

merely acts on the defensive, or with aggressive ideas and intentions, no one is competent to guess. The preparations in Russia imply more than a desire to be equal to future emergencies. The real danger lies in the attitude of France in the event of a Russo-Prussian war. France by herself is nowhere, nor can she become dangerous to Germany for many years; but if France and Russia should be simultaneously prepared, and should simultaneously operate against Germany, the conflict would be doubtful in the extreme.

HOW BISMARCK KEPT GOETHE'S BIRTHDAY.

WHILE the Germans of New York were paying homage with garlands and with music to the memory of Germany's greatest poet and stateliest man of letters on Saturday, Prince Bismarck was celebrating the birthday of Goethe in his native city of Frankfort-on-the-Main in quite another fashion. On that day Mr. Edward Sack, the responsible director of the 'Frankfurter Zeitung,' was arrested and imprisoned for refusing to disclose the authorship of three articles published in his journal last March, which the imperial authorities chose to regard as hostile to themselves and to the policy which they desired to impose upon Germany.

The dying prayer of the great author, in whom Germans take such pride, was a prayer for "light." The one thing which the actual rulers of Germany have resolved shall not be known in Germany if they can prevent it is light. To this end they have undertaken not only to reduce the pulpit to a position of complete subservience to the State, but to make the press, in the forcible language of Baron Von Liebenstein, of Baden, already quoted in these columns, "a mere echo of the views of the Government."

How resolutely and mercilessly Prince Bismarck has prosecuted his campaign against the independence of the pulpit is known to all the world. The story of last week in Germany makes it certain that the "prince of blood and iron" fears the press no more than the pulpit, and will give the journalists of Germany no more quarter than the priests of Germany. A month ago, on the 2nd of August, three of the editors of the 'Frankfurter Zeitung' were arrested and imprisoned avowedly with the hope that these harsh proceedings might lead them to release themselves by giving up the name of their collaborator, in or out of office, who had written the obnoxious articles. A day or two afterwards a fourth editor of the 'Zeitung,' casually absent from Frankfort when the first arrests took place, was impounded with his fellows. At the same time Mr. Sack, the responsible director of the journal, was fined and distinctly given to understand that the fate which had overtaken the editors was in store for him also. Mr. Sack, to his credit be it said, met this threat with spirit and with dignity, denounced the action of the Government in fitting terms as a revival of the ancient ordeal by torture, and declared his readiness to accept imprisonment if it should be offered to him as the alternative of treason to his associates, to his order, and to his duty towards the public.

Three weeks after this, a congress of German journalists was held in Bremen, which, though incorporated with the new German Empire, still retains its local Government and freedom enough to secure liberty of speech within the law to men who, under the flag of Prussia, must be dumb.

By this congress resolutions were adopted calling upon the Imperial Parliament of Germany to protect, by new and specific enactments, the liberty of the German press to publish the truth in regard to all proceedings at law, and to withhold from publication the names of writers in the public journals. Neither Mr. Edward Sack nor the congress of the German press at Bremen went so far as to demand immunity for the responsible directors of the press in the exercise of their functions from prosecution by the Government.

What they asked was much less than this. They asked for the conductors of the public journals of Germany the right to deal as men of honor with their contributors, and to take upon themselves the consequences of any publication made by them which might draw down upon them the vengeance of the Government as transgressing the limits of a plain and clearly defined legality.

What answer the Imperial Parliament of Germany will make to these resolutions remains to be seen. Prince Bismarck, for his part, has already answered them. They were adopted at Bremen on the 23rd of August. On the 28th of August, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, Mr. Edward Sack, by whose treatment these resolutions had been called out, was seized and sent to prison, with orders that he be kept there until he should disclose the name of the author of the articles which have so aroused the wrath of the authorities at Berlin. It would be difficult for any Government to offer a more direct insult than this to a body of German subjects who, whatever may be true or false of them as individuals, certainly stand now as the spokesmen, and in the vacation of the Imperial Parliament as the only spokesmen, of the German nation.

In countries like England and America, which have become accustomed by long years of practical freedom to look upon the press in its true light, such a course as this into which Prince Bismarck has thus deliberately entered will be justly regarded as the beginning of the end of his hitherto triumphant career. If he should abandon it now before the united hostility of the journalists of Germany, or at the behest of the German Parliament, his prestige, which, in his case even more truly than in the case of most of his historical contemporaries, must be taken to be two-thirds, at least, of his power, will receive a serious and perhaps a deadly blow. If he perseveres in it, though for a time he may be able to deal successfully with the German press, as Prince Polignac tried and failed to deal with the press of France, he will inevitably find his authority mined and undermined in a thousand hidden ways throughout the German Empire, and the colossal edifice which with so much pains and passionate zeal he has gradually built up will

fall about him in a day when he thinketh not, with a crash to startle not Germany only, but Europe and the world.

The very efforts which Prince Bismarck, following blindly in the fatal path trodden by so many great personages and famous rulers before him, is now making to compel everybody into thinking as he thinks on pain of not being allowed to think at all in Germany, plainly prove that Prince Bismarck himself recognizes and fears this latent power of everybody's thinking.

If it were possible for Prince Bismarck to transform the Germany of 1875 into the likeness of the Prussia of 1775, to abolish representative institutions entirely, and to rule the empire as the generals of the Kaiser rule the Kaiser's camps, this policy of the asphyxiation of the public press might be pursued perhaps with better prospects of superficial success. Even in that case it would be a policy deadly in the end to the life of the empire.

There is no such intrinsic difference between the Gallo-Teutonic people of France and the Sclavo Teutonic people of Germany, that the forces which slowly ate away the vigor and the energy in public affairs of the Parisian empire of Napoleon III should be expected to nourish the vigor and the energy in public affairs of the Berlin empire of William I. The Germans of the nineteenth century are no longer the docile and domestic people whom the great Frederick disciplined with his baton into the first military machine of his time.

The lust of the eyes and the pride of life crossed the Rhine long ago, and make their home now as thoroughly on the banks of the Spree as on the banks of the Seine. It is well for Germany to erect statues to Arminius and to deck with flowers the tomb of Goethe. But the future of Germany is of deeper import to herself and to the world than all the glory and all the greatness of the past. And the future of Germany lies to-day shut in and stifling behind that prison door in Frankfort-on-the-Main,—'New York World.'

COMTE DE CHAMBORD.

THE expected Orleanist pamphlet urging the Comte de Chambord to abdicate is out. It is entitled "Responsibilities," and is in the form of letters to that Prince "from a gentilhomme de province." The writer appeals to the Count to put an end himself to the deadlock into which the Monarchical cause and party have got in consequence of his own refusal to accommodate himself to existing facts. He tells him that at the time of the publication of his Manifesto in 1871, an Archbishop compared him to Pope St. Celestine V., who in spite of his heroic virtues, in consequence of his complete ignorance of public affairs, felt himself compelled to abdicate after five months' reign. "The Manifesto of the Comte de Chambord," said this Archbishop, proved him to be a man so deceived as regards his country and himself that he would never reign, or if he did, in spite of the best intentions, would make as many blunders as St. Celestine." The pamphlet concludes with a passionate appeal to the Count as "a descendant of the Kings who made France" not to ruin it, and "as a son of St. Louis" not "to run the line and kingdom of St. Louis." The 'Union' treats the publication as a device to provoke a refusal to abdicate, in order that on that refusal another usurpation may be based; but this is unfair to the Comte de Paris. There is no reason to suspect that Prince de being insincere in his declaration that he will never violate his cousin's rights; and we cannot see that there is any necessity for talking about usurpation, because supposing almost *per impossible* that the Comte de Chambord were to abdicate, France would only be placed in the position in which she will be when in the course of time he pays the common debt of nature. But it is rather the fault of the extreme Legitimists to think and talk as if Henri V. were to live for ever, or as if they did not care what came after him. The writer of this pamphlet must have a shrewd suspicion that his persuasions will not be effectual, but that does not prove that he contemplates an Orleanist usurpation. If he fails—as he must—there is always the new Monarchical Republic to fall back upon.—'Tablet.'

EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

"THANK GOD!" said O'Connell once, "there are 540,000 children in the schools of Ireland, and they will be the masses in future." It is not a bad sign for Ireland, that, although two millions of people have left her shore since O'Connell's time, there are more children in the Irish schools to-day than there were then. The Report of the Commissioners of National Education for 1874 is now issued. It states that on the 31st of December last there were 6,257 schools in operation, being 97 more than in 1873. The number of children on the rolls who made any attendance was 1,006,511, which was an increase of 31,815 over the previous year. The average daily attendance was 325,300, which was 31,815 more than in 1873. The Commissioners explain the irregularity of the attendance by the habit, and in most cases the necessity of employing the children during certain seasons in farm work. They have endeavored to make other schools attractive, and the system of payment by results has acted as a stimulus, and there has been a decided improvement in the attendance. There were 85 schools struck off the rolls, chiefly for insufficient attendance, and five schools suspended. The number of warranted schools is 5,356. There are 1,252 clerical and 204 lay Protestant Episcopal managers, 328 clerical and 178 lay Presbyterian managers, 88 clerical and 12 lay managers of other denominations, and 207 official lay managers. There are 4,741 schools under Catholic clerical management. Over 79 per cent. of the pupils in attendance are Catholic, 11 per cent. Presbyterian, and over 5 per cent. Protestant Episcopal.

THE brevity of human life is generally recognised in the abstract by all men; and yet nearly all of them act as if it would endure for ever.