

## The Politician.

### THE BRITISH PRESS.

From the Illustrated London News.

#### THE HIGHLANDS.

Professor Blackie, the distinguished Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh, who has been passing three months of summer and autumn amid the mountain fastness of Braemar, has recently taken pen in hand to denounce the systematic depopulation of the Highlands of Scotland. The subject is one of national, as well as economic importance. It raises the whole question of the right of property; and whether the owners of large landed estates can be allowed, under all circumstances, to do as they like with their own. Amid the wild glens and mountain passes of the picturesque counties of Perth, Aberdeen, Argyll, Ross, Inverness, and Sutherland, there existed in times not very remote, a hardy race of men, who formed some of the best and bravest soldiers who ever fought the battles and maintained the supremacy of Great Britain. By the operation of a system which has gradually been introduced into the Highlands, these men are no longer to be found in the ancient habitations of their race. They have been coaxed out; squeezed out; driven out; and have betaken themselves with their wives and children, to Australia, to Canada, to Nova Scotia, and to the United States of America; where they form the very bone and sinew of the population, and contribute in no slight degree to the present, as they will to the future, greatness of those portions of the globe. Modern landlords—and no blame to them for their clearightedness—discovered that small farms and potato crops, though sufficient to breed a useful race of men, were not so profitable to the proprietors of the soil as large sheep-farms. As a consequence large sheep-farms became the rule among the hills, and people had to turn out and make the best terms they could with fortune, either in their own country, or in some other, where patient industry and daring enterprise might be more certain of reward. If Great Britain required men it also required beef and mutton. The inexorable laws of political economy justified the landlords in turning the soil which had become their inheritance to the most profitable account: and the men, displaced for sheaves and beaves, were disposed of in one way or in another. The most energetic and fortunate established themselves in the United States or in the Colonies, and had nothing to complain of, except the pang of parting. Another portion, less happy, were draughted off into the great manufacturing towns of England and Scotland, where they found the employment or the charity which were denied them amid their native glens. The most unfortunate of all died and made no sign—some by the roadsides, some in hospitals, far from their birthplace; and some in the poorhouses of Glasgow, Paisley, and Dundee; or in the remoter regions of Liverpool, Manchester, and London. But as time wore on, it was discovered by some of the great proprietors that deer forests were either more pleasant or more profitable than sheep-walks; and sheep, which had displaced men, were themselves displaced to make room for deer. As regards sheep-farms the question was solely one of profit, and of such recommended itself entirely to the men of logic and of political economy, and to the commercial sympathies of our age and people. But the question of deer-forests is not so entirely a question of the shop. It is a question of sport, with which considerations of necessity intermingled. The Dukes of Leeds and Atholl, the Marquis of Salisbury, and other great owners of deer-forests, claim the right of converting all their mountain territories in the Highlands into deer-forests, if it please them so to do, quite independantly of all calculations of profit or loss, and simply because it is their will and pleasure so to arrange, dispose and manage their property. We will not accuse these mighty hunters of any unnecessary harshness, or even of selfishness, in indulging their tastes in this matter; but, as the question which they raise is one that appeals to the whole nation, they must not be surprised if their right to do as they like with their own be strictly invested. In all the discussions that we have seen or heard upon the subject—whether the arguments have turned in favor of the makers of solitude for the deer, or in favour of the peasant, whose right to live is at least to the right of the landholder to hold land—the difference between the law of England and Scotland has never been pointed out. The law of England, like the law of Scotland, allows a landlord to govern his estate—to convert it into arable, into pasture, or into forest, as may best suit his own taste, or his own calculation. In England this law is subject to a great limitation. In Scotland it is subject to a slight limitation. The limitation in England prevents deer-forests with-

out ever having dreamed of or imagined them. The limitation in Scotland is ineffective, for that purpose. In England if a man owns a whole county, he may if he please, make a solitude of it, pull down every house after-legal notice to the occupiers, and allow the grass to grow on the sites of towns and villages; but, being the sole owner of the property, he is the sole ratepayer of the parish, and must maintain the whole population whether able bodied or disabled, whether young or old, who were born upon his land and have a legal settlement upon it. The consequence is that the English landowner will not make a deer-forest. The luxury is too expensive, for it would swallow up his whole revenue. But in Scotland the able-bodied poor have no legal claim upon the lord of the soil. He is only responsible for the support of the aged and the impotent. It is, consequently, cheaper to make a deer-forest in Scotland than in England by the whole sum which the maintenance of the able-bodied poor would cost. If there had been in Scotland the same poor law as in England, this great question would never have arisen, and our modern Nimrods would have had to betake themselves to Finland, Lapland, Kaffirland—the wildernesses of mid Africa—or to the remoter wilds of Russian North America, if they desired to enjoy more hardy and invigorating sports than civilised England and Scotland can afford to them. It is, perhaps, too late to apply this remedy. The flowers of the Highlands exist no more in the place of their birth. May the day never come when England shall have need of their strong hands and brave hearts to aid her in extremity!

From the London Weekly Despatch.

#### PALMERSTON—INTERVENTION.

The civilized portion of mankind has, for these eighteen hundred years and odd been made somewhat familiar with what is a very old story now, about a "certain man who once fell among thieves." Most respectable people learn it at their mother's knee; and, considering it is somewhat of a parable, it is surprising how early they manage to get an inkling of the meaning of it; and how intuitively they seem to realize its scope and purpose. The man must have been a Jew, because he "went down from Jerusalem;" he "got into mischief," which may, perhaps, be the origin of the phrase, "go to Jerico." Stripped and mauled, he was left by the way, half dead. A countryman of his own, a parson, "chanced" to come that way; when he saw him he "passed by on the other side." Next came a Hebrew attorney. He acted with more professional coolness. He "came and looked on;" but as the thieves took all the man had, the solicitor also passed by on the other side. Well, the "Jews hold no dealings with the Samaritans." The disciples wondered that their Master should be seen so much as speaking to one. But, "a certain Samaritan" when he saw the "poor forked animal," bound up his wounds, set him on his own beast, nursed him at the wayside inn, and paid the reckoning.

Now this is a parable which was "given for our learning;" which, indeed, so long as poor human nature remains what it is, will supply the model of endless examples. A State is but a number of individuals. An aggregate of single persons do not, by their association, emancipate themselves from the obligation of the fulfilment of moral duties. A society of persons do not lose their claim to the good offices of their fellow-creatures by combining together to own a country, and become a nation. Suppose now, two or three men had set off together instead of one, and they had all been garated, and imagine that the parson, the attorney, and the "foreigner" had jogged on in company, would the former have had no title to the compassion of the latter, because there were so many? would the latter have had no call to help the former, because, for mutual protection against the thieves, they had agreed to a defensive alliance?

Sicily is a certain man—taxed to the very skin—flogged, dungeoned, left half dead. Bomba and his police are the thieves among which he has fallen, Laing is the priest, and Cobden the Levite. John Bull is the Samaritan, the two pence are a loan, the host is Rothschild, the inn is a revolution, and a constitutional asserveign surrounded by Republican institutions. Where is the flaw in the parable? The priest and the Levite acted on the true principles of non-intervention. The one saw, and the other looked on and—passed by on the other side. What right had they to become way-side Quixotes? The thieves didn't rob them; they weren't surgeons to bind up wounds. Let the man cry "Thieves" if he has breath enough to holla for the police. It is none of their business, they don't belong to the "Force;" and the "certain man," for anything they knew, lived out of their parish. The thieves were sad rogues no doubt, and the man was very ill-used; but if they are to help every fool who chooses to travel in the

dark without his revolver, why they may have nothing else to do! What they have to look to is to keep the middle of the road, pull to their own side in passing other vehicles, drive round mobs in place of going through them, and say nothing to anybody. If they come to a break down, or if a poor devil asks them to give him a lift, their best plan is to "decline to interfere." All that they purpose to themselves is to get to Jerico before dark; how can they do that if they are to pull up when anybody chooses to hail them? "Mind your own business;" that is their maxim. If you once recognize the principle of mixing yourself up in other people's concerns, where are you to "draw the line?" Are you to thrust yourself into any house you like to see if man and wife are agreed? How can you prevent others from doing the same? What right have you to stand between the thieves and the "certain man," and pretend to dictate to gentlemen of the road as to how much they are to take, and what amount of intimidation is necessary to frighten travellers into submission? If you once "open the door" to meddling in the affairs of your neighbours, you give a handle to others to do the same. If you interfere between a traveller and a highwayman, where is the thing to end short of everybody ruling his friend's house and ordering Mrs Grundy's dinner.

As for the Samaritan, the thing was perfectly ridiculous. So far from being his neighbour, "the certain man," by his very religion, could "hold no dealings with him." If anybody was called upon to take up the case, it was the priest and the Levite, his countrymen and neighbours. The Samaritan "went out of his way" in having anything to do with the Jew. What business was it of his whether he should reach Jerico, or, being left half dead, should wholly perish in the road-side ditch? Let your philanthropist keep "his twopence" till he gets to Samaria, and not go running up bills to a foreign innkeeper for the reckoning of an "alien in blood, in language, and religion." How can he keep out of debt; how attend to his own concerns, or order his own house, if he is to run all over the world in a transport of republican enthusiasm, and universal philanthropy? Let him keep his twopenny pieces in his pocket, his intervention for his family or his counting house, his sympathy for those who belong to the parish, and who may come upon the rates. The Jew would hold no dealings with him when he was well; why should he "run after the Jew when he was in trouble? Is not that Laing, and the Manchester school all over? There's nothing like cotton; Buchanan is the Southern Candidate; no slaves no cotton; what have we to do with Fremont and abolition? The Crimea was 3,000 miles off; see what an income-tax it has cost us. Naples is not within a long way of our shores; what claim have the Sicilians upon us?

"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." He is your neighbor who stands in need of your help. The Samaritan and foreigner was the neighbour of the Jew, when the Jew was evil entreated, and ready to perish. None of us were sent into the world for ourselves alone; none can isolate himself so from the world that he can live independently of it. It is in vain the sordid man asks, "Am I my brother's keeper?" God and Nature have so made us responsible for each other's welfare that the belly and its members are but a type of the mutual contingency which binds up the members of the human race in the vicissitudes of each other's fate. A nation, any more than an individual, cannot ignore the claims of the world upon its sense of duty. The more powerful it is, the greater is the mission which God has given it. Strength was given to the mighty to defend the weak. Is a giant bully to assail an inoffensive dwarf, and the crowd merely to cry, "A ring! a ring!" standing by in strictest neutrality, while they see them fight it out? A great State is the constable of the nations. It is the providential vicegerent of Divine justice—the mace-bearer of heaven—the earthly incarnation of the moral government of the universe. The Providence which made us a mighty power ordained the use of it, and called us to the exercise of the judicial functions it implies. We cannot reject the burden, without resigning the privileges, of the office; the nation that abdicates its title as arbiter of mankind, must lay down the power and majesty which were entrusted to its stewardship, not to be hidden in a napkin, but to be put out at usury for the benefit of the human race. Our ships are in every harbor, our merchants on every mart, our goods in every warehouse, our wares in every house. We made the whole world tributary to our wealth, power and comfort; are we to do nothing for the world but to make money of it? Is cash to be the sole nexus of human sympathies, and a commercial ledger calculation to strike the balance of our duties, refusing to acknowledge the claims of any higher motives, as the sailor declined to say grace, because he had "had no more than his allowance."

Austria and Russia bawl out for non-intervention. They say it is an acknowledged

rule in the public policy of Europe that no State shall interfere in the internal concerns of another; that that was our ground of war in reference to Turkey, and yet that we ignore it in the case of Naples. Let us not be misunderstood. "To undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free," is a function the exercise of which is enjoined upon us as individuals, and must be incumbent on us as nations. We are not to be told that we are not to employ constables to detect the thief, because we thereby establish a precedent for extitling receivers to train pick pockets to plunder the honest. To say that we must not interfere to rescue the defenceless from the highwayman, because we thereby afford the foot-pad an excuse for helping a housebreaker to commit a burglary, is to ignore all moral distinctions and to reduce society to a state of ithical idiotism. When Naples pointed to Ireland, she shut her own mouth. If ever rulers forfeited the allegiance of the ruled, England, by her atrocities, lost all title to the fealty of Ireland. The weakness of the one was ever the opportunity of the other. Spain, France, repeatedly, and had their policy arisen from sympathy with suffering, would have quite justifiably, projected armies of liberation of our oppressed Irish fellow-subjects. Our own greatest statesmen trembled for the consequences of our tyranny and injustice; and proclaimed their conviction that England was in danger, as long as Ireland was oppressed. The danger of internal disaffection being helped by foreign sympathy is one of the sources of protection to the weak and of the motives to mildness in the powerful and moderation to the tyrant; nor is it too much to say that the sister kingdom at this hour owes her freedom and happiness, and England her tranquil stability, to the measures of reform and emancipation to which that conviction gave rise.

But while we assert the right and even proclaim the duty of a great leading State, happy herself in the enjoyment of the blessings of freedom, and grateful to Providence for having led her people to vindicate their independence, and to make her great by freeing her from oppression, to impart to mankind the benefits bestowed on herself, we have always been deeply impressed with the conviction that

Who would be free himself must strike the blow.

No people were ever really delivered from oppression, except by their own right arm. The "genius of universal emancipation" is not in men's outward circumstances, but in their own character. It is in vain to cry "Lo here, and lo there, for behold the kingdom of Heaven is within you." Strike the fetters from a community of slaves to-morrow, and they will relapse into another form of abjectness, and submit to a new master. Independence, by self achievement, is the test of fitness for liberty. The French but yesterday had a Republic, and called to an autocrat to resume their manacles, by universal suffrage and vote by ballot. We are no propagandists, or universal liberators, for the simple reason that political principles and rational liberty can exist and prevail only by being self-supporting. No Government can repress its subjects when they are worthy to be free, and resolve to be no longer slaves. Even if we made the Sicilians free we could not keep them so; that is a faculty they must acquire through their own resistance to oppression, and their intrepidity in withstanding the tyrant. In politics, as in morals, men must be made "perfect through suffering," and "work out their own salvation."

We preach up the doctrine of non-intervention, because that we know that tyranny works its own cure, and that oppression will cease to be whenever subjects no longer deserve to be oppressed. Leave nations alone, and the darker the day the nearer will be the dawn. When wrong becomes intolerable, men will throw it off. Until it be intolerable, they will never inspire the spirit to resist it. We interfere in Naples just because neutrality is not observed; because our maxim, that tyranny will work its own cure, is not allowed fair play; because for ages absolutists intervene to sustain tyrants against their subjects, while they protest against our interference in support of the oppressed. But for Russia, Otto would go and Hungary would have been free; but for Austria, Italy would be independent, and prosperous. We cry "A ring! a ring!" We say, stand by, and see fair play; pull devil, pull baker; let the thickest skin stand longest out. We know how that policy would end. "Oppressed nationalities" would become the subjects of a free and rational constitution just when they were worthy of and fit for it; not an hour sooner. We say, let kings and peoples fight it out; we are quite ready to abide by the issue. But when, in the throes of national agony, the best, wisest, bravest doing, and daring all, for their country, are crushed under the iron heel of alien autocrats, and legitimist sympathisers, intervention becomes a duty, and neutrality a crime.