

of the pulpit, and had neither said nor done anything inconsistent with his position as a Christian minister. It was a brave and catholic utterance, quite characteristic of the orator. Perhaps the bravest speech of the evening was that of Joseph H. Choate, who declared in very plain Anglo-Saxon terms that the rich, and especially the great corporations, were largely responsible for the political corruption in New York City, that they had paid thousands of dollars to political bosses for police and legislative protection, and that political corruption would not cease until contributing to a corruption fund, however disguised, became disreputable, by whomsoever practiced.

The brief address which the Czar has issued to his subjects is notable mainly for the kindliness of feeling which it expresses. He has, however, made some concessions in the way of pardons, reduction of terms of sentence, and remission of taxes, which, although not sweeping, are sufficiently generous to excite large hopes. More than this, he has astonished and delighted many of his subjects, and terrified others, by appearing in the streets of St. Petersburg without a guard, as if he intended to throw himself upon the good will of his people and discard the oppressive espionage under which his father lived so many years. If one had to choose between constant danger and constant presence of troops and detectives on the one hand, and the possibility of death on the other, most people would probably choose the latter alternative. It would probably be a wise thing for the Czar, if the choice were forced upon him, to accept the danger rather than the horrible conditions under which his father lived. There is good reason to believe, however, that throwing aside these safeguards would constitute an appeal even to the extreme revolutionists which would not be disregarded. It is reported that the Czar is considering the granting of some form of parliamentary institutions. In this connection the formation of a new "Party of Public Right" is an interesting sign of the times. It promises to be a revival of Liberalism, and it is said that it has already drawn together a very large group of influential Russians in the towns. It promises to be sufficiently catholic to include all those who are united in a simple demand for some form of constitutional liberty and representative government. It will be a happy day for Russia when the subterranean contest which has so long undermined the monarchy comes to the surface and takes the form of a constitutional agitation. If the Czar has the breadth of view to give this discussion free scope, and keeps the hands of the police off the men who are conducting it, he will do more to secure his personal safety and the prosperity of Russia than in any other way.

Germany and England have so definitely expressed their willingness that France should do what she chose in Madagascar that the Madagascar question has been taken out of the circle of international questions, and is now mainly a question of how much money the French Assembly is willing to spend in another attempt to extend French authority. The French ultimatum was presented to the Malagasy Government a month ago by the special envoy. Its claims are not known in detail, but it was undoubtedly so framed as to cover the whole ground, and to demand so much that the French would be justified in doing anything they chose hereafter under its provisions. In the event of the refusal of the Malagasy Government to accept the ultimatum, war was to be declared. The Malagasy Government has now replied, conceding the position of the French Resident in the island as the inter-

mediary between Madagascar and the foreign powers, and agreeing that France shall create such public works in the island as the authorities deem necessary, and proposing that disputes between the two countries shall be settled by a mixed court, the Malagasy Government retaining the right to import arms and munitions of war. Meanwhile the French Ministry has obtained from the Chambers a credit of \$65,000,000 to cover the expenses of the expedition, and it is definitely announced that 15,000 men, under the command of General Duchesne, will set out as soon as the rainy season is over—that is, some time in April—the general plan being to invade the island from the western side in order to take advantage of water openings into the country. It is believed that the native troops will not fight until the table land on which the capital is located has been reached. All this looks very much as if the exchange of ultimatums counted for nothing, and as if France had resolved on practically making Madagascar a French colony.

The events of the last week in China have been of a sufficiently alarming nature to call for the increase of our forces there. It would be amusing were it not pathetic that our only ship in Chinese waters has been that obsolete side-wheeler, the Monocacy. It is a pleasure, therefore, to learn that Rear-Admiral Carpenter's flag-ship, the Baltimore, has been ordered from Nagasaki to Taku, to provide the necessary force for the protection of American officials, merchants, and missionaries in Tientsin and in the Chinese capital. The sea-distance is about seven hundred miles. As commander-in-chief of the Asiatic squadron, Admiral Carpenter will probably collect from each vessel of his squadron the necessary number of men to guard our Legation at Peking and our Consulate at Tientsin. Our fleet now consists of the Baltimore, Charleston, Concord, Petrel, and the Monocacy. Of these the last three, on account of their light draught, can go up the Chinese rivers for some distance. The Machias and the Detroit are now on their way to join the squadron. The Japanese Government has published a statement to the effect that Mr. Detting (who was recently sent by the Viceroy of the province of Pechili to feel the pulse of the Mikado's Ministers as to proposals for peace) was in no way accredited for that mission by the Imperial Government at Peking. Furthermore, the Japanese note very properly adds that in order successfully to negotiate for peace, China must accredit a high official with complete powers. To us, accustomed to an Anglo-Saxon directness in dealings, however diplomatic it is, strange that any policy, but especially that of placation, should be so strongly marked by evasion, indirection, and subterfuge. The request of China to the Great Powers for armed intervention, then for intervention of any sort, then for arbitration, failing which she would accept mediation, and now the ridiculous attempt made by a subordinate unaccredited by the Peking Government, should convince China that only by suing for peace directly and through amply qualified commissioners can that peace be obtained. Meanwhile the Japanese armies are advancing and report new victories. It would be the very best thing for China, and for the world if Japan should continue her victories to the gates of Peking, and after occupying that capital should there prescribe terms of peace. Only in that event would the Chinese fully understand how ridiculous has been their civilization, and institute a new order of things. It may be that the days are numbered of the present Tartar dynasty, a dynasty which has controlled the fortunes of China for 250 years. In this case Li Hung Chang, the "degraded



Bismarck" of China, might be a leading candidate for the succession. It is believed that the house of Li Hung Chang would be favored by the Japanese Government, especially since his adopted son is a man of brilliant attainments, and has recently ably represented the Chinese Government at the Mikado's Court. He is known as Prince Li-hui.

What attitude, as relates to the obligations of international law, should a civilized nation like the United States take towards a semi-barbarous nation like China? This question has been brought up in a practical way the past week by the attack upon Secretary Gresham made by Mr. Julian Ralph, an able and interesting writer for magazines and newspapers, who has just returned from Shanghai. Mr. Ralph recounts the facts relating to the recent surrender to the Chinese of two Japanese spies (for there seems to be hardly any question now that they were in fact spies) who had appealed for protection to our representative in Shanghai. The men, after some delay, were given up upon Secretary Gresham's cabled order. They were then executed—probably after horrible tortures—by the Chinese authorities. The effect of the detailed account of the tortures given by Mr. Ralph is somewhat lessened by the fact that he bases his report on general rumors prevalent in Shanghai and not upon any direct or positive evidence. It is extremely likely, however, that the men were in truth tortured after the usual barbarous Chinese method. The real question is, Had the United States any right or power under international law to refuse to give up men accused of crime by the authorities of China, because they had taken refuge in a United States consulate? If China were civilized, there could be no pretense of such a right. In Paris, during the Franco-German war, Minister Washburn cared for the rights of German residents much in the same way that our representatives in China and Japan are befriending the unfortunate Japanese and Chinese, respectively, who are in their enemy's land. But Mr. Washburn would not for a minute have thought that he could have conducted the trial of a man accused by the French authorities of being a spy. In point of fact, in the present instance, Mr. Gresham has been assured by the Japanese Minister here that his course was right, and that in the case of a Chinese spy arrested in Japan who should appeal to the American consul, Japan would expect him to act in precisely the same way. But says in effect Mr. Ralph, China is barbarous and bloodthirsty; Mr. Gresham should have put off complying with the plain dictates of international law, have delayed and argued, and in some way have saved the men. The real issue in this case is comparatively simple. Are we to regard China as a civilized nation? In that case we could not refuse to deliver the Japanese to the Chinese authorities for trial. Are we to regard her as a barbaric people, not to be trusted to adopt civilized methods in trial nor likely to be governed by civilized principles in conduct? Then we are under no obligation to act as though we had a confidence in her justice which we neither possess nor ought to possess. We have in the past dealt with her as though she were a civilized nation. It begins to look as though we ought to deal with her as a mob of barbarians.

Our Department of State is still without official information about the alleged massacres at Sassoun in Armenia. It is regarded as improbable that Minister Terrell should neglect to inform his home authorities of such wholesale slaughter as has been reported. On the other hand, we have word from Bitlis that the destruction of life south of

Mush is even greater than first announced, including the massacre of six thousand men, women, and children, while the annihilation of twenty-seven villages is also reported. The Turks have sent back from Trebizond all those from the Mush region who had come on business, so as to prevent the news of the massacre from being too widely known. From last reports it seems that the Kurds had robbed certain Armenian villages of their sheep, upon which the natives pursued them, trying to recover their property. A fight ensued, and some Kurds were killed. Unfortunately, these men had been enrolled as troops, and were armed as such, but were not under Government control. However, it was promptly telegraphed that the Armenians had killed some of the Sultan's troops. Abdul-Hamid therefore immediately ordered out cavalry and infantry to quell the Armenian rebellion. In the picturesque language of the dispatch, "not finding any rebellion, they cleared the country so that none should occur in the future." Telegrams from Tiflis say that the people of Sassoun surrendered to an overwhelming Turkish force on the solemn promise that no harm would be done to them. After laying down their arms, they were attacked by the Turks and Kurds, who massacred them. The Turkish commission appointed to inquire into the outrage has now sailed for Trebizond; but instead of inquiring into the conduct of the Turkish officials, it is said that the commission has been instructed to investigate the acts of Armenian brigands. Canon Malcolm MacCall, who was the first to draw public attention to the Bulgarian atrocities in 1877, has published a letter in which he says that the Porte has been responsible for almost every massacre perpetrated in Armenia, and that the commission just sent to investigate the matter is of a piece with that sent by the Ottoman Government in 1860 to Syria, and with the one sent in 1877 to Bulgaria—that is, an utter farce, the only object being to throw dust in the eyes of Europe. The Armenians dwelling in foreign countries, who (like the Hebrews) show an extraordinary aptitude for trade, have formed associations to arouse sympathy for their brethren, who at home are mostly shepherds. The Armenian colonies in New York, London, Manchester, Amsterdam, Marseilles, and Venice have organized themselves in this way. No amount of prosperity in foreign lands has dampened their ardor of national cohesion, in which point they again strongly resemble the Israelites.

Mr. J. Rendel Harris, of England, gives in the last "Contemporary Review" an account of the new Syriac Gospels recently discovered in a palimpsest manuscript, from which they have been emancipated by several scholars, Mr. Harris among them. The manuscript dates, he thinks, from the fifth century, and represents not unfaithfully a translation which "must have been made far back in the second century." He regards it as "superior in antiquity to anything yet known," and, save for a few serious blemishes, "superior in purity to all extant copies, with very few exceptions." Judging from this article, the chief significance of this manuscript lies in three features: (1) It demonstrates the existence of the Fourth Gospel in the early part of the second century, thus confirming what had been apparently established by the recent discovery of Tatian's "Diatessaron." (2) In the Gospel of Matthew it inconsistently affirms the virgin birth in one verse, while in the genealogy of Jesus Christ it affirms that "Joseph begat Jesus." Mr. Harris enters into an interesting study of what he calls the "bifurcation" in the primitive text of the New Testament; that is, two distinct conceptions,

from a very early date, on the subject of the virgin birth. The result of his studies is that the orthodox view of the virgin birth is the earlier one, and the variant view that "Joseph begat Jesus" is a later corruption. (3) Interest attaches also to this new manuscript on account of light which it throws upon readings in other passages. We judge from Mr. Harris's too brief account that it generally confirms the judgments of later scholarship, as embodied, for example, in the Westcott and Hort text.



## The President's Message

The most important portion of the President's Message is that relating to our financial system. Respecting the justice of his criticism on our present no-system there can hardly be two opinions. We direct the payment of our notes in gold, and reissue them as fast as they are paid. Thus our Treasury notes become a chain-pump, constantly drawing the gold out of the Treasury and straightway going back to draw out more. To add to the absurdity of the procedure, we elect to pay in gold notes which, by the law under which they are issued, are payable in gold or silver at option. That under such a policy we have any gold left, and that our bonds are taken at a premium sufficiently large to reduce the interest on them to less than three per cent., indicate a remarkable prosperity among the people and a remarkable public confidence in the Government. But there will be two very antagonistic opinions about President Cleveland's proposed remedy. This is, in brief, that the Government withdraw wholly from the business of issuing paper money, and remit that business to private enterprise. And yet not wholly; for he proposes that the Government shall not only exercise a paternal supervision over the private banks, but shall hold itself responsible for the paper money which they put into circulation. This plan is, in brief, this: All laws providing for the deposit of United States bonds as a security for circulation are to be repealed; the banks are to be permitted to issue circulating notes not exceeding 75 per cent. of their paid-up capital, depositing with the Government its own legal-tender notes to an amount equal to 30 per cent. of their circulation. This 30 per cent., and the proceeds of a small tax on the banks, will constitute a guarantee fund. If any bank fails, the United States will redeem its notes out of this fund and the capital of the bank; and if the two together are not adequate, it will levy an assessment on all other banks sufficient for the purpose. State banks which comply with the provisions of this law would be released from the United States taxation which now operates against them.

There are three plans of dealing with the currency question, and one of the three ought to be intelligently adopted by the country; and therefore the distinction between them should be clearly understood: (1) Remit the issuing of currency altogether to private enterprise and let the Government confine itself to coining gold and silver. That was our plan up to the Civil War; and it worked very badly. Bank-notes were private promises to pay; their value depended wholly upon the character of the man or the corporation who made them; no man could tell what the bank-notes in his pocket were really worth; they were rarely far outside the State; they were often worthless, and the holder did not know it. (2) A combination or partnership between Government and private enterprise, on such terms that private enterprise takes exclusive control of the issuing currency, but Government guarantees its face value, securing adequate guarantee in return. That is the President's plan; and while we must leave expert bankers

to determine the question whether the guarantees are adequate, and the proportion of circulation to capital, etc., safe, the method seems to us on the whole good, provided the principle is sound. But we do not believe that the principle is sound. We do not believe in partnerships between the Government and private enterprise, whether for educational, financial, commercial, or industrial purposes. (3) This leaves for adoption the third plan, which gives to the Government the exclusive right to issue paper currency, as it already has the exclusive right to issue coin, and confines banks and bankers to the function of loaning money—whether paper or coin—which the Government provides. According to this plan the Government would issue all paper currency; would pay it out in exchange for gold or silver, and in salaries, wages, and necessary purchases; and would loan it either to banks or individuals, the best contrivance for such loan yet suggested being Secretary Windom's interconvertible bond plan. The President justly calls for "the absolute divorcement of Government from the business of banking." This would be accomplished by giving the Government the exclusive right to issue all money, whether coin or paper; it is not accomplished by making the Government a practical indorser of all the paper money issued by all the banking institutions in the country. We believe that in this matter experience teaches the same lesson as political philosophy: but evidence of that must be reserved for the future. The more important portions of the rest of the President's message are practically covered by our account of the Departmental Reports.



## The Reunion of Christendom

How to heal the divisions in the Christian Church and reunite divided Christendom is one of the problems of the hour. Come back to the Bishop of Rome, cries one. Receive the gift of Apostolic Succession, cries another. Adopt our evangelical creed, says a third. Receive the primitive rite of baptism in the primitive method, suggests a fourth. We must agree to disagree, is the pessimistic conclusion of a fifth.

If denominational differences were differences only of method and of temperament, this last would not be a pessimistic conclusion. These differences will perhaps always exist. Some will always like an artistic ritual, and others no ritual at all; the cathedral service will inspire devotion in one, the Salvation Army's drum and tambourine in another. One will best ascend to the Father by the well-worn steps of traditional prayers; another will fly, as the bird flies, by a way no other ever went. The solemn rite of immersion will be impressive to one, meaningless to another. As in rituals, so in creeds. The awful doctrine of divine sovereignty will inspire one with courage and paralyze another with dread. The consciousness of human freedom will nerve one to activity, and crush another under a sense of personal responsibility too heavy to be borne. We might agree to disagree, and work side by side in the same church, fulfilling the same mission, loyal to the same Master. But this is not what we are doing. Our denominations are sects; and our sects are at strife with each other. What Paul told the Corinthians is true to-day. Out of parties have grown schisms; out of schisms, contentions. Christ is divided.

How would it be if, instead of seeking to invent some new method of reunion, we were to go back, discover the cause of disunion, and repair the wrong by retracing the steps which led from unity to sectarianism? How would it be