

ists. It can be put into operation whenever the minor state of siege is declared in any city or province, and the return of an expelled person can take place only with the consent of the police authorities. This, of course, amounts to banishment. The law will probably have to be seriously modified before it can pass. Besides the opposition of the socialistic party, it will encounter antagonists in all those who perceive that its stern provisions may be invoked against themselves as well as against the socialists.

In spite of the repressive measures which the government has taken from time to time, socialism continues to spread in Germany. It looks very much as if Bismarck's attempts to suppress active socialism on the one hand, and on the other to bribe the working classes by a very mild form of State socialism, were doomed to failure. His state socialism is embodied in the scheme which makes the state the insurer of the working men against accidents, and of the small landowner or peasant against disasters of certain kinds, and which guarantees the support of the working man in old age. The fight in the Reichstag, therefore, is one between different kinds of socialism—the state socialism of Bismarck and the radical socialism of the socialistic party. The decision will depend upon a body of men who stand between the two and adhere to neither system; they are the National Liberal party of the Reichstag.

Nothing in Austrian politics is more noteworthy than the rising sense of nationality on the part of the Czechs of Bohemia. The sessions of the Bohemian Diet are continually agitated by the intrusion of questions growing therefrom. At its very opening the young Czech party, which won such great successes in the recent elections, came forward with a bold petition to the Emperor asking him to consent to be crowned as King of Bohemia at Prague. The leader of this party, M. Gregory took occasion on the moving of the address to make a long oration setting forth the hopes and aims of his followers. He denounced the undue prominence given to the German element in the Austrian Empire, and especially in Bohemia, and declared that the young Czechs looked confidently forward to the restoration of the ancient kingdom of Bohemia, with its historical rights and privileges. The oration made a great impression, but the whole matter was referred to a committee, and, it is thought, will not be reported upon at all; but the young Czechs have accomplished their main purpose at present, which is to declare their position. Shortly after came the interpellation of the new governor of Bohemia, Count Thun, on the suppression of the "Leseverein" (reading club) of Czech students. These reading circles had been suppressed at the time of their sending an address to the students of the University of Paris on the opening of the "Nouvelle Sorbonne." The governor declared it to have been an "illegal

manifestation," which means that the address breathed too strongly of the spirit of independence and Czech nationality. The whole movement is already a significant one.

The fall of the Brazilian Empire is suggestive from many points of view. If we look at it from the point of view of the humanitarian, it presents a striking contrast to most of the revolutions of the past, both in the old world and the new, by the absence of the cruel spirit of revenge. If we look at it from the point of view of the philosophical politician, it reveals many unmistakable signs of progress. It is a movement from a lower to a higher condition of associated manhood—manhood self-reliant and self-governing as contrasted with manhood dependent and blindly submissive to power from without.

On these and kindred points it would be easy to enlarge; but that is not my present purpose. My object is to call attention to the singular non-success of monarchy in America. It would seem as if there were something in the American atmosphere, especially in modern times, unfavorable to the monarchical sentiment. In olden times monarchy was congenial enough to the soil. Among the northern tribes chieftainship was common; and there was a genuine loyalty on the part of the different members of the tribes or nations toward their hereditary or elected head. When the Spaniards made their first great conquests, they found monarchy firmly established and fully recognized in Mexico and Peru. Long years after the native American lost every vestige of power in the hand of his fathers the principle still held sway; for, North and South and East and West, the supreme authority was vested in men who represented royal authority and the divine right of kings. The new America was Spanish or English or French or Portuguese; and divine right, sanctioned for the most part by Papal authority, held sway in the new world as in the old.

A new era was opened for America when the northern colonies broke the British yoke. The English speaking colonies, when they secured their independence, refused to crown the edifice by a social or imperial figure-head. The people had won their liberty, had secured their independence; and the people remained sovereign. Circumstances proved unfavorable to the French; and French authority vanished from American soil. Spanish influence lingered in the South; but when, in the first quarter of the present century, the struggle for liberty was carried on and finally crowned with success, it was found that the taste for monarchy was dead. The Portuguese establishment in Brazil was peculiar; and circumstances, have favored the continuance of monarchy up to the present time. It was not, however, because monarchy was in any special way dear to the Brazilians that the Brazilian Empire was permitted so long to continue, but because of a feeling of

respect for an individual man. The Brazilian monarchy has fallen—died, in fact, a natural death; and there is but little likelihood of its ever being revived. It will only be temporary, and it will serve little other purpose to allow time for decent burial.

Things might have been otherwise. It would be difficult to prove that monarchy is a natural impossibility on American soil. We know what is; but what might have been, had the first grand example been different, we cannot tell. A crown was at one time a possibility in the emancipated States of the North. Had George Washington wished it, and had the men who were near and around him favored it, the course of American history might have been different. Happily the crown had no attractions, and the example which was set was decisive. When the Spanish power was broken up, men had long been accustomed to look at the northern star; and the demand for republicanism was general. It was not merely to get rid of the Spanish yoke—it was to give to the Spanish States of the South republican institutions that Bolivar, and men like Bolivar, fought. It was a fight of no ordinary difficulty. It has long been known that the entire strength of the Holy Alliance was pledged to the restoration of order in the Spanish-American States, the creation of small kingdoms, and the placing on the thrones of these kingdoms European princelings. Had the experiment been possible, it might have failed. But happily it was not possible, or rather it was rendered impossible. The voice and the example of the United States were against it; and the circumstances of England, controlled at the time by an able and courageous minister, put her vast influence on the side of right and liberty. James Monroe and George Canning proved themselves to be mightier forces than the holy alliance, composed of kings and emperors.

America has, during this century, witnessed the birth and death of three monarchical experiments—two in Mexico and one in Brazil. In May, 1822, Don Augustin de Turbide, after successfully heading the first rising against Spanish authority, in Mexico, ascended the throne as Augustin I., but the experiment proved a failure, and he was compelled to abdicate March 20, 1823. Maximilian, of Austria, arrived in Mexico and assumed imperial authority in 1864. In 1867 he was captured, tried by court-martial and shot, and his empire perished with him. The Empire of Brazil has been in existence since 1822. It was a government of the people's own choice. But time has worked against the monarchical sentiments, and we have now seen its end—the end, we are willing to believe, of the last American monarchy.

The event is important not in the history of America only, but of the world. It is a manifestation, in a very emphatic form, of the modern spirit. Individualism