played has, we are glad to note, begun to reach the colleges.

The fact that the game is dangerous to limb and life might not be conclusive against it; the demoralization which comes from it is conclusive. Give us reformed football, and let the present game be ruled out entirely.