

©

A

CHRISTIAN  
COMMONWEALTH.

BY  
FRANCIS WILLIAM NEWMAN,

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,  
LONDON.

The *solid foundation* of the Lord standeth with this seal: . . . Let every one who nameth the name of the Lord STAND ALOOF FROM INJUSTICE.— *Paul to Timothy*, 2, ii. 19.

---

LONDON:  
TRUBNER & CO., 57 & 59, LUDGATE HILL.

PRINTED BY STEVENSON, BAILEY, AND SMITH,  
NOTTINGHAM.

1883.

~~VI 4052~~

Int 6824.3

JUN 15 1899

Rev. J. H. Allen

Concerning the recent affairs of Egypt, it is well to refer readers to Mr. J. SEYMOUR KEAT'S Analysis of the Blue Books (up to the bombardment of Alexandria). It has passed through many editions, and if it had been possible to convict the quotations of inaccuracy, that would have been done long ago.

F. W. N.

# ON A CHRISTIAN COMMONWEALTH.

---

THIS tract or treatise cannot hope for a reading until its title be explained to two classes of objectors.

One class will ask, What is Christianity?

Another class will say, All theory of what *ought* to be in States is Utopian and useless.

I meet the latter first, agreeing with the objectors that to confess myself Utopian is to forfeit all claim to be listened to.

---

## SECTION I.

### WHAT IS UTOPIAN?

From Greek *ou*, not, *topos*, a place, was invented for us Utopia, to mean a non-existing community: custom has extended the word to mean a community which *cannot* exist. I protest against the assumption that what never has been never will be and never can be. Human nature being always human, its history is sure to have a fundamental likeness to itself, and acquaintance with the past will always be instructive to those who study for the future. Nevertheless the ages do not move round in a monotonous orbit. New and unexpected births astonish and perplex alike kings and many public men who think themselves philosophic. New mechanical inventions transmit, diffuse and quicken old wisdom and wide experience. The millions of every nation are learning to think, learning also the right and wrong of public deeds. To arm ignorant rustics against thoughtful townsmen is no longer a feat easy to baron or king. New aspirations

and new ambitions spring up in classes of which habitually no account was taken by politicians. Patriotism takes new shapes; national antagonisms are so metamorphosed by the width of travel, and by Science necessarily cosmopolitan, that the contrast of the modern to the ancient world is signal enough to confute the stifling doctrine of despairing pessimists. The freedom of democratic Churches in presence of State Supremacy is a vast moral revolution,—perhaps the greatest contrast wrought out in two millenniums: nor has antiquity any parallel to the phenomenon now seen in England,—the weeping yet enthusiastic outcry of the multitudes against drunkenness, impurity and cruelty,—against the fostering of vice and heartlessness by fatuous policy. A real novelty, which Time will only confirm, is the awaking of intelligent women to their political responsibilities, and essential public duties. An embryo this, but destined to be a mighty moral power. Freedom of utterance for truth and justice is the great victory which the myriad army of noble martyrs has achieved against multiform tyranny; a victory too solid in many centres to be reversed by violence and intrigue. This is, in all human history, novel, and certain to entail other novelties unsuspected by men of routine, mere gropers into statistics and petty induction. Every open and fresh eye ought to see that the new strivings of even the nearer future will not reproduce mere squabbles of two parties, each selfish to the core, neither adhering to any fixed or avowed principle of Justice. Instead of a contest between dynasties or officials for place and power, we have now a holy war of philanthropy and patriotism against gunpowder-glory, class-avarice, impurity, usurped authority, and trampling down of the weaker as by scientific right and instinct.

So much is said against that shallow axiom which bids us expect nothing in the future better than the past. But I

should accuse myself of Utopianism, if I believed that between corrupt Imperialists—whether English or Roman—it could matter much to the moral world, whether a Brutus or a Cæsar conquered. Predominance of Justice, not Paganism in Christian dress, is our urgent want. The axe must be laid to the root of evil; we must not be satisfied with white-washing an exterior which has rottenness and pollution within. I am well aware that it is vain to hope better government and a happier future than the guidance of the best and wisest can give; and that an upper class seldom knows when its own foundations are rotten. Routine blinds it. Through this ignorance, four despotic Emperors in succession, whose intentions were excellent, and all the peoples abjectly submissive, could do nothing to hold up the old Roman empire from sinking deeper every ten years into misery and barbarism.

In a corrupt age, where mechanical skill passes as *civilization*, where the swarming multitudes are artificially debased and there is no massive middle class, free from the vices alike of ambition and pauperism, little can be effected by literary wisdom or by religious zeal. If our existing state were such as this, another Tacitus might say of us, that the destinies of the Empire urge (or verge) to ruin. But England has a greater, nobler, wiser nation *inside* that veil of place-holders whose horrid Imperial spectre alone so many a crushed people now beholds. Therefore I do not admit that a deep-reaching Reform of our country in harmony with high morality and noble Justice is at all a chimera or a Utopia.

But this is not all. I charge on those who talk against morality in high place as Utopian and try to sneer down all noble aims in national effort, that they are base Fatalists; that they advise nations to drift with what is called "Manifest Destiny" into Violence and Robbery; and instead of struggling for the Right and standing aloof from the Wrong,

bid us to do what we find easiest and most convenient. Their wisdom regards the "Flesh and the Devil" as our legitimate, paramount, necessary lords, and "the Spirit" as an influence too weak to count on. Such doctrine tends to make a nation, in proportion to its strength, an object of hatred, a public scourge, an incarnation of hard-hearted selfishness. It ensures calamity and final contempt, if it prevail. Therefore every good and prudent citizen is bound to do his utmost against doctrine so fatal to public and private welfare.

## SECTION II. CHRISTIAN MORALS.

But next, What is meant by Christianity, when we speak of a Christian Commonwealth? If we were dealing with a problem of Church History or of Ecclesiastical Law, or were desirous of forming a Theological Creed, I fully admit and maintain the extreme difficulty (one may rather say, impossibility) of defining Christian orthodoxy. But in a popular and political sense, no real difficulty of explaining the phrase exists. Christianity in its origin *was a protest for righteousness* against the accumulated oppressions and vices of Imperialism. It announced the coming overthrow of all unjust power and the establishment from heaven of a righteous rule; exhorting all men, before that day of divine retribution should burst on the world, to pass *from the slavery of sin and Satan to the free and noble service of God, in which and with which was salvation.* That was the key-note of all apostolic teaching. Denouncing all unrighteousness, and signally claiming a supremacy of the spirit over the flesh, it was yet more severe against spiritual than against carnal vices. Ambition, avarice, cunning of lawyers, oppression under legal veil, injustice of judges, pride of rank, fierceness, violence, and all hypocrisy of rulers, are with it cardinal sins. Tenderness

and kindness, meekness and gentleness, compassion and mercy, forbearance and forgiveness, temperance and purity,—all the feminine virtues,—were prominent in its estimate as fruits of the Spirit. No doubt, a peculiar, and at first a very limited, creed was at the same time inculcated, indeed a creed concerning the speedy convulsion of this world that has not lasted; but under every apostle the creed was only *a means* to an end; Holiness and Righteousness were *the end* proposed. Nor herein is Christianity hostile to Judaism. Its most valued preachers were born Jews: its first Bishop in Jerusalem, James, “the Lord’s brother,” did not cease to regard the twelve tribes as his co-religionists.

The epithet Christian as applied to a commonwealth is not at all contrasted to Jewish. The Jews themselves have no desire to press upon Gentiles any peculiarities of their ancient local State. Concerning domestic Justice, which is the supreme virtue of States; concerning temperance and purity, which are the very foundation of social existence; concerning Justice to the foreigner, which makes our Ethics human and no longer tribal; there is now absolutely no schism between Jew and Christian. Any apparent moral conflict is only such as may occur within a Christian Church.

The history of two millenniums has fixed the great outlines of Judæo-Christian morality. We cannot safely abandon the phrase in favour of a new-fangled one, such as Robert Owen’s “New Moral World,” if only because this is a trumpet of uncertain sound. The epithet Christian emphatically enshrines Kindness, Meekness, and Purity, all of which alas! many of our scientists desire to explode as a superstition. Political Justice was not within the practical range of ancient Christians, yet all modern Christians will insist that in proportion as it comes within *our* range, it is binding on the conscience.

So much seems more than sufficient to explain the epithet Christian as here applied to a Commonwealth. But I gladly add that my noble-hearted friend Frederic Harrison, a high intellect in a very limited circle, has displayed on more than one occasion, with the sympathy of that circle, his devotion to Justice; a devotion far higher than that of a host of bastard Christians. *To stand aloof from Injustice* is the motto and flag to which all the highest souls and intellects of mankind, under every religion or no religion, will enthusiastically rally.

### SECTION III.

#### PATRIOTISM AND LOYALTY.

To certain Political Virtues, as we esteem them, the received Christian Scriptures undoubtedly give no prominence. Native Governments, Native Law, having been crushed under Roman Imperialism, Local Patriotism could hardly in that age mean anything but a desire to rebel. The Christian doctrine was: "Leave to a Divine Avenger the redress of your Political wrongs: *it is but a little while, and he who is to come will come and will not tarry*: meanwhile submit to injury." Nearly everywhere men had lost their country: Patriotism seemed no longer a virtue, but a spirit which could have no vent but in disorder and in the companionship of crime. Nevertheless, after the lapse of centuries and the decay of that cruel Imperialism by its own inevitable fatuity, the breadth of Christian precepts leaves us no reasonable doubt as to what is *Christian Patriotism*. "We ought to obey God rather than Man" is an Axiom in all Christian thought. This overruling principle forbids that for a moment any imaginary duty to one's Country or any fond love of it should be pleaded against primary morals. Love of Country is in many respects like love for one's own Family. To be destitute of it is un-

natural, and ordinarily may be culpable : yet because it is so natural, its general tendency is to excess. From love to wife and children a man may become stingy, smart and hard in his dealings, perhaps criminal. His fondness ceases to be a virtue, so soon as it encroaches on justice to neighbours : hence jealousy against its probable excess is as necessary as censure for its total absence.

Only in critical times can Patriotism summon the units of a nation into direct Action : its ordinary call is upon our Sentiment, which may affect our political Judgment, and thence indirectly our action. Now what ought to be our Patriotic Sentiment, is not obscure from common Morals. No mother can wisely wish her child to prosper by vice and crime. Evil is self-destructive. To call triumphant villainy prosperity is an abuse of words. Nevertheless a wicked individual may to his last day be successful, and leave the retribution on his crimes to fall upon others after him ; to a community this is impossible. The crimes committed by any State are certain to entail retribution on that State. When fathers have eaten sour grapes, the children's teeth are set on edge. If the fondness just imagined in a mother is sheer folly, it is ten-fold sheer stupidity in a citizen or in a Statesman, to desire his country to prosper by crime. Such aspirations are open to just suspicion as a mere cloak of personal selfishness : the man hopes for promotion, or high reputation, or for a lucrative contract, and calls it *Patriotism*. In reply to censure on a certain Asiatic war, a lady from India simpered out, that really if we were so nice in our political morals, our rising generation would find it hard to get appointments. This is the average "Patriotism" of English place-holders. No man is bound to wish for his country that which he would regard as a calamity to himself,—triumphant wickedness. I pray God that if I ever become unjust, it may be revealed, to my

disgrace or punishment: *such* punishment, I mean, as His wisdom, mercy and fatherly love would then see to be best for me. Must I not, if I love my native land, wish for it the same thing as I wish for myself?

If we sincerely believe our country and our race to have excellencies beneficial to mankind, we may go so far as to wish it to attain quite an over-proportion in the empty spaces of the earth. If our institutions are juster, our laws wiser, our habits more friendly and peaceable, our literature more instructive, our knowledge more practical, our religion more compassionate and comprehensive; we may well desire that Englishmen rather than Celts or Slavs, Indians or Chinese, nay, than Germans or Scandinavians, should fill the void; *whenever it can be done without injustice*. Unless the last condition be fulfilled, I do not accept as Patriotic the desire to extend English Colonization: much less to extend our sway by violent conquest of those, whose lower mechanical and chemical attainment or lack of stores makes them easy victims to our veteran arts of war. Worse and worse is it to allow our colonies to encroach on regions too hot for English labour; where alike experience and reason teach that average Englishmen will aspire to cultivate the soil by actual or virtual slaves.

Once more. What will follow, if on full survey of our native institutions we discover that some of the most fundamental are unjust and very oppressive; that their praises have been sung so loud and so continuously by falsehood, adulation and credulity, that well-meaning Englishmen have committed cruel wrong on foreign nations by abolishing their hereditary customs and forcing ours upon them? Is it then Patriotic, to desire the extension of our sway abroad, before we have set our own house in order at home? I trow not.

He who worships a God whom he believes to be unjust,

unawares worships a Devil. He who makes his civil obedience paramount over his own perceptions of Justice, is as bad as a Devil-worshipper. A Positivist who makes Justice both sacred and paramount, in devoting himself to a holy principle rises high above double-minded spurious Christians. Justice is the chief good, the common good, the cement of mankind. To proffer Love and omit Justice, is folly and insult. Only in so far as we aid and press our Country to be just, can we promote its permanent welfare.

From Patriotism one may pass to a second topic called *Loyalty*. Loyalty is a French corruption of the word Legality; and through the hereditary influence of despotic kings, each of whom could afford to say, "I am the State," Legality has been perverted into a sort of personal affection to the Sovereign. What is due to the office, we all know; and there is probably little difference among us. What is due to the individual, varies with the individual. Charles II. is reported to have enjoyed as a good joke his being called in the Solemn Liturgy "our religious and gracious king." To make such a phrase conventional and (as Roman law would say) *tralatitious*, does not elevate a Sovereign, but degrades sacred prayer into vile hypocrisy. It is hard to imagine in pure and noble natures who knew George IV. only as a Royal Prince, any personal affection for him. No one will deny that Wellington and Peel were in the truest sense *loyal* to George IV., yet no one imagines that they loved him, if even they can have had sincere respect. Neither affection nor personal respect enter the idea of *loyalty*. The true meaning of the word is not found, until we virtually fall back on its origin, and say that it implies so much of obedience and honour as the *legal* position of the sovereign exacts, and no more. Even to an insane monarch loyalty is due; but is certainly most difficult to define. All who desire Constitutional Law to be

upheld against princes ought to avow that, as in the case of Patriotism, so in that of Loyalty, the great practical danger is, lest Loyalty be too fervid, and entail treason to the community.

Concerning Loyalty no single doctrine can be made dogmatic from the Christian Scriptures. St. Paul, enjoying Roman citizenship, was many times protected by Roman magistrates from Jewish enmity, and took a roseate view of their power, as sure to give applause to the good, and to use the sword as God's representatives against evil men only. But St. John, writing after Nero's persecution of Roman Christians, represents the Imperial power as a fierce beast, "drunk with the blood of the saints," and marked for speedy destruction from heaven. Christians may infer, as Christian doctrine, the duty of judging concerning a king or emperor, what sentiment from them his public conduct deserves.

But here I take leave to protest against a pretended zeal for Constitutionalism which degrades, dishonours and insults royalty. In history we read, that when our Whigs began to treat the King's speeches to Parliament as speeches of the Ministers and not of the King, George III. was greatly enraged. Without censuring those Whigs (who perhaps had no other safe and legal course open to them) I justify the King's resentment. Every man of spirit would say: "To call me "King of England is mere mockery, if I am to be the only "man in England who may not speak out of his heart to "the English nation." Nicolas of Russia fanatically hated Constitutional Monarchy as false and hypocritical. While a king is debarred from opening his lips to Parliament, he is likely to seek relief to his bondage in other ways. Queen Victoria *has done so*, by giving us in the life of her Consort many plain avowals: and now forsooth, pretended loyalists forbid us to quote the Queen's book, and reprove it as a grave

offence to mention her name in a political argument. The Queen publishes her book, of course to be read, to be pondered over, to be circulated. In the face of this fact, we are told to be silent about its remarkable and important revelations of her sentiments and judgments.

It is preposterous and absurd to expect a Queen who comes to the throne under Parliamentary Authority, to admit anything less than the same authority to restrict her right of action. Public Opinion, Advance of Democratic Sentiment, may claim that a Queen shall submit to her ministers. Naturally this is felt to be a degrading doctrine. The Queen clearly shows her approval of the efforts made by the Prince Consort to press Lord Aberdeen into the Crimean war,—efforts, of which the nation knew nothing before her Majesty told us. I beg the reader to understand that I am not censuring that war, much less the Prince's zeal for it. In my life-time it is the only war which the English people pressed on the Government; the only war for which they had a voluntary zeal. That zeal was prompted by just fear and just indignation, and was wholly without cupidity. Nicolas of Russia had already invaded Turkey and used Turkish resources for his war. He had done the same four years earlier, when planning his unjust inroad into Hungary, whose established laws he aided Austria to overturn. If he had been allowed to conquer Constantinople, he would have become paramount over all the shores of the Mediterranean. His enmity against Constitutional Restraint of Monarchs would have been felt in every corner of Europe, and instead of merely supporting the Turks against his armies, we might have trembled before a universal league of despots. The Prince Consort, no doubt, saw with mixed indignation and alarm every German Prince paralyzed before Nicolas. That our dynasty should desire to tell to the nation

its sympathy with the national movement, (if such was the fact) certainly meets with no disapproval in these pages. All that I here contend, is, that *if* an English monarch is to share the War-power, it ought to be exercised not secretly, but openly and under personal responsibility. Prince Albert (to my mind) was quite right, in desiring England to help the Turks *and their Christian subjects* against Russian invasion: yet his influence being secret, was pernicious. How so? The new generation does not know the facts and needs to be informed. The Ministry (as Mr. Gladstone has told us) had a conscience *against* assisting the Sultan; yet they sent a fleet to Besika Bay, and thence to Constantinople *as if* to support the Sultan! Our ambassador distinctly told the Sultan that the fleet was sent to defend him; yet the Admiral had orders not to fight! It is impossible to explain this, except by supposing that the fleet was sent, to *seem* to be yielding to the Prince Consort's importunity. Not to swamp my argument in detail, I check my pen. Suffice it to say,—if the Prince's advice had been uttered publicly, as early as it was expressed privately; if upon this had come debate in Parliament; Nicolas would have been made aware of his danger in due time. His earnest effort had been to avoid a quarrel with England: therefore there would have been no war. The fixed resolve of our Ministers for peace, and the silence they imposed on Parliament, duped the Czar and encouraged him to plunge forward, until our Ministry was forced into the war by shame at its own duplicity.

Loyalty cannot forbid free speech concerning the most dreadful of all topics. War affects a country vitally. If undertaken at all, it ought to be undertaken under the most sacred public responsibilities. To *drift* into it as Lord Clarendon (then Foreign Secretary) said we were drifting, is at once pernicious and disgraceful.

Neither Patriotism nor Loyalty can justify the entrusting of the War-power to a secret conclave, in which it is not known how each member votes, nor for what reasons and under what secret influence a war is made. I seem to remember words of Lord Aberdeen about that time—"an unnecessary war is the greatest of crimes." Nay, but greater still is a war fundamentally unjust,—a war of ambition, of pride and of mere personal cupidity.

#### SECTION IV.

#### TESTS OF A CHRISTIAN COMMONWEALTH.

Every Christian Church must have many unsound members. It does not thereby cease to be a Church. Moreover its most genuine votaries are not yet perfect men and women. To make them true to their high profession, it suffices that they fix their aims high and struggle upwards towards the goal of spiritual life. Just so, a Church collectively can seldom on any side be called perfect; but if its aim be sincerely set towards the main object avowed by the primitive teachers,—“to turn men from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive inheritance among them that are sanctified,”—we cannot deny that it is a Christian Church, whatever may be its defects in detail.

The same general principles apply to a Christian Commonwealth. We are no longer in the Middle Ages; nor, as under Queen Elizabeth, can we avow with “the judicious Hooker,” that English citizenship itself makes us members of the Anglican Church: nor any the more can we embrace the Puritanical idea of the State Church. The doctrine of the Independents has conquered. Even our Ritualists hold it, as did these who in 1888 originated their movement. Whatever may be wished or dreamed by some zealous members of the “Broad Church,” no union in formal Ecclesiasm is any longer

possible or desirable for any nation, however widespread its ardour of religion. The wise Churches of the Future will not seek for Unity in external details nor in subjection to the same Church Officials; but they will unawares find it when they accept the same moral image of God and godliness; when they sigh after the same ideal of Holiness; finally, when they actively struggle for impartial Justice, as paramount over all particular and national aims. Zeal for Righteousness alone made Christianity honourable; this, and this alone, will ally its sects into a Spiritual Federation, as a mighty Power for human welfare,—a real blessing to mankind. But to return to our immediate topic,—all organized States are necessarily moulded on Morality. They cannot cohere, become stable and powerful, without certain virtues from within, and when (as generally happens) their strength makes them *unjust* to other communities, they encounter hatred and opposition and leagues of hostility. So far is it from being true that States have nothing to do with morality, that their life and strength is from Virtue, their weakness and death from Vice and Injustice.—Inferior religions which condone vice or command injustice, cannot usefully coalesce with the State: but precisely in proportion as a religion aims at high morality—eminently at purity in the family and justice to those outside,—it has aims in common with the virtue native to every flourishing State. The Christian doctrine aims at something more than mere *action*, namely, at influencing the desires, the motives; as indeed do all noble systems of Ethics: we call it *Spirituality*. The State (hitherto at least) has stopt far short of this: but if any Religion makes morality enter its very essence, it is a natural ally and support to the State.

We in England may seem to be torn apart by divers creeds. Our variations and controversies are a byword, and furnish many a stone to those who love to pelt. No doubt, there is

plenty of error where opinions are contrarious, and probably plenty of folly. Nevertheless in the rival and contending churches the vital doctrine common to all is of superlative importance; the weakest and most foolish churches sincerely recognize it when stated to them. What is it? It is a strain of moral enthusiasm running through the most honoured and sacred writings. Its essence is summed up by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, when expecting (it seems) his speedy martyrdom. He sets forth two propositions as the *solid foundation* of Christianity. The former is not here to the purpose: "The Lord knoweth them that are his." This is transcendental, rising high above State-action. The second lands us on *terra firma*, prescribing the primary duty of every Christian, (2 Tim. ii. 19.)

"Let every one that nameth the name of Christ **STAND ALOOF**  
"FROM INJUSTICE."

Here, according to Paul, is the solid foundation. In this principle all branches of the Christian Church are of one mind, and, one would hope, of one heart. There have been times when no Christian had any influence over worldly politics. There must always be many Christians who have no influence and no action. But whether action be in the State, in the Market, in the High Road, or in the Family, it is with every Christian a paramount duty to *stand aloof from Injustice*. No pretence whatever can dispense with this precept. As for those who say: "Let us do evil, that good may come," Paul comments on them: "*whose condemnation is just.*"

Moral Right, whether in the State or in the Church, is essentially and necessarily dogmatic. The State fines, imprisons, enslaves, scourges or kills offenders against the public code of morals. The Church or the Private Conscience virtually excommunicates the scoundrel whom the arm of the Law cannot reach. Those who desire to weaken our moral

forces and convert us into machines carried away by desire, disparage the unity of human morals, pretend that it has no stability, and forbid strong epithets such as *wicked, impure, cruel, abominable, robber, fraudulent*, as if moral truth had no broader basis than personal taste. But in every cultivated language the epithets of vice and virtue testify to the contrary. Variation is superficial, agreement is deep and fundamental. Pre-eminently in recent years, through the various Churches of these islands a greater and greater zeal for our common morality is developed.

Now if through the strivings of good men within and without the Churches this State of England were deliberately aiming to be Just, aiming "to stand aloof from Injustice;" then, even if, through the entanglements of the past, many institutions continued indefensible; we might hesitate to deny that this is a Christian Commonwealth. The denial will probably cause to many even resentment: so thoroughly has the idea been imbibed with the mother's milk, "Other nations "are Pagan or Mohammedan: ours is a Christian country: "to conquer them is to bring them a blessing." But as, if a Church does not *even aim* at Christian morality, to call it a Christian Church is deceptive and mischievous, so if the State *do not even aim* at Justice abroad, nor at Temperance and Purity at home, then to call it a Christian State is "a mockery, "a delusion and a snare."

Broad and recent facts are here decisive; but if the reader's patience endure, further details will presently be added in proof. A general Election was held in 1880. Magnificent orations were spoken, abounding in moral principle and wise condemnation of overt injustice. Mr. Grant Duff (whom I mention for honor,—a man so eminent that he is now Governor of Madras) put forward the very sound doctrine, that "a Statesman is bound by the same laws of morality as a pri-

“vate man.” The doctrine was commented on with approval by one still more eminent. But when debate arises in Parliament, arguments from Justice are nowhere; a moral vocabulary is nowhere: right and wrong, just and unjust, vanish: British interests (so called) alone are mentioned. Officials whose injustice was previously condemned, encounter from the same lips no word of moral reproof in Parliament. The morality of private life has thus no place in high politics.

One more small, but very notable fact, full of deep meaning. Lord Carnarvon, as Minister of the Crown, declared to a deputation that “he did not believe that there was “a person in England who desired a war with Russia.”—A year later he revealed in Parliament that for these words *he had been most severely rebuked*. He did not tell us by whom. It must have been by a very high secret power behind the minister. Yet at that moment our ministry were in amicable concert with Russia, who took no step without giving us courteous information and avoiding everything that could excite our displeasure.

More than a quarter of a century ago, Kossuth, when in this country, dropt an utterance before a large company.—But who was Kossuth? Men in middle life tell me they barely know his name. It suffices to say, that in the end of 1851 he stirred this island from end to end; that though an exile, he was received with more than regal honours, from the rich men of London, Birmingham, Manchester and Edinburgh, as well as by the masses of the poor: he was invited by 187 municipalities to visit them, and next he traversed the United States, North and South, as the honoured guest of the republic. Within my hearing he said: “I begin to think “that Christianity has no future in this world.” Voices arose, asking what he could mean. He explained: “There “is not a single Government called Christian, which—I do

“not say, *acts justly* toward other nations; but which even  
 “professes to make Justice its rule of action to the foreigner.  
 “They calmly avow *their own interest* to be their goal, their  
 “conscious aim. With such a fact before me, I despair of  
 “foreign nations embracing Christianity.”

Will any English-born Christian be comforted to think,  
 “Well! after all,—the rest of Christendom is as unprincipled  
 “and as Pagan as we are?”

An American critic on seeing in Westminster Abbey the  
 flags of our naval triumphs and tombs of our heroes, exclaimed  
 “Behold the gods whom England glorifies!” Bravery  
 in war, *just or unjust*; activity as a Party Leader; success  
 in pleading causes, *just or unjust*; such are the virtues which  
 we honour. Some have asserted that Jesus of Nazareth  
 would have poured forth scalding words against our Christian  
 professions as illustrated in our central shrines.

#### • SECTION V.

### ON WAR AND ITS SOFTENINGS.

With Assyrians, Persians or Greeks in old days, to make  
 war on a foreign people needed no justification. As man  
 subdues beasts, birds and fishes, because he is cleverer and  
 thereby stronger, so cultivated man without reproof made  
 barbarians his slaves; so each nation, as soon as it became  
 stronger, counted Might to guarantee Right. Greeks and  
 Hebrews, when crushed by foreign force, unlearned this  
 savage doctrine. Romans, pupils in Greek philosophy, began  
 to propound nobler morals. But Imperialism was unteach-  
 able, and the Empire sank into weakness from inward  
 corruption. Barbarous invasion thereupon overwhelmed all  
 Europe.

War and Confusion, War and Cruelty, War and Misery  
 from waste of resources, went on, with destruction of litera-

ture and overthrow of education. Hereby brute ignorance dominated for nearly a thousand years. At last, ambitious princes found mercenary foreign troops to have more expertness than new levies, and to be trustworthy tools. Gradually Italians, Swiss, Scotch, English and Irish fought *for pay* in dynastic wars; fought in opposite ranks as against foes who to-morrow might be allies; and lo! War began to be softened! Prisoners of war were treated more mildly. To kill one who might be captured was deemed dishonorable. To wear a UNIFORM carried with it a sort of privilege. Wise books were written about *the Laws of War*,—that is, not on what grounds War could be justified, but under what restrictions War (*just or unjust*) ought to be entered and conducted. Kings and Statesmen began to become virtuous by professing obedience and subjection to literary authority. Europe admired and congratulated herself. “We are no longer on the level of unscrupulous Pagans.” “Christianity has softened and ennobled us.” “We carry on War only for high and grave causes, and do its terrible work with as much gentleness as may be made compatible with Victory, our paramount aim.”

Undoubtedly there has been a softening, *primarily* and *chiefly* in the treatment of actual combatants, when strong enough to confront one another in the field, alike dressed in uniform, and fighting under the name of powers known to European diplomacy. A modern army of invasion is supposed not to plunder at random. If possible, it *buys* food of peasants, or gives them bits of paper *promising* payment, so as not to drive them to despair and bitter enmity. Nor does it plunder the shops of a town, but through the Mayor and Aldermen it makes requisitions which equalize the loss over thousands. Much less does it wilfully burn and trample the crops or cut down fruit trees,—cruelties which seldom con-

duce to victory. But that this "softening" of War is inspired only by the interest of the belligerents is proved by the fact that merchantships at sea are seized as prizes,—the richer, the better for the victorious ship. When we ask, "Why do you respect civil wealth on the land, but clutch all you can lay hand on by sea?" we get for reply, "Because in the latter case, and in the latter only, we do not increase our own danger by freely plundering." Not Christianity, but what is called "enlightened self-interest" has, in so far, softened war.

The worst miseries of War are not from battles, however dreadful, but from a suspension of cultivation and of traffic, and from waste or destruction of food. The longer the War, the greater the misery to the population on whose soil it is waged. In the course of the last seventy years the increased power of locomotion, also of warlike engines, and the enormity of expense, have vastly shortened the duration of Wars and proportionately lessened suffering. No claim can here be set up for advance in Justice and Humanity.

If a people once conquered *renews war*, its conduct is stigmatized by us in Latin, as *rebellion*, and is accounted to forfeit all human and national rights, all right therefore to such softening as the received Laws of War prescribe. When Poles rise against Russians, Italians against Austrians, though they may fight in uniform, they are called *rebels*, not *enemies*. Nay, Hungarians, who were not conquered by Austria, but had received an Austrian dynasty by treaty and under the strictest legal limitations, yet for the crime of resisting Austrian perfidy and usurpation were hanged after they had surrendered to Russian generals. Has England followed any other principle of conduct, when beyond the controul of European opinion?

Mr. Gladstone recently told us, that as long as he has been

behind the scenes, the conduct of the Cape Colonists has been a perpetual anxiety to the Home Government. I have not his words before me; but I know that the Colony has been again and again judged in England to make unjust aggressions on natives. Two difficult Cafir wars were waged by us, *because* injured Cafirs "rebelled." When beaten down by great armies from England, they desired peace, without the disgrace of surrendering their leaders to our discretion, *i.e.* to possible death or perpetual imprisonment. The answer to them was: We make no terms with *rebels*.

The East India Company had attained a legitimate status by accepting from the Grand Mogul a diploma constituting them Collectors of Revenue under him. Hereby without sacrifice of patriotism natives were able to serve as soldiers under the Company. When the Suzerain declared war against us, our Sepoy regiments regarded themselves as bound not to fight for us, but did not rise against us, until they found that their inaction was with us unpardonable mutiny. "No terms with rebels," was our sacred principle. The Christian General Havelock (whom I name for honour) could not promise them even their lives, if they submitted. When we captured the Great Mogul, *our own Suzerain!* we treated him as a rebel, and sent him in felon's garb to consort with felons. The last general who fought against us,—Tantia Topee,—we captured not very honourably, and then hanged him.

Prisoners of war were shot out of the mouths of cannon, in order that burial might be impossible; Brahmins we polluted with blood, in order to torture the hearts of their kinsfolk by the supposed horrible results to them in the world of spirits.

Having recently invaded and annexed Oude under the pretence that its king governed the people badly, we were so exasperated against the villagers for harbouring armed insurgents, that we burned in the same fires insurgents, villagers,

old, young and sick. So far, not much softening by Christianity showed itself, up to 1857-8.

Having made war upon Shere Ali, prince of the Afghans, under pretence that he favoured Russia (a country with which we were not only not at war, but even in close peaceful conferences), we burnt the villages of the Afghans in the depth of winter, because they were most reasonably supposed to be hostile to us, their invaders. This was *very* recent.

More recently still, Sir Bartle Frere made war on the Zulus, not only without just cause, but *against* positive order. Short of high treason, this is the gravest crime that an official can commit. A crushing defeat of our army was the result. Hereupon (as the newspapers reported) the Queen sent to Sir Bartle a letter of condolence and confidence. Lord Beaconsfield's "hand was forced." His ministry adopted the war which it had forbidden, sent an overwhelming force against the king who for many years had been our friend, who in his hour of triumph had been as forbearing as his cause was just. Our brute force, utterly reckless of Justice, crushed Zululand beyond repair, and gave it over to empty fields and famine, with every chance of anarchy. When Sir Bartle returned to England, wholly uncensured by a self-degrading Parliament, the newspapers stated that the Prince of Wales went down to the coast to receive him, carried him to the Prince's own palace at Sandringham, and thence escorted him to Balmoral, where the Queen entertained him for a fortnight. The sufferings of the Zulus from famine must be comparable to the worst which the Pagan Romans inflicted.

Sir Bartle displays his zealous Christianity as a patron of missions, and was lately welcomed on the Christian platform (if the newspapers report correctly) by the highest Church Dignitaries. He has taught young aspirants what sort of

disobedience to legitimate superiors in office, and what form of dealing with bold but unoffending savages, may bring them honour and its fruits from our religious and gracious Queen.

The late Sir Robert Peel was a Constitutional Statesman and a Tory prime minister. He could not bear "maids of honour" who might possibly breathe *Whig* favouritism into the Queen's ear. Oh how blind was he to the future! A Spanish lady married a Frenchman, who was diseased by Empire on the Brain. This man obtained chief office under the French Republic, and, to establish his own despotism, flagrantly violated his official oath and massacred myriads of innocent law-abiding Frenchmen. Clutching the French treasury for nearly twenty years, he was able to enrich his wife. She is believed to have so goaded her husband into the great war with Germany, as to call it *her own war*. But under it the usurped Imperial power fell. The Ex-Empress is nevertheless enormously wealthy, has a palace in England and is the personal friend and associate of the Queen. The ablest prime minister of the Tories, who in the green leaf did not foresee the dry, might now moralize: "How much better to have half a dozen Whig ladies whispering in the Queen's ear, than to have a fanatical foreign Imperialist closeted *tête-a-tête*, an adviser who does not change with change of ministry."

#### SECTION VI.

#### REPENTANCE AND RESTITUTION.

It is related, that, in preaching before Henry VIII. and his Court, Latimer boldly stated a very unwelcome doctrine in words substantially the following. "I warn you, my Lords and gentlemen, that if you have committed any Injustice, Repentance (though quite right and necessary) is insufficient to set your souls free. Repentance is incomplete without

“Restitution. Restitution is the test that your Repentance is sincere, and there is no forgiveness from God without it. “My Lords, if you have been unjust, you have to choose “between Restitution and Hell.” Such an address, if literally delivered, we should all now call rude: but rude sincerity, with substantial truth, is far better than opiates to a guilty soul.

Earnest Christians have often maintained, that the energetic soundness of Christian morals eminently depends on the intensity imparted to the sense of Sin; with which are connected Repentance, Confession, and Restitution. All of these are humiliating to the sinner, but for that very reason are to him purifying, strengthening and restorative. Nor only so; but the same things give to the injured party conviction of the sinner's penitence, and confidence for the future. Evidently, and beyond denial, what is true concerning the offences of *individuals* is equally true as respects *communities*. Let us in imagination go back four centuries, before England was powerful by sea; a time at which Algerine and other Moslem cruisers were often our superiors. Such cruisers often carried Englishmen out of our merchant ships into slavery: they might, with small change of circumstance, have committed the same outrage on our sea-board. The evil could not be limited to their actual deed. It spread alarm and anxiety far and wide, and drove us to expend labour in defence against uncertain attack. No military successes against such buccaneers,—short of a total annihilation of their force,—could set us at ease. But suppose that among Algerines themselves a section became powerful, which revered international justice and maintained the equal rights of infidels. If this section gained predominance in Algerine counsels, and condemned the buccaneers, yet winked at the detention of Englishmen in slavery, we should not at all trust them for their mere words.

But if they frankly lamented the past, confessed their wrong, and gave all the redress which was possible, then and then only should we breathe freely. Not only should we cease to fear a repetition of their injustice; but they would *rise in our moral estimate*: they would be likely to become close friends, instead of enemies, and the more so, the less any *external* influence could be imputed as a cause for this change of conduct.

The last words say nearly,—“the more so, the greater the “Power which thus made confession and restitution.” If the buccaneers were weak savages, probably ignorant of the resources of England, confession and proffered restitution might be imputed to *fear*, arising when they got increased insight of our power. But when a Potentate notoriously greater, one who cannot be compelled, confesses the wrong done by his own servants or people, and proffers redress to the injured, no one doubts his sincerity. Nothing is more gracious than frank penitence avowed by a Great Power. The beauty and nobleness of his voluntary humiliation and restitution are proportioned to his greatness: so too is the confidence and deep respect which he earns, as one with whom Justice is paramount. So *false*, so *entirely false* is the doctrine that Great Powers *ought not* to be expected to humiliate themselves when they have done wrong. It is just they who can do it without running any risk, who also are sure to win by it reverence and honour, priceless and enduring.

But what is the current morality of English public men and English Cabinets, in this cardinal matter? It is useless to allude to such men as will never admit that our officials, highest or low, have been unjust to foreign tribes or nations. The present question is, When injustice is *confessed* among ourselves, what course do we pursue to the foreigner? Do we confess it to *him* and give what redress we can? or do we

insist, that "that would be a humiliation to us, therefore we must dissemble, and do nothing to redress the injury?" Several recent test-cases (as they may seem) offer themselves.

It is not many years since Governor Eyre of Jamaica was a public scandal. He had proclaimed martial law in certain parts of the island, because of popular commotion. Taking advantage of this, he arrested his parliamentary opponent, a Mr. Gordon; carried him into a proclaimed district, and there had him tried and hanged by two or three young military men; after which the Jamaica Parliament passed a bill of indemnity, which secured the Governor from punishment by English law. Our Cabinets, of both parties, muttered indignation, deep if low, and the Jamaica Assembly obeyed some dark orders from England to decree its own annihilation. Jamaica thenceforth is a mere crown-colony. But Mrs. Gordon, the poor widow, bereft of her husband, could not get from us even a miserable pecuniary solace.

Soon after, a panic seized Englishmen in Natal concerning the native tribe of Langibalele, who were fiercely attacked and driven out, their cattle seized, and their chief imprisoned. The Home Government deplored the conduct of our colonists, who were ordered to restore to the tribe a certain amount for the cattle. Complaints were loud, that the restitution was most imperfectly made; and certain it is that Langibalele is unjustly kept a prisoner to this day.

So too, the war against the Zulus was notoriously unjust, and had been made against order from England. Yet the ruin inflicted by us on Zululand so little touched the consciences of our statesmen who condemned it, that no one seems to have dreamed of proposing to send provisions and cattle to the starving Zulus. If such restitution were enforced by our "State-Conscience," individual statesmen would fear loss of reputation from their crimes,—surely a slight punish-

ment enough. A special tax levied to redress the cruel wrong they had wrought, would keep their guilt in remembrance of the public. Perhaps their opponents fear retaliation.

Cetywayo is now released from his unjust imprisonment, but we have not confessed that we have done him wrong, nor do we pretend to give redress. According to the last accounts, we are even now robbing him of the best part of his country. He was brought to England to see our dockyards and arsenals. The Government despairs of winning his good-will, and seeks only to inspire him with terror. Such is the morality now predominant in high places. The natural consequence is to make all the races of South Africa to adopt the fixed sentiment: "The weakness of England will be our opportunity." Thus does our Cabinet diffuse Good-Will to mankind.

The Afghan affair was on a still greater scale,—a war without any just pretence. The Ameer was required to admit English residents in his country; he refused, because he had no power to secure them from rude or violent treatment. He had a right to refuse, and events cruelly proved that his foresight was just and his reason sincere. *That* was no just cause of war. But, it was said, "he is disposed to be favourable to "Russia,"—a country with which we were not at war! No cause could be more hollow. When an eminent statesman who had vehemently condemned this war as unjust, consented to become the Queen's prime minister, it seemed to simple minds an axiom, not only that he would stipulate to stop at once a war which he knew to be unjust, but that he would implore Parliament to send as peace-offering to the Afghans some million or two of money, in repayment for our devastation. But no! we are shut up into a new theory of *continuity!* A new ministry which abhors and has publicly condemned the conduct of its predecessors, is bound to *continue* the evil work which they have begun!! Our armies were left to go

prowling among the Afghans ; a rude defeat came on us : then the very minister who had condemned the war, was forced to send out new levies and make the unjust war *his own* ! This is our substitute for Restitution. Who can fail to see that such conduct exhibits false principles at the bottom,—principles fundamentally condemned by all Christianity ? As if to stamp England as the “double-minded man who “is unstable in all his ways,” the fort of Quetta is still retained by us : the fort which was occupied solely to threaten invasion of Afghanistan, a fort which no sane man would retain (distant as it is, and enormous of expense in money, men and camels) except to threaten *new* invasion. Penitence and Restitution would earn for us respect and confidence ; our actual conduct can only inspire intense distrust, contempt and hatred. Yet it is pretended that it makes our hold upon India firmer,—and for this sacred object it is a thing of course to trample Justice under foot.

#### SECTION VII. WAR AND PIRACY.

The Great Powers of Europe see a vast difference between War and Piracy. Captive soldiers are to be treated honourably in proportion to their rank : pirates are to be hanged or butchered. The higher their rank, the more guilty they are, and the severer their doom. The more enterprizing and more obstinate may be the courage of a man who fights in legitimate War, the higher is his honour from the enemy : but the bravery and enterprize of a pirate only makes him more loathed and less pitied. The difference then is very grave. What is the practical criterion distinguishing them ?

Common sense at once replies that the State which engages in such War as admits of moral defence must *suppose* itself

*just* in the quarrel, must have definite claims, and must know what they are. The *signs* of this are, to make the claim known and sharply define it. If any one desires justice and not *War as an opportunity of robbery*, he will propound his claims in the quarter which can enforce or give redress, namely, to the highest authority in the offending country. Thus if at Bristol a pirateship were fitted out and then plundered the French coast, the French Government would be retaliating piracy by piracy, if it sent a squadron to burn the Bristol docks and bombard the city. It must send to London and demand redress of the Queen's Government. Until redress has been refused, no war can be legitimate.

Nothing so marks an assassin as sudden unexpected attack, with no previous demand, or anything to disown indiscriminate plunder and the principle that *Might makes Right*. Sudden surprize in the midst of peace is to established Governments the most abominable sin and crime. Hence eminently their ferocious unpardoning revenge on insurrection from races which they have trodden under foot: because in general such insurgents *cannot* comply with the inexorable claim of International Rules, of demanding Redress with solemn warnings of what will follow refusal.

Not to load these pages with detail, I briefly note a few outlines from our Asiatic dealings in about thirty years past.

(1) In 1852 two ship captains complained to Lord Dalhousie, then Governor of India, of overcharges in the port of Rangoon. After examining their details, Lord Dalhousie disallowed some, and reduced the total to about £980.

Hereupon he sent Commodore Lambert with three ships, ordering him to demand the £980 from the Governor of Rangoon, but *in no case to use hostilities*. If the money was refused, he was to demand that a certain sealed letter should be sent up to the King at Ava. Commodore Lambert both

disobeyed and blundered. He picked a new quarrel of his own, and cut the King's ship out of its moorings and prepared to carry it off. He was implored not to do so, because the gunners at the fort would be bound in duty to fire on him if he passed with the King's ship captive. He forthwith did the very thing. The gunners fired, without effect: perhaps missing on purpose. The Commodore replied by blowing the fort to pieces and then shelled the town for three or four hours, committing, *as his dispatch stated*, great slaughter. He then claimed that the sealed letter should be sent up to the King. It was sent, containing a lie! It told the King that the Commodore *had demanded* the £980 and the Governor *had refused* it to him: but he had not even demanded it!!

The Commodore was censured (*on paper*) by Lord Dalhousie. Clearly he had been guilty of disobedience, of piracy, of wholesale murder of innocent unarmed civilians, of arson and ravage. One might have expected "an amiable, intellectual "and just nobleman," to be anxious to wipe from the English name the imputation of piracy. But the Commodore was continued in command. His war was adopted! The King was taken by surprize. Half his kingdom, and that, the more valuable part, was torn from him; his people changed into English vassals, unworthy to hold posts of honour: in fine Commodore Lambert himself was honoured by a blue ribbon from the Queen. When did an officer who had enlarged the English Empire by wickedness, ever meet disgrace? When is *restitution* to the injured ever deemed a sacred duty by an English Cabinet?

(2) In China our conduct had exposed us to the taunt of a mandarin, "How long have you honoured the English flag so little, that you sell it to men who may want it to cover piracy?" Our representative, Sir John Bowring, was not daunted; and to me in person (years later) he said: "When

“my instructions from home are at length published, it will be seen that I had no choice but to act as I did.” I held my lips as with a bridle, from replying “Unjust orders ought to be disobeyed at any risk or sacrifice.”—However in 1856, when a Chinese captain, who had bought the English flag, was arrested for piracy, and the governor of Canton would not surrender him, Sir John Bowring bombarded that great city. The English Parliament severely censured the deed, Lord John Russell and Mr. Gladstone nobly and feelingly denouncing its horrors. Nevertheless Lord Palmerston persisted in “hostilities,” but without declaring war on the Emperor of China. The newspapers of 1882 tell us that our present Premier appeals to this bombardment of a commercial city while at peace with its Sovereign (a deed which he thoroughly abhorred and denounced), as a “*precedent*” for like conduct. Lord Palmerston could at least plead, that as Peking then admitted no English ambassador, no conference with the Chinese supreme power was open to him.

(3) On the topic of our last war with Persia *few* newspapers gave information to the public: but I read in those days (about 1867) the following facts. We were angry with the King of Persia for desiring to capture the town of Herat, the centre of ruthless slave-hunting, which carried Persians into Tartar slavery and devastated Northern Persia. Our ambassador at Constantinople made demands on the Persian ambassador there, who asked and received time (days numbered) to communicate with his Sovereign. But a British fleet was already on its way to Bushire (Abushehar); war was proclaimed at Calcutta. The British Consul at Bushire *boasted of his cleverness* in carrying off everything English safe into the British fleet, and declaring war against Persia after he had quitted the shore! The war began, according to the complaint of the Persian ambassador, before the number

of days stipulated to him had expired. No questions (as far as I could ever learn) were asked in Parliament on this matter. To me the tale sounded like Piracy.

Asiatic war is supposed to have *its own laws*; which means barbarian licence. Nothing that Englishmen can do, *if they are but in uniform*, is called Piratical. The philanthropic Rajah Brooke horribly massacred Dyaks in mass, both in villages and in boats when trying to escape; merely on the presumption that they were Pirates. English sailors were paid head-money in proportion to the slain. Hume and Cobden were shocked in the extreme, but *with what result?* Piracy imputed to savages justifies indiscriminate slaughter, without trial or verdict. Piracy when about to be punished by a Chinese mandarin brings on that mandarin and on hapless Chinese millions prompt and crushing punishment, miserable death and suffering in countless and agonizing forms, from Christian England, anxious for the honour of the flag which she has sold. How shall I now approach that most painful topic, our recent dealing with Egypt, which our Premier seems unaware to define as Piracy, when he avows that it is not War, but *only* Hostilities? Such conduct from such a man freezes the blood, paralyzes speech, confounds intellect. "Mr. Gladstone must know something that we do not," say his multitudinous admirers. "Mr. Gladstone would not enter into bloodshed without overwhelming necessity." Who might not have so believed, except for his Ashantee war? and next, his Transvaal war? We are forced to look straight at facts, and at the history which preceded. Without pretending to know secrets, enough of events are public, notorious and certain.

Ismail, despotic Viceroy of Egypt, a hereditary prince, yet subject to the Sultan as his Suzerain, had (like other scourges of mankind) conceived Imperial schemes. He saw that the Sultan, under the tutelage of Lord Palmerston,

had broken through Moslem scruples against mortgaging taxes to the foreigner, and was revelling in immediate wealth at the expense of men unborn. The Viceroy was already largely in debt for the Suez Canal and other domestic works: but he planned great armaments. Large sums were quickly advanced by French and English capitalists, which were spent as quickly. Direful earth-hunger gnawed into the Viceroy's heart; he hoped to conquer beyond Nubia and reach into the distant Sudan; larger and larger loans were coveted, but the laws of the Empire limited him, and without permission he could not borrow more. That permission was at last obtained (according to the Blue Book) by huge bribes at Constantinople: then the Viceroy launched out freely; indeed he fought three wars against Abyssinia, with little success. In all, he received rather more than forty-five millions sterling, which were charged to him as ninety! The unfortunate people were whipt and bastinadoed to extort money for the interest of the debt. The foreign bond-holders were paid, while the other creditors of the Government were starved. (Not half the cruelties can be here told.) Our Consul General wrote home (for once) an indignant protest against the crushing of a whole nation; but soon understood that such a tone had no echo in Downing Street. Out of her extreme poverty *Egypt actually* in a course of years *repaid the forty-five millions and six per cent. upon it*; but the bond-holders still claim ninety millions. When at last the misery and outcries of the people had aroused the Chamber of Deputies to resist the usurpation of legislative and executive powers by the bond-holders, Ismail himself bankrupt, ruined and disgraced in his private estate, sympathized perforce with his wretched subjects, and dismissed from his Cabinet the hated and highly-paid foreigners. But to them dismissal was unendurable. Quickly by influence at Constantinople they effected the

Viceroy's deposition, and enthroned his son Tewfik as his successor.

All Egypt had been convulsed. Deputies from every part had come to Cairo. The unanimity of the people had been reflected by the Chamber of Deputies; the Army had supported the people, in demanding of the Viceroy—what? Something very terrible? very unreasonable? something that might justly offend even a foreign power previously friendly? Nay: but they claimed to *economize, in order to pay their debts!!* They acknowledged the full nominal debt of ninety millions, probably in ignorance that only forty-five had been received and how that had been squandered. They bound themselves not to touch or discuss those branches of the revenue which had been mortgaged, but to manage and allot those only which remained for the administration of the country.

It is important here to quote from public dispatches sent at the most critical moment. Lord Granville in an urgent telegram dated 12th January, 1882, demanded "a report by telegraph as to what will be the precise effect, if the Notables obtain the power over the finances which they claim."—The Consul-General replied on the 13th of January:—

"Official Salaries, not regulated by contract, would be under the control of the Chamber, so that it would be able to abolish the Land Survey which is the result of no international engagement, and to remove many Europeans in the administration."

In other words, *It will enable the Chamber to economize.* Lord Granville's reply is not given. We can now easily guess why. Counsels of violence prevailed. No decent argument for them could be presented to the English public, and false reasons for our *War which was not War* had to be concocted.

The indignation of the people rose ever higher through the pretensions of the foreign agents: the unanimity of the

Chamber forced the new Viceroy to consent to a National Ministry, under which the Deputies proceeded quietly to their duties. No violence was attempted or needed, so unanimous and steady was the nation.

Without any new cause or new events, on the 20th of May, 1882, a formidable fleet of English and French ironclads arrived at Alexandria. Our Consul-General in writing to urge this step on 14th May, had warned our Government that *it might possibly cause danger to Europeans in Cairo*. No doubt, it aroused fierce excitement through all Egypt, for it was a palpable ACT OF WAR. The Sultan had previously declared that our ships might cause a dangerous popular commotion. Englishmen are blind, even to stupidity, as to the nature of such a deed.

A man who holds a pistol to the head of another, threatening to kill him, if he do not sign a certain document, is pronounced by every English judge to be abominable. If the culprit defended himself by saying that the pistol was not really loaded, the judge will reply: If that be ever so true, still you are a scoundrel for the threat. How much worse would be the threat of burning a man's wife and children to death, if he did not comply with some arbitrary command? Yet that is a trifle in comparison to pointing our deadly guns against a peaceful commercial city of two hundred thousand inhabitants. *One* defence is, that our ministry never intended a bombardment, they only intended a "demonstration," and probably were horror-struck at the actual event.—To make this defence valid, they ought to have commanded the ships to go *without ammunition*. Even so, the "demonstration" would be no more *justified* than the threat (imagined above) made with an unloaded pistol. Those who armed the ships, meant those arms to be usable and deadly. If the bombardment be a regretted blunder, what is the theory of the after war? Crime to disguise the blunder?

Again, it is said: "Violence was threatened against the forts only, not against the city." Are we then quite simpletons? Common sense knows, and every seaman confesses, that a ship firing at a distance of miles cannot guide the flight of her missiles to a limited scope. We intended to terrify the whole population, and we did terrify them. Hence the riot, which has been falsely called a *massacre*. It was caused by our Act of War. In it the natives fought with sticks and Europeans with firearms. Naturally *their* loss of life was far greater than that of Europeans. Yet this riot is assigned as a justification of our bombardment! "What else *could* we do, after that *massacre*?" We could do what the French did—steam away. The batteries would not have run after us. It is gravely said, that we were forced to our cruelty for *self-defence*! To call it REVENGE would be franker.

It is further pretended that the conflagration was not our work, but that of native scoundrels. Yet, if so, nothing but our attack drove out the army, emptied the private houses, caused anarchy, and made the scoundrels masters of the city. Moreover our newspaper correspondents who wrote before the invention of this sophism, attested that they saw houses fired by our shells. That was the beginning, and we were quite reckless what was to be the end. Of course we would rather have had the city in our own hands, safe and convenient. For that very reason a patriotic general might have burned it when he could not save it from us.—It seems that we are now imposing on the Egypt which we have ruined, the debt of three millions for the destruction of European property which only our attack made possible and brought about.

If a French fleet of ironclads suddenly appeared in the Mersey and threatened to bombard Liverpool, that would be an act of piratical war. If the English population at once set upon all Frenchmen with sticks to drive them out, it

would be a most natural act. If thereupon the French bombarded the city and called it either *self-defence* or *necessary revenge*, they would add gross hypocrisy to hideous cruelty. That is exactly our position. Fraud and falsehood naturally follow murderous violence. The Wolf slanders the Lamb.

The earlier accounts represented our bombardment to have been justified and *necessitated (!)* by Arabi's new batteries, as if we could not steam away from them. But *now* we learn, first, that Arabi did what he did, by order of the Viceroy; next, that on July 7th, the Consuls General of the Great Powers addressed a *collective* note to our Admiral, offering to procure satisfactory assurance respecting the work on the fortifications (work for protecting gunners!) and added a protest against bombardment as cruel to the population, Christian and native, and involving incalculable ruin to European property. They begged him *to get an answer from London before bombarding*. But he flatly refused, saying that he should direct his attack against the fortifications only.—Newspaper correspondents informed us at the time how disappointed were the crews, when for a moment they feared they would have no fighting; and of course we know, that if the Admiral had been more humane, he would not have earned an English Peerage.

But what of the Sultan? He was the Suzerain. If we had any complaint against Egypt, we had no ambassador there: we were bound to complain at Constantinople. Did we make any demand in Egypt? Yes; we did. In an ultimatum with the fleet, we sent a demand that Arabi should be banished; and we made the same demand or request of the Sultan at Constantinople. By so doing, and in many other ways, we formally confessed the Sultan to be the Suzerain; the only authority which could legitimately interfere in a question interior to Egypt. I do not know that a very interesting fact is told in the blue books, which was told in

the newspapers, and (I believe) without contradiction : that when our ambassador asked that Arabi be declared a rebel, the Sultan replied by sending to Arabi *the highest decorations of honour*. Mr. Seymour Keay lately alludes to it as notorious.

We cannot know certainly, yet we may sometimes reasonably conjecture the inward movements of a Sultan's conscience. The blue book reveals that the bond-holders obtained for the Viceroy Ismail power to plunge deeper into debt by a process of which the Turks were ashamed. A bribe of £900,000 was accepted by his Majesty the Sultan. The Cabinet took no part in the transaction. It was carried on in the palace, not in the Porte ; *i. e.*, not in the *Downing Street* of Constantinople. The Sultan had no foresight of the miseries which his deed would cause to Egypt ; but in a later year, after he had learned through special envoys the actual state of Egypt, he was conscience-stricken, and he discovered that Arabi was precisely the one man in Egypt whom it was his duty to support. Hence when importuned impudently by a foreign power which had absolutely no right, and *knew that it had no right*, over the interior government of Egypt, his conscience and his pride for a moment prevailed over his fears, so that to our demand that he would proclaim Arabi a rebel and exile he replied defiantly by placing on him signal honour. Nevertheless, after the horrible destruction of Alexandria, this display of our power and our cruelty dismayed and unmanned him. What might not next happen to the forts on the *Dardanelles* and to Constantinople itself ?

In our newspapers appeared a declaration of the Premier that he was not at war, but, in the interests of the Egyptians themselves, he was engaged in mere hostilities against Arabi and a few factious supporters. That is, he was behaving as if *he*, and *not the Sultan*, were Suzerain of Egypt. He asks us to believe that he did not know the unanimity of Egypt, did not

know that the Princes and the Ulema (Religious Dignitaries) after Tewfik joined our invasion, regarded him as a traitor,—in short, did not know that Arabi was acting with the Chamber of Deputies in a purely civil cause, for a highly necessary end, by purely constitutional means, with the high approval of the Sultan.

The Emperor Nicolas of Russia committed an awful deed of wickedness in crushing the liberties and laws of Hungary at the invitation of a violent and perfidious Austrian Cabinet. But the Austrian Emperor, half imbecile as he was, did through his ministers call upon Russia for help. Therefore Nicolas's invasion of Hungary could not be called Piratical. But what if the Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary had been entreated by Nicolas to proclaim Batyanyi and Kossuth "rebels," and had replied that Hungary was in profound peace, was loyal to Austria, and that the two men whom the Czar denounced were just those who deserved the highest decorations of honour;—how much more hideous would have been the guilt of Nicolas's gratuitous invasion! It would seem that in the pride of power England is trying how much of arrogance and violence God and man can bear from her.

As constitutional and loyal subjects of the Queen, we are supposed to be under duty to impute it to the malign advice of the Prime Minister (who is our theoretical scapegoat), that the Queen through her Royal Son sent a special message of sympathy to the weak and ignorant Tewfik, the creature and tool of the bond-holders, whose complicity with unprovoked foreign invasion had forfeited the trust, love and respect of every patriotic Egyptian,—even the princes of his own family condemning him.

SECTION VIII.  
ARMAMENTS AND THEIR TENDENCY.

The late John Stuart Mill uttered in Parliament the following words of wisdom: "Our Armaments ought to be "as strong as possible for defence, and as weak as possible "for offence." Perhaps at that very time, in the midst of profound peace, we were building ironclads to terrify New York, and to damp the American demand of restitution for the ravages of the Alabama. Ironclad vessels, enormous and unwieldy, helpless against buffeting waves, but moveable within a safe harbour, are an admirable home defence, but could never alarm and offend foreign States. Yet, alas! the great effort of our mechanics and our dockyards, is not for defence, but for offence. When the ship called "the Captain" was swallowed in the waves, carrying down to death many a valuable sailor and the son of Mr. Childers himself, any one who believed in Divine Interventions (a very general notion) might well infer that the dreadful calamity was a *Special Judgment* on our mode of dealing with the foreigner.

Englishmen fondly think that our armed navy is only a defensive force: at least they argue as if it were so. Foreigners, when they get the ear of an Englishman whom they think to know what Justice means, plainly say that our fleets are a standing menace to all maritime cities. "I can never "forget Copenhagen and Navarino," said one eminent foreigner. "For aught we know, an English fleet may suddenly swoop "down on one of our cities or on our fleet, without previous "warning." What did this mean, but: "We look on English "policy as retaining carefully in its hand the power of acting "the Pirate, at its own discretion." The Fenians maintain that we claim for ourselves the *status* (though not the name) of "the Pirate Empire." Huge ironclad ships are not built

to chase Pirates, but solely to attack forts. What *right* in time of peace they can have in the Mediterranean, is not easy to understand.

Contrast the policy of the American Union. They have a vast sea coast and distant commerce. Long ago, they sent merchant ships to China for tea, as did we: but they sent no ships of war, and had no quarrel with China except for inhumanity to American ships in distress of weather. Concerning this they used bold and stern language; and pleading only for Justice, they obtained Justice without war. When harassed by Algerine piracy, they quickly made the Dey of Algiers sensible that he could not safely wink at the misconduct of his subjects. The American Commodore in those earlier days was quite as effective as our Lord Exmouth against Algerine piracy. Their ships have ever nobly sustained the honour of their flag in favour of refugees. No one can accuse them of tameness: yet their armed navy in time of peace has been proportioned to real need and has never given offence by its magnitude. When their civil war broke out, their ships had been sent to distant seas, or locked up in a Virginian harbour, by the craft of the perjured seceders: yet in a few months President Lincoln's Admiralty built ships of the newest fashions, able to blockade two thousand miles of Coast. Their navy was then the more powerful, precisely because it was new; so vicious is the policy of building, in time of peace, more ships than are really wanted. The odium which they bring on us from foreigners entails moral weakness, and to this is added mechanical inferiority and great waste. Certain classes among us are insatiable as to the magnitude of the armed navy which they desire. They lay it down as an axiom, that our navy must be equal to all the navies of the world put together. To argue with such aspirations, is useless. When a man wishes our navy to be strong

enough to defy collective hatred of other nations, the presumption is, that he wishes us to be strong enough to practise Piracy without fear. But if we desire peace and good-will, well directed expenditure and just economy, nothing is more obvious than to invite all the Great Powers to take an active part, not only in protecting neutrality of the Suez Canal, which of late has been called a European duty, but in suppressing piracy in every sea. Of course, in all combinations difficulty will be met: but as soon as it is discerned that Justice, *the common good of mankind*, is sincerely sought, conciliation begins and good-will does not linger far behind.

But Armaments by sea or land involve a deep and terrible controversy, which we cannot annihilate by blinding ourselves. Quaker doctrine is not here preached: yet in my private experience sensible Quakers do not object to home-defence against marauders any more than to police-defence against robbers. We *must* keep some nucleus of an Army, and *whenever we have the will, it may be made to harmonize with high morality*. These pages only maintain that it does not now harmonize with any morality that is not fundamentally Pagan. Will the reader at least for a moment look at things with fresh eyes? Nothing is now-a-days commoner than to read in magazines and newspapers invectives on Jack Ketch, the typical hangman, whose character (it seems) deserves contempt and loathing unlimited. Yet this much-reviled person never takes away life, until a Judge and Jury solemnly pledged to seek for a true verdict and a judgment according to law have pronounced that the culprit does not deserve to live, and is no more fit than a wild beast to be at large in a human community. What would be our hatred of Jack Ketch, if the man whom he hanged were doomed by a mere majority of a secret council, *not* pledged to pronounce a true verdict, none affecting to seek Justice as a *paramount aim*,

indeed some of them impudently disowning any guide but Expediency? A Jack Ketch who for *mere money* engaged to hang as many persons as might be committed to his clutches; who further calmly informed us, that the guilt or innocence of those whom he hanged was no concern of his: that if murder there was, he cast the guilt of it on those who paid him: that he thought of his trade only, and of his pay, which it would be inconvenient to give up; *such* a Jack Ketch would be to us as loathsome as a Caliban. If further he paid the Poet Laureate to glorify his office, he would only sink the deeper.—Yet, if a well known and highly honoured general truly represent the moral position and moral tone of our army, it is hard to see how it differs from that of my imaginary Jack Ketch. Sir Charles Napier (the hero of Miani) informed the world, that the paramount aim of a soldier is “to win glory.” We know that it is simply impossible for an army to act at all, if it is to sit as a jury on the justice of a war. But if a man consent to make himself the agent of deadly violence, without any *reasonable ground* of believing that a *Just Verdict* has condemned those whom he is ordered to attack, he is reckless of the blood of the innocent. If he has adopted this calling as a trade, it appears to be by far the least honourable trade in the whole world.

The oath which is said (truly I suppose) to have been taken by every member of the Jesuits: “Whatever the General of my Order commands me, I will obey without inquiring whether it be right or wrong,” has been regarded as *atrocious*. But in substance it is identical with the English military engagement, if that be interpreted to mean, “I will kill and ravage wherever and whenever a majority of a secret Cabinet bids me, and I will on principle refuse to inquire into the right or wrong of this extreme frightful process, and even whether the Queen in Privy Council have

“declared war.” To add: “I do this *to win glory*, and the “fruits of glory, rank and increased income,” makes the case morally worse and worse.

In the coronation of a Tartar prince, the frankness of barbarism pierces the heart: the words of devotion have no hypocrisy. When a successor of Jingsis Khan was to be enthroned, the elect put the question of homage to all the great princes in these words: “If you wish that I be your King, are you resolved “and disposed each of you to come when I call, to go whither “I send, *and to kill all whom I shall order to be killed?*” To this they all made reply, Yes!—Perhaps this very formula might be used elsewhere,—say in Russia, where the Russian Czar bears an undivided responsibility by no means nominal. Yet as time goes on, each Czar becomes more and more anxious to have the sympathy of *all Russia* with him in every war;—a very valuable guarantee that the eagerness of generals and princes for “glory” and promotion shall not be allowed to mould the whole nation into noxious banditti. On the contrary, where the Sovereign is supposed to have no responsibility, but is hidden under the screen of a Cabinet, and each member of the Cabinet is screened in numbers, no one knowing how any one votes, while each is expected to argue to the public *as if* he approved that which he opposed in the Cabinet, the tangle involves all in a dark veil. No one can know whether the vote is influenced by the ambition of military and naval men, by the avarice and corporate spirit of place-holders or by pompous and frivolous aspirations of a Court. Moreover impetuous generals and admirals, nay and Courts, at their own will plunge into war, either aiming at “glory” or carried away by zeal; and our Cabinets, for reasons easy to guess at, never resent this licence of fatal omen. I believe Mr. Gladstone in his Midlothian campaign *praised* Sir Robert Peel for keeping Sind as an English possession though he

strongly disapproved the war by which Sir Charles Napier, without orders from home, had conquered it. We hardly need proof that when a mass of men live for war as their profession, collectively they will press hard for war and will hate the inaction of peace, which brings no promotion. When men, not for Justice, but as a Trade, habitually expose their own lives to deadly risk, very few indeed of them will sustain in their hearts much tender humanity or horror at slaying and starving innocent thousands. Generals and Field Marshals, though they do not sit in the Cabinet, are often influential in secret: so indeed are great contractors, and money-lenders. To sell one's services as slaughterers knowing that no such precautions are taken for sacred Justice as we deem indispensable for punishing a pickpocket, has none of the moral justifications which are obvious in the case of Jack Ketch. Does the Poet Laureate glorify or satirize soldiers, when he says of them,

“Theirs not to ask the reason *why*?

“Theirs but to do and die.”

We may seem to become constantly less scrupulous, as Imperialism has become more and more ascendant. It used to be taught that every soldier is liable to the same trial before a civil Judge as every other citizen, if he use deadly weapons unlawfully; his engagement is (or was) to obey *lawful* orders only, and to make war *lawful*, the King in Privy Council must have decreed and proclaimed it. But now, no inquiry into the lawfulness of wholesale slaughter is made. The idea seems not to cross the mind of any Admiral or General. No Nihilist assassin could more thoroughly discard conscientious scruples than they do. Some of the religious and semi-missionary magazines during the Zulu War were a literary curiosity, at once grotesque and dreadful. A pious soldier wrote home a letter

mixing verses of hymns with moanings that he had to kill Zulus whom he knew to be innocent and injured. He finds it very painful work, yet he *has* to do it. Our officers, it is to be feared, are too eager for "glory," ever to moan over the fact that they are possible murderers.

#### SECTION IX.

#### LARGER RETROSPECT.

This recklessness of shedding innocent blood is no new fact. It descends from high antiquity. Our Royalty and our oldest nobility have their roots in the military profession. Under Norman rule, King and Barons were nothing but a Robber Caste. The assumption of legal formalities may in domestic affairs happily curb the robber by the constable, and make violence the honourable servant of Justice; but in foreign relations, *if any trade in bloodshed is allowed to exist*, legal formalities much oftener do but disguise and varnish injustice. On this account perhaps, bold natures, that despise "humbug," prefer to carry out high-handed violence as undisguised buccaneers, rather than as glozing hypocrites who pretend to justice. One thing is certain, that no slight modification of existing routine can check our present career. Mr. Gladstone has told us, that to get a foothold in Egypt will awake a craving of conquest as far as the Cape. Imperialism is a wolf with insatiable maw. Like the horseleech of the Proverb, it ever cries "Give! Give!" Unless we are willing to run the well-known road to hatred, disgrace and ruin, deep searching political change is necessary, not mere surface-change.

Our aristocracy from the beginning was in its essence a royal army. It was not a mere militia for home defence, but always counted upon liability to foreign war, especially as our Norman kings had French possessions. Equally the higher

Baronial titles, Duke and Marquis, were military, as likewise the minor titles, Knight and *Squire*, i.e., shield-bearer ; and the heraldic coats of arms, which denote something of nobility, testify the same fact to the present day. War has by the vast preponderance of Christian moralists been approved *on one condition only*, viz., that it be resorted to as a *last* resource in the maintenance of Justice, so that it may be described as executing between nations the same functions as within a nation are performed by a Court of Justice and its officers. To repel piratical attack we must be somewhat armed, especially by batteries in ports and rivers. Yet how truly do the Quakers deny, that English war ever assumed any such process as in every Law Court of England is held essential to the discovery of *what is Just!* Our practice seems more and more to assume concealment and secret decision, and to avoid all responsibility for blood-guiltiness. In old days there was barbarian callousness, but also barbarian frankness. Our Henry II. thought it just to attack Ireland, because he had obtained leave from the Pope. Our Edward I. invaded Wales and Scotland from a simple instinct of aggrandizement. His grandson cruelly desolated France on a ground that we now judge outrageous,—that his birth gave him a divine claim to French royalty. Henry V. resumed his great-grandfather's monstrous assumption. Each invasion was barbarous in cruelty ; but their wickedness is overlooked through mere admiration of victory. We may groan in secret, but no powerful voice utters indignation against blood-guiltiness. The wailings of widows and orphans, the sufferings of innocent myriads, to this day plead in vain. Edward I. needed no war to attach either Wales or Scotland to the English crown. By justice and courtesy both would quickly have been won. *His injustice and cruelty postponed for centuries the consolidation of Great Britain ; yet he is admired by Englishmen for his*

ferocious activity, and is fancied to have promoted our welfare. Our behaviour to Ireland is a still more shameful story. What symptom of a Christian Commonwealth,—except in a mere surface-washing of baptism, which a Christian apostle scornfully describes as “a putting away the filth of the “flesh,”—can be seen in English history from William the Norman to Henry VIII. ?

And with Henry VIII. new and shameful State-enormities begin. But, not to be tedious, let us come to later times and glance at our Indian Empire. The merchants who founded it aspired neither to war nor to dominion. They desired to remain merchants, and when their servants betook themselves to arms in self-defence, the Company had no choice. By war it became involved in debt and in grievous responsibilities; but when many individuals were enriched, a few signally, we cannot wonder that the Company was unable to restrain its own servants. While the English in India were new in power, the native princes always hoped to expel them: the French also were a constant danger; and letters from England being slow in arriving, it could always be pleaded that they were written under ignorance of the actual facts. In short the servants of the Company were long struggling for existence on that soil, *not* for Empire. But from the day that the princes of India had more to fear than to hope from war, it is manifest that it was in our power to keep the peace. And the Company *would* have kept it, in defence of their revenues, but the Ministers of the Crown had obtained the power of appointing the Governor-General, and secretly dictating instructions to him. They and they only could command peace or war. That war was not to them a *necessity*, is clear in the broad facts. Gibbon with just sarcasm observes, that Livy tries to persuade us that the Romans conquered the world in self-defence. The same sarcasm

manifestly applies to our conquests in India ever since the career of Wellesley and Lake.

While the East India Company ruled under authority from the Great Mogul, the rule (though despotic) rested on a native army. But since we have trampled on the Great Mogul as a felon, we sustain our empire by troops from England, and hold the position defined by Aristotle as Tyrannical, not Royal. English officers base their terror of Russia on their confident assurance that our rule is hated in India. What a Christian position we hold!

England is ruled by two factions, once called Tory and Whig, now called Conservative and Liberal; but grievous facts display that in conquest and robbery they are as like as two peas. Who can expect anything else under a standing army and a vast company of civil servants fattened on conquest?

#### SECTION X.

#### THE SHAM REMEDY.

Names which I sincerely respect, have supported and support the remedy which I denounce as a *sham*; a false, deceptive remedy, which can but throw dust in our eyes, and divert our minds from the magnitude of our danger. In momentous affairs it is futile to mince one's words.

The late Mr. Cobden was perhaps the first to give prominence to the fancy that Wars could be prevented by the Great Powers promising to have recourse to Arbitration before War. It was immediately replied that Arbitration was no new idea, that it was often resorted to, when no passion made it useless, that it was excellent when Governments quarrelled on mere *points of honour*; but it was certain that they either would not resort to it or would not abide by the decision when any strong passion impelled them. Mr. Cobden did not see weight

in these replies, and (apparently) did influence our Government. For in the peace of Paris, 1856, Lord Clarendon as English Plenipotentiary brought forward Mr. Cobden's proposal, which was accepted readily by all the signatories of that peace.

But in 1859 two of those signatories violated their engagement, and the reason of it was so obvious, that to me it has seemed a marvel that any men of common sense should fail to see the imbecility of Mr. Cobden's remedy. France was humiliated by the Treaty of Vienna; the Bonapartes signally. Italy was by it handed back to Austria, to the Pope and the Neapolitan Bourbons. The object of the two Powers, newly allied, was, to break loose from that treaty of Vienna. If they had asked for European arbitration, the arbitrators would not have fallen back upon *moral principles* and have discussed the problem, whether it was *just* for Austria and Austrian Archdukes to uphold over Lombardy, Parma, Placentia and Tuscany a despotic power hateful to the Italians; but would have judged the question by appealing to the treaty of Vienna as the basis and test of Right and Wrong. And even Cobden, obstinate as he was in his own notions, would have seen, that *if* (to put an absurd hypothesis) the Arbitrating Power had ruled that Austria had no business on Italian soil, it could not have prevented war. Austria would have fought for it, just as she did fight: just as England fought, not to be expelled from India. The events of 1859 and 1860 sufficed (one might have thought) to dissipate Cobden's halo.

Next came the American Civil War, and the affair of the packet ship, the Trent. Liverpool merchants believed they could blow up a war. Lord Palmerston and the West End Clubs were eager to seize the opportunity of breaking the great Republic in twain and annihilating Mr. Lincoln's navy. The "Times," as usual, went strongly with the Clubs, with

the Parliament, and with "Society" in London. The Quakers were gravely alarmed, with excellent reason, when the dockyards became suddenly more active than in the Crimean war. A deputation went to Earl Russell, then Foreign Secretary, reminding him of the Treaty of Paris, and begging him to have recourse to Arbitration before War. The Earl curtly replied, that this was a case in which *our honour* was concerned, therefore our engagement in the Treaty of Paris did not apply.—What could the deputation say to that? If the Earl had known his own heart and had uttered the true sentiment of Palmerston and his party, perhaps he ought to have spoken thus: "A great opportunity now presents itself of knocking to pieces a Republic which grows twice as fast as we do, and before the century ends may have the double of our population. We cannot afford to lose our present chance, in order to keep the promise which Lord Clarendon unwisely made." Again Cobden's staff pierced the hand that leaned on it.

Does any thoughtful man imagine that any verbal promise could have induced Prussia to submit to arbitration her pretences over Denmark, or have stopped her from her war against Austria, or have hindered Louis Napoleon from plunging into war in hope of hindering the consolidation of Germany? In the Conference of Constantinople United Europe failed to hinder war, though one may say, it was a virtual mediation between Russia and Turkey. When Governments *desire* peace, they are glad of arbitration, and we need not make a fuss about it. But when their aims are opposite and obstinate, only an *armed* mediator can control them. Unless that armed mediator is prodigiously and visibly superior in force, her intervention may spread the war and increase bloodshed. This talk of Arbitration is not harmless. It comforts men by hope from a remedy already proved futile,

and hides from them what is needed to counteract this fatal madness—not of nations, but of governments, of officials, pre-eminently of a military caste.

But there is a further topic. Earl Russell briskly enough broke through the cobweb of a solemn promise made by his predecessor in office; but Mr. Gladstone has gone far beyond him. Suppose Lord Clarendon's pledge repeated with tenfold solemnity and accepted by every power. How would this have stopped our invasion of Egypt? The Premier sends out (against Arabi) the most powerful fleet that mankind has ever known, and a larger army than took the field at one time in the Crimean War; and when asked with whom he is at war, and whether war is declared, he replies (unless newspapers belie him), "We are *not* at war." Of course then he has sacredly kept the pledge of Lord Clarendon; the question of war has not even come before him. There was no room for Arbitration! True; he did send to *somebody* an ultimatum, with threat of ulterior results from our fleet, *unless Arabi was exiled*. But the ultimatum was not sent to the Sultan nor to his Viceroy. Apparently—(but I write with diffidence)—it was sent to the National Government of Egypt, which (it seems) he regarded as unworthy of Justice, having no rights which a foreign power need respect,—no more right than a Pirate on the high seas; and this in flat contradiction to the Sultan its Suzerain. But it was not War, only Hostilities. Will none of these well meaning persons who talk of Arbitration open their eyes to see how contemptibly weak is their prescription for the intense disease of **EMPIRE ON THE BRAIN**, which drives Statesmen into deeds far worse than the most ferocious madmen set at large, with all the fierce beasts of earth to aid them, could possibly achieve?

An English ministry is in some respects comparable to a Roman Proconsul. In his Province, the latter could do his

deeds of violence *very quickly*; could cut off the heads of the innocent, and say to the kinsfolk: "I am responsible at Rome; you may prosecute me there, if you please." An English Cabinet has only to secure that the Opposition will be on the side of any atrocious usurpation; then it knows that, however shocked its own friends may be, yet, *when the deed is irretrievable*, they will be dumb, lest their open resentment bring back the Opposition to power. Its time of despotism being very short, "loyalty to the Cabinet" is practically its first duty. Having, as Burke coarsely said of Corporations, "neither a rump to be kicked nor a soul to be damned," to expect that it will respect Justice towards weak nations is a fatuity. Our Constitution was never made for governing an Empire; but so wise and noble are *the desires of our nation*, that the injustices which Englishmen commit on foreigners would be vastly diminished if the Executive were not permitted to shroud its dealings in darkness,—to act first, and refuse information on the easy pretext that British interests require secrecy. Cobden wisely said, that *in the long run no strong nation can ever lose anything by making every step of its action public*. Cannot Cobden's admirers follow his wisdom, rather than his weakness?

#### SECTION XI.

#### THE TRUE REMEDY.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson tells the enemies of excess in Drink that if you wish to stop it, you must claim that those who suffer most from its ravages shall have legal power to stop it. Those who wish to thrive on public drunkenness dread above all things his Local Option; because they know that his measure will send an arrow into the heart of the evil.

Just so is it, as to the dreadful evil of War. The great sufferers by it are the poor; the prizes and honours of it are all

carried off by the highest and higher classes. The poor betake themselves to it, never through hope and ambition, but chiefly from the hard pressure of want. On them fall sickness, wounds and death. Mothers and wives suffer bereavements. On them also comes poverty from financial reaction. In the old Roman republic, among the earliest outcries of the people was that against War, in which the aristocracy perpetually involved them; and among their earliest constitutional victories was that which subjected every proposed war to the veto of the Assembly.—In the French Republic we have already seen how averse to war is the rustic vote. It put constraint first upon Gambetta, next on the war of Tunis, thirdly, prevented the complicity of France in our Egyptian war. Old Rome was not so happy. In early days the Assembly was craftily constructed, like the distribution of M.P.s to English constituencies, to secure that minorities should outvote majorities; (*ne major numerus plus valeret.*) Their lower people at last learned the vice of the patricians: many of them fattened on foreign plunder, and rose into distinction. And with what result? As Michelet well sums it up: “While the bones of the Roman plebeians whitened every shore of the Mediterranean, slaves from the conquered nations stepped as freedmen into their place.” One may add: The aristocracy absorbed Italy in huge estates, and freedom was overwhelmed by armies recruited from abroad. The whole history is a frightful warning against Imperialism.—Happily for us, at present the English poor are sincere lovers of peace, and if ever a clear vote is put to them, Will you have Peace or War? nothing but an overwhelming sense of what Justice and Prudence demanded, would make them vote for war. In a Plebiscite they would have stopt the China war of 1856. Of course that is the precise reason why the classes who are reckless of Justice and

Humanity, whose Trade is War, will fight vehemently against giving a Veto to the poorer. But if any man is sincerely a Christian or has the spirit of Christianity; if he truly desire to

*Stand aloof from Injustice,*

he will not allow himself to be fooled by the pretence that this vetoing of War by the poor is a *Democratic* measure. A Veto is a mere negation. It is defensive, and in every sense just. War exposes a whole nation to great sacrifices, great dangers, and a severe strain. The millions who have to bear the brunt of it ought not to be forced into it against their will.

I have quite enough of the aristocrat in me to rejoice when through wise and just policy in the classes which have most leisure, the toiling multitudes gladly leave to them the management of public affairs. But we have to deal with our upper classes as they are, and not with an ideal aristocracy of our fancy. Two centuries hence, it may be that our Parliament will be a serene assembly, devoted to Justice, uninfluenced by Party, proof against all class-influence. In my opinion it would be most *desirable* for Parliament to have a purely Judicial spirit and firmly impose on ministers a just policy, domestic and foreign. But to devise any plan for bringing this about, would only divert effort from the possible to the impossible. Every complex scheme would certainly be spoiled by what are called "amendments," craftily pushed in. Therefore I look on only very simple enactments as giving hope of arresting this insatiable craving for greater armaments, fresh war, and extension of Empire.

In order to take genuine *Plebiscites* no new organizations are needed. Louis Napoleon, when it suited his interest, found the matter easy enough. Switzerland has of late years given us example and instruction; I refer to her votes against Compulsory Vaccination. To take a *Plebiscite* in

England, it would only be requisite that *in each constituency* simultaneously the vote Yes or No on the same question be taken. It would be better, if no constituency had more than one member, and in all (approximately) the same number of votes: but taking things as they are, the vote of a town which has 8 members should be reckoned as 8 against 1 for a constituency which has only a single member.—The mere *right* of Veto would arouse public attention to foreign affairs, would act against the conspiracy of silence, now prevalent in newspapers, which are become to the nation what pernicious flatterers are to a despotic king. If I remember, the Duke of Newcastle in the Crimean war told a deputation that the people had no business to concern themselves in foreign affairs.

Next, not only that part which suffers most has special right to a Veto, but that part which alone can gain by war and is most prone to desire it ought to be made pre-eminent in the *war-taxes*. We feed paupers: we do not leave them to starve; we deprecate taxing those who are on the edge of pauperism, lest we drive them over the edge. Excellent. This concedes the sound doctrine that we ought to tax, not income, but surplus income; and the larger the surplus, *the higher ought to be the percentage* of that surplus which the Exchequer demands. In the near future this will be accepted as an Axiom. Meanwhile it is on this principle that we must put war expenses, if we are to stop War and Buccaneering. The public press tells me that in this Egyptian two months' war *six millions* sterling were squandered: just the sum at which our Government estimated their two years' war in China (1840): so frightfully is expense enhanced. Mr. Gladstone long ago pronounced that Income Tax ought to be reserved as War Tax. That utterance only needs slight modification, by saying that the *higher* incomes ought to pay the Tax on all Wars

which we ourselves initiate, each income being taxed, at a rate rising higher and higher with its magnitude.

These two principles, (1) Let a Plebiscite be able to veto the initiating of war, (2) Let the expense of every war voluntarily entered be laid pre-eminently on the rich;—have no complexity, need no new organization; may of course be refused by Parliament, but cannot be muddled by trickery. They would be very effective, if actually carried. But a *third* enactment which works excellently in the American Union for the extinction of Secret Diplomacy, must not be here omitted. Every member of the American Senate has free entrance to the Foreign Office, with the right to read every despatch at fourteen days after the date (of the reception or sending). No correspondence of the Executive can be concealed from political adversaries: no mutilation can be practised, no cunning suppression, by which our blue books are disgraced. The Government, aware that it cannot maintain secrecy, tries to gain credit with the nation by volunteering early and full information; and if it dared to mis-represent, confutation would be immediate. Moreover if the Senate vote that any particular document shall be published, the Government is bound to obey. The Senate, like our Privy Council, is sworn to secrecy. It may not be our *best* way of effecting the same object, to give to the Privy Council here the same privilege as is held by the American Senate: but it would introduce less of novelty, than that of attaching new duties and rights to a standing Foreign Committee of the Commons House.

In pointing out to the public these three possible steps towards freeing England from injustice to the foreigner,—without which she must inevitably go headlong into disaster,—without which, to call her a CHRISTIAN COMMONWEALTH is gross delusion,—I do not imply that no other methods are possible. Where there is a unanimous will, there are always

many possible ways. Where there is a struggle between opposite wills, the possible ways of success are very few; and success without dangerous convulsion is still harder. I desire to write nothing dogmatically to those, who with me desire the same end,—Honourable Justice to men of different Race. This only I say to them dogmatically: “He that is able to “do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.” Those in whom Christian sentiment is fervent, cannot innocently make Party ties or Family concord paramount over the sacred claims of Justice, or immerse themselves in purely religious and private affairs, ignoring their duties as citizens to help forward every righteous cause. The Christian Churches in England hold a very different position from that of the primitive Churches. Then they were trampled down by a brute military power; now they have but to unite for Justice and speak Truth simply, and the forces of Injustice, which are strong by Secrecy and Untruth, will be put to shame and fall into comparative weakness. You cannot be double-minded and strong. You cannot cringe to Mammon and serve God. But if you put the foot firmly on Paul’s *foundation*, and

**STAND ALOOF FROM INJUSTICE,**

you will be acceptable to God, and in due time approved of men.

---

In referring the reader to Mr. Seymour Keay’s pamphlet, “Spilling the Egyptians,” the names of the publishers, Messrs. Kegan Paul & Co., Paternoster square, ought to have been added.