

is not easy to show that these ideals cannot be realized. Nor can it be denied that the world has often been mistaken, and pronounced those men incapable enthusiasts who finally have been determined to be great reformers. It is not always the case that great men are very articulate reasoners, and geniuses have a way of reaching their conclusions by instinct or inspiration rather than by logical process. Hence it is inferred that those who do not reach their conclusions by reason must do so by inspiration—a principle that hedges all enthusiasts with a certain divinity. Truly it is not easy to discriminate. Hardly any one would now call John Brown an incapable enthusiast, yet at the time of his epoch-making foray it was thought charitable to call him a madman. He may, perhaps, have reasoned as well as Arnold of Winkelried, or thought not without reason that he could play the part of Samson in the temple of the Philistines. The denunciation that fell upon him was of the same nature as that which fell upon the other abolitionists; they were odious because they were held incapable, and yet the incapacity proved to be rather on the part of the critics than of the enthusiasts.

The case of the abolitionists, however, is an excellent example of the possibility of distinguishing true prophecy from false. For nothing was plainer than that our society would not always tolerate slavery. There was nothing unprecedented in the demands of the abolitionists. Slavery had been abolished before, and it was rather surprising that it should have been maintained so long in a community so far advanced in civilization. No one who pretended to reason could assert that history taught that slavery was a permanent institution, or that it would exist in an ideal state of society. All that could be rationally urged against the abolitionists was that their methods were not the correct ones, or that the time was not ripe—arguments that were refuted by the logic of events if not by that of the anti-slavery party. Hence it was necessary to resort to appeals to the feelings, to coarse abuse, and even to violence against these enthusiasts, who had reason on their side; and when these arguments are employed, there is a presumption against the case of those who employ them. In fact, it may be laid down that the criterion of the capacity of enthusiasts is the attitude of their opponents. The final appeal is to reason; those who attempt to bring their case before other tribunals admit its weakness.

If we contrast with the abolitionists some of the enthusiasts of the present day, the applicability of the distinctions which we have taken becomes apparent. Their declared aim is to increase the wealth of the poor, and they propose to accomplish it by subtracting from that of the rich. It is true that political economy teaches that the accumulation of capital tends to increase wages; but as they dislike the conclusions of that science, and lack the capacity to follow its reasonings, they declare with the greatest assurance that it is obsolete. They propose to abolish the ancient relation of master and servant, and to institute a novel kind of partnership between labor and capital, in which labor shall dictate its own wages, control the management, and share in the profits, while capital shall bear all the losses. They lament the woes of the poor, and rejoice over the formation of trades-unions, whose principal effect and whose avowed object is to shut out the poor from opportunities of work, and whose practice is to persecute those who endeavor to maintain their independence or who try to work in defiance of union hostility. They de-
claim against the injustice of the present

constitution of society, and ignore the injustice which they encourage men to inflict upon one another. They refuse to explain the details of their projected reforms, but the most logical of them are driven into Socialism, and advocate the improvement of the condition of the poor by setting up the Government in business with capital furnished by the taxation of the poor whose condition it is to improve, regardless of the lessons of experience concerning the wastefulness of all governmental enterprises.

The most conspicuous proof of the incapacity of these enthusiasts is their insensibility to moral considerations. The great causes of poverty, vice, improvidence, laziness, and dishonesty, are treated as its effects, and charity to the poor is indeed made to cover a multitude of sins. The outrageous and growing faithlessness of laborers as regards the performance of their contracts meets with no condemnation from these effusive sympathizers with labor. They rave over the corruption of our legislation by capitalists, and ignore the fact that laborers form a majority of the electoral body, and that they prefer to choose representatives so ignorant, so dishonest, and so rapacious that capitalists are compelled to buy them off to avoid ruin. It has not often been the case, in the history of our race, that enthusiasm for justice has been attended with such a disregard for the most elementary virtues. It is a most discouraging sign that so large a proportion of our clergy and of the writers for the "religious" press should have proved themselves incapable enthusiasts by their utterances in these matters. They may not have much positive influence for evil, but they have encouraged so much folly that it is impossible to look for any great improvement in the condition of the poor until this generation has passed away.

IRISH NOTES.

DUBLIN, April 18, 1888.

AFTER a harsh and backward period, spring is coming upon us in all its beauty. Light clouds shadow the hills over which green tints are spreading; the birds answer each other in the hedges—over all there is the indefinable charm of the season. The moral order in Ireland is, however, not changed. A coercive policy is being carried out to the uttermost. William O'Brien was arrested on Saturday, John Dillon yesterday. Numerous are the other arrests, mainly in connection with the meetings in the west on Sunday week, where Mr. Balfour's challenge regarding the suppression of the League was resolutely taken up, and an attempt made to hold meetings in spite of their being tardily proclaimed. Some of these meetings were suppressed with brutal violence. At Ennis the people managed to elude the authorities and assemble in a warehouse opening off a yard separated from the street by a gateway. As they were passing out the authorities came upon them. The people made no resistance, and even opened the gates for the police, who commenced taking down their names. It has been fully proved that not a hand was raised or a stone thrown. Yet into this yard and upon these people charged, by order, police with drawn batons, infantry with fixed bayonets, and cavalry with sabres. Many persons were injured. The armed forces of the Crown cannot have had their hearts in the work, or the results must have been fatal. Fortunately, at least one

English member was present to see what occurred the same day at Loughrea.

It is difficult to understand the policy of the Government regarding the suppression of meetings. The humane course would be to issue the prohibition as long as possible beforehand, and to give it the fullest publicity; instead of which it is often delayed until the evening before, or the very day of the meeting. Crowds of countrymen attend, and a police charge is to many the first intimation that they have placed themselves in opposition to what is here called law. It doubtless has a discouraging effect, and that may be the intention of the Government. The poor, depending on their daily labor, cannot afford to run the risk of broken heads and disabled limbs. Mr. Balfour also probably wishes to make it appear that every meeting not suppressed is held by his permission. There is never any disturbance where the police and military do not interfere. Of late years, since we became accustomed to the presence of the Government note-taker, he is invariably protected and accorded a place on the platform. Meetings were announced for Sunday week, and at the last moment suppressed. Another was advertised for last Sunday, at New Ross, on the border of a district where the League is suppressed. Large bodies of military were quartered in the town. William O'Brien was arrested on his way to this gathering. Elaborate preparations were made for eluding the authorities and holding meetings elsewhere if necessary. Only when ten o'clock in the forenoon came, and no prohibition had been issued, was it felt with any degree of certainty that the meeting would be permitted. The police and military were confined to the barracks. The Government note-taker marched with the promoters between bands and banners. Perfect order and good humor prevailed, as is always the case when the people are left to themselves. The few police and soldiers off duty that strayed into the crowd passed unnoticed. Some 6,000 persons were present, and the number might have been doubled had there been any certainty of non-interference.

Nothing can be more futile than Mr. Balfour's assertion that he has really suppressed the spirit of the League, and weakened its prestige and organization. He has made it more dangerous; in the proclaimed districts secret gatherings and secret combinations replace open proceedings. The people are more than ever devoted to their leaders. William O'Brien's character has been revealed to an extraordinary degree. The crudeness, bitterness, and exaggeration that too often characterize *United Ireland*, of which he is editor, have led the outside public to underestimate his entire singleness of purpose, simplicity of nature, self-forgetfulness, and religious fervor. It is said by many that he intends, when the Irish question is satisfactorily settled, to enter a monastery, and this I quite believe. Nothing can shake Mr. Parnell's position as leader; but O'Brien and Dillon are the most beloved of the people, sharing personally their difficulties and dangers.

I never travel through Ireland or look beneath the surface here that I am not renewedly and painfully impressed with the dark shadows that inevitably accompany this movement. It is quite different from anti-slavery, or temperance, or any other great agitation in which the mainspring is conscientiousness and philanthropy. In our cause, indeed, such motives characterize the leaders and large numbers of the rank and file, and English support is generally unselfish; but the chief incentive here, so far as the land (apart from the Nation-

al) question is concerned, is personal interest, a desire to escape from the incubus of a land system that is crushing out the life-blood of the country. This personal interest inevitably leads to the assertion of much that is unreasonable, and much actual dishonesty. For instance, the position of prominent Nationalists is often shamefully taken advantage of by tenants. A landlord friend of mine was discouraged from openly joining the movement by a Nationalist leader, who warned him that if he did so, his tenants would take unfair advantage of him. One of the leaders lately applied for rent to a backward tenant, who held land at a low valuation. The tenant admitted this, but said: "I hold another farm at a rack-rent from X., who is not a Nationalist, and I must pay him, and so cannot pay you." As the good and bad landlords stand together, so do the good and bad tenants. Each side believes that whatever is good in the aims of antagonists is overshadowed by what is evil in their methods. Each side condones and ignores the evil in the character and methods of supporters, in view of the overwhelming good which is expected from the attainment of the common object. I do not see why this should be so much the practice here. We are required to keep silence regarding anything and everything objectionable in those who nominally side with us. Perhaps a reason for this may be found in a desire to avoid even the semblance of the division so much desired by opponents, and which has been the curse of Irish politics. Such want of candor, however, provides future complications and perils. The condition of parts of Kerry is appalling. The murder of poor Fitzpatrick at Lixnaw was most brutal and unprovoked. Yet, because his daughter Norah had helped to prosecute and convict the murderers at the assizes, when she appeared on Sunday at chapel a large number of the congregation left, despite the protests of the clergy. Moreover, a conviction of the murderers would, I believe, never have been secured if they had not been tried under the Coercion Act in another county. It is easy for an English party to make political capital out of delaying a settlement, but reconstruction will be no easy task, and to us and not to them it must fall.

Regarding land settlement, things are in the accustomed confusion. No government has as yet compassed a real final reform. This tinkering satisfies no one but the lawyers, except, perhaps, the tenants who are purchasing under Lord Ashbourne's Act. Those whose rents were adjusted a few years ago are as discontented as ever. Some 60,000 cases await the courts. Uniform principles of land valuation for separating and defining the interests of landlord and tenant are more than ever seen to be impossible. Men pay large sums for interest in farms, and a few months afterwards go into court and get the rents reduced upon the basis of which they made the purchase. I lately heard of a case in which a tenant of an agricultural holding near Dublin had his rent reduced to £2 an acre, while his neighbor on the other side of a wall sold his land at £800 an acre for building purposes. Ownership in most instances is the only possible satisfactory settlement. How that is to be effected is the difficulty. The people in many districts now hold back, as the landlords formerly did. They still see that the rent and price of a farm depend upon its condition and capacity, and so they prefer to drift and let matters go to waste for a while longer, trusting to what may turn up.

The ascendancy class here are jubilant. Several waverers of two years ago have returned to the fold. On the other hand, there

are many Protestants more distinctly in touch with the people, and whose ideas of liberty and constitutional government have some bases in conviction, who are becoming aware that a continuance of the present state of things is impossible. A protest against coercion is being signed by Irish as well as English members of the Society of Friends.

As to public opinion on the whole in the United Kingdom, the Tory position is still strong. Mr. Balfour's policy may have to be tested much longer before its overthrow. I doubt whether, if an election took place now, the position of parties would be materially changed. Under all the circumstances of Ireland, and sad as it is for her, I cannot on their own account regret the decision of the thousands of our young people who are taking their fortunes in their hands, and crowding to our seaports to embark for the United States.

I have spoken of the internal condition of this country, and hazarded an opinion as to the state of feeling in England. I cannot conclude without reference to what is generally supposed to be going on in Rome. Archbishop Walsh, one of the ablest and most vehement Nationalist ecclesiastics, has been detained there some months. Contrary influences are evidently at work. Many of the best informed shake their heads, and believe that the Pope will eventually be worked upon to abate the zeal of the clergy in the cause of home rule. Others are firmly convinced that he will never risk in the slightest degree alienating the Irish people. By some it is thought that a temporary settlement is being negotiated which might be urged upon the clergy, as preferable for the interests of the Church to a continuance of the present contest. On the whole, intelligent Catholic Nationalists regard the position of affairs in Rome with some anxiety, while they admit that any action the Vatican may think proper to take would only retard—it could not prevent—the ultimate accomplishment of home rule.

D. B.

FERRY'S BALZAC.—II.

PARIS, April 18, 1888.

THE daughter of Mme. Gay, Delphine, who was extremely handsome, married the famous journalist, Émile de Girardin. Balzac was a friend of Mme. de Girardin, but his relations with her husband never became very cordial. When he wrote his 'Médecin de Campagne,' in 1837, he hoped that Girardin would publish it in one of his papers, the *Journal des Connaissances Utiles*, which had 100,000 subscribers (an enormous number for the time); but the editor, who was of a very positivist turn of mind, thought the 'Médecin de Campagne' a very uninteresting *berquinade*, and would give no extracts from it. Balzac was offended; he wrote to Mme. Carraud: "This book is better than laws, or battles even; it is the gospel in action. How many people have already wept over the confession of the Country Doctor! Mme. d'Abrantès, who rarely weeps, has wept over the disasters of the Beresina, and the life of Napoleon told by a soldier in a barn." Balzac and Girardin quarrelled on some other points, and Mme. de Girardin found it difficult to reconcile them when Girardin wished to have some novels for a new paper which he had founded, the *Presse*. Balzac used to go and see Mme. de Girardin only at the hours when he knew he should not find her husband. He made in her house the acquaintance of Lamartine, who afterwards, in his 'Cours de Littérature,' made a very living portrait of the author of the "Comédie humaine." Balzac dedicated to Lamartine his 'César Birotteau.' One

of his most extraordinary novels, 'Les Paysans,' which reveals a profound knowledge of the sentiments of the rural population of France, and of the effects of the French Revolution, appeared in the *Presse*. At the very moment when he worked at the 'Paysans' he was preparing for another paper, the *Constitutionnel*, that masterpiece, 'Cousine Bette,' which forms the first part of the 'Parents pauvres.'

The 'Paysans' appeared in 1846. It had no great success—it was too true. Its readers did not find it amusing—they were spoiled by the stories of Alexandre Dumas, the father. Girardin insisted every day on some abbreviations in the feuilleton; Balzac, who cared much for his long and almost photographic descriptions, was in a state of constant irritation. Mme. de Girardin poured oil between the wheels. She had it in mind to make of Balzac a member of the French Academy, as she was intimate with Lamartine, with Victor Hugo, with Charles Nodier, with Barante. Balzac was not very anxious to present himself; his affairs were embarrassed, and his monetary condition very precarious. At the last moment he withdrew his candidacy; Victor Hugo persisted, however, in giving him his vote. Who was elected in his place? I really do not know. Balzac never made the famous visits, so it cannot be said that he ever was a candidate; but it is clear that he was not encouraged, and that, if he had been in the least, he would have presented himself.

In the autumn of 1833, Balzac made, in a hotel at Neufchâtel, Switzerland, the acquaintance of the Countess Hanska, who was with her husband and her daughter. Mme. Hanska, who was of Polish extraction, was at that time thirty years old. She had the peculiar grace and distinction which belong to the women of her race; she spoke French to perfection, and was well acquainted with all the works of Balzac. Her notions were very aristocratic. Count Hanska was a great Russian proprietor, in the Government of Kieff. He invited Balzac to make him a visit at his estate. Mme. Hanska was of a mystical turn of mind, and full of imagination. At the end of 1833 she began a correspondence with Balzac which was never interrupted. The friendship which had sprung up on the Lake of Neufchâtel became, by a constant communion of thoughts, a deep affection. He confided to her all his troubles, his difficulties, his projects. He sent her his portrait painted by Boulanger.

In 1838 Balzac became acquainted with the gifted and beautiful Princess Belgiojoso, who had for a moment inspired a passion in Alfred de Musset. "She has had the good fortune to displease me," wrote Balzac to Mme. Hanska; "her house is well kept, and her people are very witty. I have been there two Saturdays, and have dined once; that will be all." In that same year Balzac, being a little more easy in mind, bought a piece of land at Ville-d'Avray, and built the little house which he has made famous. The view from it is admirable: the valley of Ville-d'Avray, the immense panorama of Paris, the hills of Meudon and of Bellevue. "Forty-five thousand francs more of debt," he wrote to Mme. Carraud. "The folly, you see, is complete now. I must pay, and, in order to do so, I work every night." Still, the speculator—for whoever has read Balzac must know that there was a speculator in him—was satisfied. He wrote to Mme. Hanska that the value of the place would soon be doubled. The truth is, that it was only a source of expense to him. He soon found himself so embarrassed that he entered, into a mining adventure. He had read, in Tacitus,