

These clogs upon him, improved by our laws for the public convenience, confer upon him correlative rights. A State prisoner, the State is bound to support him. Disabled for ordinary life by State regulations, the State must always provide for him his gilded cage.

England is republican in the sense of being quite satisfied with the republic as it actually exists in England, under the Presidency of an Imperial Doge; and, we believe we are right in saying that the Republicans of the Continent count the English Sovereign among the very few sovereigns whom they do not desire to displace. We feel, here, that there are certain public conveniences in the united Ministerial functions entrusted to the Monarch, and if any of us are Republicans, our opinion on that head is a sort of deferred stock, not yet available. But it may be a question whether all the circumstances of royalty are beneficial. The condition of Europe, the manifest incapacity of the whole royal class to know its place, its destiny, or its dangers, and the impossibility of establishing a mutual and complete understanding between Princes and Peoples, anywhere, prove that the training of the Princes in their business is not what it ought to be. Biographies, and living countenances, teach the fact that the lives of Princes are not happy—except in the case of a few goodnatured commonplace individuals, to whom bodily comfort is all in all. The results suggest the expediency of an improved training for our Princes. State pomp may have its uses and its æsthetical influences, but it ought not to distort the learning of the infant; nor completely surround him so that he shall not know the world he is to govern; unless Oxenstiern's sarcasm is to be taken as a grave maxim of government—and it is desirable to govern the world with as little understanding as possible.

But the fault does not lie with the royal classes wholly, nor chiefly. The segregation of classes is not limited to the highest orders. Catch any austere Republican, catechize him about his domestic troubles, and ten to one he will tell you that "servants are the greatest plagues in the world." In England we cultivate this species of caste more rigorously than many others. Class scarcely knows class; and if some adventurous Haroun al Raschid of a philanthropist makes enquiring inroads upon Bethnal Green or St. Giles, it is still as an alien visitant. It is possible—these things seldom come out except posthumously—that in our own royal circle a reasonable relaxation of state ceremonial may bring the royal infants nearer to the actual world, and if so our future Princes may be able to keep pace with the age in preparing for the great political changes in store; but pageants like those of Saturday, in which the winking baby is the object of an imperial procession, in which the little brothers and sisters of the infant see the nursery elevated to a political institution, and note the divided attention bestowed on religion, power, and dress, cannot afford any wholesome discipline to the youthful mind. In the days of tumult and revolt we ought to remember these early disadvantages of royalty.

THE RUINED LANDOWNERS.

CONSIDERING that the agricultural interest has been going headlong to perdition for the last twelvemonths, it is astonishing to witness the pains taken by the impoverished landowners to conceal their sufferings from public gaze. Instead of reducing their expenditure to a level with the reduction which—so they say—has taken place in their incomes, they have launched out into a more extravagant rate of living than ever. Day after day the Court Circular is filled with reports of the brilliant manner in which the forlorn landlords, with their heartbroken wives and daughters, have been out-dazzling all former drawing-rooms and state balls. At the drawing-room, on Thursday week, the court chronicler says "the costumes (which seemed to combine the picturesque richness of the Court of Anne with the chaste elegance of that of Victoria) were of surpassing splendour." What a contrast to turn from these courtly doings of the landlords and their families, to Mr. Ferrand's latest bulletin of the progress he is making among the exasperated farmers, with his Flannel Shirt League, and his recommendation of sackcloth as preferable to satin! Alas for the poor deluded farmers! Sackcloth and flannel are all that Mr. Ferrand can offer them, while their landlords—although they cannot afford to reduce their rents—are figuring in court costumes of "surpassing splendour," at St. James's, just as if wheat were still at 70s. a quarter.

POETICAL ECONOMY.

PURSING through Trafalgar-square, not long since, our matutinal path—brushing with hasty steps the dust away,—we noticed that the fountains were enshrouded

in a resplendent halo of mist! What could that mean? Was it that our Northern sun, even so early in the day, had power to make the sparkling water evaporate, and snatch the passing fountain to the clouds? Such at first seemed the solution; yet it was not enough. Let us track the cloudy stream to its rise: whence flows it? Truly from the waterworks behind the barracks, sharing their pure Artesian source with the public offices, and also with the parish baths and washhouses of St. Martin's.

What Triton Turncock is making game of the cockney? Is it supposed that your Londoner is so effeminate that he needs, not only warm water for his morning shave, but also warm water for his noon refreshment, lest the stream be too dangerously cool? Perhaps it was thought that the pure element, untempered to the Londoner, might occasion a draught in the square—a draught being the English bugbear—and give cold to the passenger. Or is it economy that dictates the tepid flood? Probably some thrifty Egeria has been suggesting a saving application of waste water.

Anyhow, the boiled Arethusa is traceable to the Tudor building behind the National Gallery. Pursue the stream to its source, and you find there, as its presiding nymph, a laundress!



Open Council.

There is no learned man but will confess he hath much profited by reading controversies, his senses awakened, and his judgment sharpened. If, then, it be profitable for him to read, why should it not, at least, be tolerable for his adversary to write.—MILTON.

MARRIAGE.

June 24, 1850.

SIR,—While the sacredness of marriage rites was impugned in your paper, I was merely grieved, but not alarmed; but when the only correspondent who at length vindicates the right cause rests it on bare Authority, this does seem to me alarming.

On the strictest Christian grounds I would repudiate such a defence, which is opposed to the entire spirit of the New Dispensation. Jesus in John says to his disciples, "I call you not servants, but friends; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but now, all things whatsoever I have heard of my Father, I have showed unto you." So, too, Paul again and again renounces the law of the letter, and declares that the true disciple lives according to the law of the Spirit, and hereby is set free from the bondage of commandments written with ink. Yet those who now mean to teach Christianity (it seems) inculcate a slavish contented submission to the law of a letter, hereby leaving the conscience in a puerile state, and bringing back (through Bibliolatry) the bondage and weakness of the Law. The moral precepts of Christianity are not arbitrary: they rest on the deepest foundations in the moral nature of man.

These are felt by every spiritual disciple; and if the precepts are impugned, the defender ought not to rest on the authority which promulgated them, (which is to confound Mount Zion with Mount Sinai, if I may use a New Testament metaphor), on the contrary, his Christian training ought to have enlightened him to understand the inherent obligation of the precepts.

The Marriage controversy divides itself into several heads; of which the following alone need be here noticed:—

1. Ought any ceremony, witnessed by other parties, to be essential to marriage?
2. Ought Divorce to be allowed, except upon grave misconduct, proved before some competent court?
3. What kinds of misconduct will justify a court in pronouncing Divorce?
4. Is Separation, without Divorce, in any cases to be regulated by law?

Before making any remark on these points, of which the second is the really decisive one, I will refer to a striking passage in the historian Gibbon, ch. 44 (whose tendencies were the reverse of prudence), as to the great experiment in Divorce which went on for seven or eight centuries in the Roman empire. The ancient Roman bought his bride of her parents: the union was rigorous and unequal; the husband exercised over his wife the jurisdiction of life and death; "so clearly was she defined, not

as a person, but as a thing, that if the original title were deficient, she might be claimed, like other moveables, by the use and possession of an entire year." Such extreme rigour in the law led to a disuse of legal marriage. Marriage contracts were drawn up between the father and the lover of a lady; who, without losing her reputation, carefully avoided to become a lawful wife, by absenting herself three days in the year from her husband's home. She thus remained "in her father's hand," and her private fortune was his. When such unions, unrecognized in law, had become almost universal, the result was, that "marriage, like other partnerships, might be dissolved by the abdication of one of the associates. . . . Passion, interest, or caprice, suggested daily motives for the dissolution of marriage. A word, a sign, a message, a letter, the mandate of a freeman, declared the separation: the most tender of human connections was degraded to a transient society of profit or pleasure. . . . Both sexes alternately felt the disgrace and the injury. . . . A SPECIOUS THEORY IS CONFUTED BY THIS FREE AND PERFECT EXPERIMENT, which demonstrates that the liberty of divorce does not contribute to happiness and virtue. The facility of separation would destroy all mutual confidence and inflame every trifling dispute: the minute difference between a husband and a stranger, which might so easily be removed, might still more easily be forgotten."

Gibbon does not overlook, that the right of Divorce was not thus abused in the earlier age, in which the Censor's power would have been severely used against any one who was thus guilty. Public opinion, thus enforced, was for a long while a supplement to the defect of law. But except where some arbitrary power like that of the Roman Censor or the ancient Christian Church interposes, it is impossible to allow divorce at the will of the parties without giving a sanction to the loosest and most temporary connections. There is no relation of human nature which more infallibly becomes degraded than this, if not severely checked. The modern Persians have a mode of marrying for a limited period, which is specified in the marriage contract. This is said to have originated with merchants, who are often detained for a year or more far away from their own homes; and a marriage to last for a year is not at all disreputable. But the consequence is, that the priests keep lists of women willing to enter upon short marriages; and a former friend of mine, who, under Abbas Mirza, was head of the arsenal at Tabreez, and took pains to promote morality among the workmen, assured me that he had seen a marriage contract regularly signed by a priest, in which the parties were pronounced to be "lawfully married for the space of half an hour." We have to meet the question, will we, or will we not, look with complacency on such extremes? and if not, where are we to draw the line?

If the will of the parties is to suffice for divorce, the will of one party must suffice; for the one who desired it, would easily be able to make the other so unhappy, as to secure that the desire should be mutual. The majority of married persons would not use the power, for children are too great a bond; but in most of the exceptive cases the liberty would be disastrous. Every married person must know how many petty disagreements are to be expected, and how many temptations must arise to wish to undo the past, how many transient thoughts, that another person would have been a more suitable partner, if only—! Such thoughts are at present crushed by those who are wise, or mourned over as sins, and a happy union is maintained, and even cemented by tenderer affection than before; but if divorce, grounded on no judicial sentence for misconduct, were possible, any of these whisperings of dissatisfaction would easily inflame themselves into invincible passions. Nor would the second and third choice often be wiser than the first. Between one man and one woman there can seldom or never be a permanent and very perfect fitness, much less an exclusive fitness. New objects of love will always exhibit some point of superiority. Married persons must always count on a large exercise of self-denial, and must learn to love in spite of felt incongruities. A man or woman who cannot do this, will never be happy in matrimony, not though as many experiments be allowed as Henry the VIIIth made.

I unhesitatingly therefore conclude, that it would be most pernicious to allow of Divorce, except upon "grave misconduct," and "by a sentence of court" based on such misconduct. But I have no doubt that our ecclesiastical law limits too closely the nature of the offences which shall justify divorce. Nothing but superstition hinders people from seeing that an attempt of one party on the life of the other is a far graver misconduct than an act of adultery. On other points I fear to write either hastily or dogmatically; but all such matters would be settled in process of time by the experience and good sense of the community, if Divorce were allowed to take its course before competent judges, unembarrassed by dogma. The same may be said concerning Separation in certain cases, as of threatened violence, or of habitual drunkenness. That which I emphatically repudiate, is the allowing persons "to take the law into their own hands" in the matter of marriage.

Mr. Francis Worsley's attack on ceremonial mar-

stage in your paper of May 18th, appears to me to admit and deserve no reply, but that of saying *No!* to every clause of it. The real question however is simply this: "Shall a man and woman who enter upon conjugal union *relinquish in their own hands* the power of free divorce? Those who say, *No*, must necessarily require some act of wedding, attested by witnesses, and must stigmatize as demoralizing all unions which are not guarded against such abrupt and mischievous disunion.

FRANCIS W. NEWMAN.

#### JOINT STOCK CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY.

Glasgow, 57, Thistle-street, June 18, 1850.

SIR,—Your correspondent's letter on a Joint Stock Co-operative Society is very good; but I think defective where it leaves the admission of members to be determined by the whim-whams of those having previously joined—the plan must be based on the certainty of a subscriber getting his money's worth. Just let us suppose that "the Old Jewry gentleman" would extend his philanthropy so far as to buy an estate of at least 500 acres of good land, well situated; and who so competent as himself to get a good legal title and keep us out of the meshes of the law, and that he divided it into one, two, and three acre lots, to be retailed out at wholesale price, including in such price the cost of original title, surveying, and making roads; that the cost of title to each occupant be stated, and on payment of the price the title to be given to the purchaser; or, in case of his being unable to pay in full, to grant a mortgage for deficiency till he or his friends could pay it off. To cover preliminary and legal expenses make the shares (apart from purchase sum) £5 each, to entitle to location. Reserve ten acres in the most convenient spot for erection of a farm-steading with commodious barns, flour-mill, store, and exchange market, a range of workshops and a school, all done in the plainest and most economical way—the cost to be allocated over the whole allottees, and the title to this central land and buildings to be vested in trustees for the general behoof, making provision that if any allottee wished to sell out, to bind him in his title to make the first offer of it to the trustees at valuation price, who would select a new tenant. Let trustees appoint a competent superintendent to regulate the whole concern, who would attend weekly meetings of the allottees for suggestions and giving information; the superintendent to be aided by a small committee appointed by the allottees, whose duty it should be to see that the accounts are kept in a proper way.

The cottages to be built together in the form of a crescent or square with flower plots in front, so as to have the full benefit of the co-operative and social ideas, and not built in the straggling style of the O'Connor allotments; the objection that each man's cottage would not be on his own patch would be trifling when we consider that a certain number of horses and carts would be required for the mill, &c., which would be used for the carriage of manure to each allotment from the general farm yard, according to the quantity of straw and cattle which each occupant had; cottages to be built by contract on a regular plan and at a stated price. Here would be individuality of possession with the greatest possible amount of co-operative labour.

I put this for your own elaboration and consideration. From my experience at Charterville I am confident a plan like this, judiciously carried out, would be pretty generally taken up; and besides would gradually yield the full development of the practical Socialists' views. Hoping you will open a share list in your columns and advocate this, or some better plan, to truly enfranchise all classes,

Respectfully yours,

WALLACE RUSSELL.

It is not so much good plans we want, as good and prudent capitalists to carry them out.

#### LETTERS TO LORD ASHLEY

ON PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY, WITH REFERENCE TO AN IMPROVED CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE.

No. III.

MY LORD,—If the measures adopted by the Labourers' Friend Society are wholly inadequate to the exigencies of the times in which we live, it is to be feared that they are not even calculated to benefit many of those destitute objects whose deplorable condition first induced attention to the neglected state of the people. It was not until the crowded, unhealthy, and demoralized state of some of the apartments inhabited by the poorest had reached an alarming degree of fever, disease, and revolting depravity, the effects of which threatened to spread even to more favoured neighbourhoods, that the idea of building lodging-houses was suggested; but if we enquire who are the occupants of these lodging-houses, we shall find that they are of the industrious

baths confined from the inability of the others to pay for them. If again we enquire the class of labourers who rent allotments, we find that they also, so far from being of the poorest of the village, are most of them small tradesmen and the better order of labourers.

No one would think of objecting to the encouragement thus given to the steady and industrious operatives. Although, thereby, it may be competing with the smaller landholders and builders in one case, and with the agriculturist in the other.

The more comprehensive plan of organized Christian communities for those who are destitute of employment would, by early training and regular employment combined with the moral and religious influences, prevent the lethargic and those characters inferior by nature, bodily or mentally, from falling into want and misery in consequence of the greater attention paid to them by the more efficient members; and this would give a still higher tone of moral feeling to the whole community. With what great advantages could such institutions, under suitable modifications, be at once introduced into Ireland, and more especially if the plan of Prince Louis Napoleon, denominated "Agricultural Colonies," described in his *Extinction du Paupérisme*, in which the strict discipline of the army is equally enforced in the peaceful pursuits of agriculture and manufactures, was adopted; such a discipline would be the more necessary in consequence of the acquired habits, indolence, and disorganized state of the Irish. Another advantage of great importance would attend the establishment of such colonies in Ireland, as the measure would supersede the necessity for the Maynooth grant of money. For if loans and grants of land were made for the establishment of Catholic and Protestant communities under competent commissioners, each community would institute its own system of education, and provide the means of maintaining its professors without any aid from Government for that specific object.

Although there are many who have urged the submission of these plans of organized associations to the attention of your lordship, others have remonstrated against the unreasonableness of appealing to those benevolent individuals who are already overwhelmed with projects of a similar character. "Why not," they say, "solicit attention from those influential parties who are not engaged in any other objects of a public nature?" But you, my lord, too well know, from the almost isolated position which you and a few others occupy amongst the nobles of the land, how fruitless it is to expect those whose wealth has enabled them early to indulge with the temptations of indolence and self gratification, to interest themselves in any other objects than those which, although they have been taught to avoid they have been trained to indulge in even to excess. To whom, therefore, ought the appeal to be made, if not to your lordship?

The degree of aid required is simply that of the influence of your name and authority, and the slight attention sufficient to induce you to give that encouragement could not interfere with the prosecution of those other objects before adverted to. Nor would it be too much to expect that the interests of your society might be more effectually promoted by others, especially lady patronesses, who with balls at Almack's, subscription cards, and fancy fairs, their accustomed means, though somewhat objectionable, might enrich the treasury; and thus relieved from the minor details you would be enabled to give an undivided attention in the senate to the higher duties of a Christian legislator, and to a further development of a great principle destined immeasurably to spread the blessings of genuine Christianity and real civilization.

It must be admitted that among the beneficial consequences resulting from your lordship's benevolent efforts, not the least is the example you have afforded to a section of the Church deeming itself exclusively evangelical. By some of those who compose this self-exalted party, all attempts to improve or alter the physical condition of the people is denounced as an endeavour to substitute human for divine means. If it is urged upon them that the clergy themselves have been invited and consented to guide the movement, their next excuse is that the condition of the people has been ordained by Providence, forgetting that, if such a position is tenable, even your lordship, by some acts of Parliament, has reversed the decrees of Omnipotence itself. The means resorted to by this party for doing all that they conceive within the province of man are prayer, preaching, and distribution of tracts: although in no instance has it been proposed to supersede these essential means, but rather to give them more efficiency. Yet is the distribution of tracts considered as the all-sufficient, regardless of the condition of the people, whether they are without work and sometimes houseless and starving. Are the people hungry? they are to be fed with religious tracts. Are they naked? clothed with religious

demoralizing circumstances by which the working classes are surrounded; and thus it is they pray night and morning not to be led into temptation, and yet they leave a starving people ignorant and ill-trained, and consequently least able to resist adverse influences, to be assailed by temptations almost irresistible except by a self-denial and holy resignation rarely witnessed upon earth; satisfied if here and there among thousands there are two or three capable by the power of religion of rising superior to the external influences that impede their progress in improvements.

When the island of Chusan was taken the victorious party upon landing beheld an affrighted missionary running away, pursued by an infuriated woman seeking his life in consequence of having lost her son in the battle. The missionary had told her that the religion he wished to inculcate and professed in his own country was a religion of peace and goodwill to all mankind. Surely, my lord, it is time that an improved mode of propagating the Gospel was adopted, and by exhibiting, like the Moravian settlements, a Christian policy in our communities, to prove what a blessed thing it is for "brethren to live together in unity," it would then be seen that missionaries would accomplish more in one year than in a century without such a visible demonstration of the truth of their doctrine.

The self-supporting villages would be the crowning work of the labours of your society, which has a machinery so well calculated to carry into effect an object so highly important. M.

#### DOCTRINE AND POLICY.

Hampstead, June 26, 1850.

SIR,—You say that I have misunderstood you, and that I "seem to imagine you wish for more doctrines, more theories, more systems than already exist;" you correct me in stating that "your demand is for the *one* doctrine which shall replace all these sectarian and conflicting views, and unite men under the banner of one faith."

I did not misunderstand you; but I wished to know if you had any doctrine to propose.

I have worked out a doctrine for myself, which unites the experience of my senses with the disciplines of my reason under the banner of one faith. This doctrine I call PROVIDENTIAL UNITY. My first position is that of absolute faith in Providence and in the laws of the universe. I am led to believe that absolute evil does not exist, never did, and never will. That which we deem evil is merely relative imperfection, a necessary state of elaboration in the development of natural and spiritual life. I will not here dilate upon this doctrine. My object is to show that you are seeking in a wrong direction for the unity of faith you want.

When I refer you to the Scriptures "you are lost in amazement as to what I am driving at," and ask if I "seriously think that the Scriptures can in any way help us to a knowledge of living facts and the progressive laws of the universe." I do think so, most seriously; and that is my reason for writing to the *Leader*. I believe the doctrine you want is not to be found without studying both natural and spiritual revelation—both Nature and Scripture. You say men *have* "studied the creation," and shown how mere study will *not* help them out of the difficulty, UNLESS it result in the establishment of ascertained laws, and those laws be elaborated into one comprehensive and harmonious doctrine."

That seems evident enough, but not exactly to the purpose.

Is it not a false conceit which stands in the way of faith and understanding more than the insufficiency of study, as a method of obtaining knowledge?

By "false conceit" I mean a false conception or a preconceived opinion, with which some men sit down to study Nature and Scripture, especially the latter.

Some students seem to reason thus:—"Whatever comes from God is perfect: that which is perfect is exactly in accordance with my conscience: ergo, my conscience is the test of truth, and justice, and perfection." Those who are consistent with themselves in this conceit generally become Atheists. They reject the works of Nature as well as the revelations of Scripture. Those who are but half consistent become Deists; they cling to Nature, but reject the Scriptures.

Instead of this conceit we must begin with perfect faith in Providence, and absolute humility of understanding, if we wish to come at knowledge by the study of facts and phenomena in natural and spiritual life.

Nature is full of swamps and poison, violence and imperfection; Society is full of violence and imperfection; why should Scripture be devoid of imperfection, to be held as sacred and divine? Is not Nature of true origin? Is not Society from God? Is