

"with your philosophy," and he invites him to make peace among the combatants. The philosopher is, of course, persuaded of his ability to do so; he is eminently conscious of his own superiority, and the depth and efficacy of his learning to accomplish all things. It is the simplest thing in the world for him to make a learned address on the shamefulness of anger, in which he quotes Seneca, for Herbert Spencer had not yet been born or even thought of, and he was, therefore, dependent on a lesser light. But, alas for the stability of theoretic wisdom, the upshot of the matter is that when the antagonists turn round upon him, his philosophy flies before his hot temper, and he himself is the first to set the example of fisticuffs; while, as for his language, nothing worse can be found—"Fripous, gueux, traîtres, imposteurs!" he cries. There is a master of philosophy here amongst us also engaged in making perfect in "science" an aspiring citizen or two, whose parents neglected their "prose" in days gone by, but who have been fortunate in finding so apt a professor to instruct them in it. He threw up his hands and eyes a few weeks ago, and demanded in a tone of indignant remonstrance tinged with conscientious innocence, whether Freethinkers like him were ever known to cast reflections on the morals of those opposed to them. We made bold at the time to say they were; we gave a couple of instances in which they had done so, and we might have gone further and given one instance, at least, in which they would continue to do so. For, lo and behold, our *Maitre de Philosophie* himself, not able to endure a touch here and there on the raw, has not ceased ever since to attack the morals of Catholics, to whom he is opposed, and has completely stultified himself accordingly; that is if it, indeed, still remained for him to do so, and such had not already been *un fait accompli*. But this is an excellent example of the honesty and consistency of Freethought. There is no more hypocritical system on the face of the earth, and everything it blames so loudly in others we find it performs itself without a blush. It comes down on the creeds for attacking morals, but, when the opportunity offers, it is anxious itself to make just such an attack; it waxes furious against intolerance and tyranny, but it is itself ever foremost in tyranny and intolerance. It rails against persecution, and seeks back to by-gone ages for long-exploded calumnies against the Church, but it passes over in silence its own hideous orgies, such, for example, as those performed by it before the eyes of all Europe nine years ago in Paris, when it tortured and murdered, in the midst of outrage and unspeakable abominations, by the hands of its members the Communists—advised Freethinkers all of them, and since it is the glory of Freethought that it owns no standard of correct thought, that no Freethinker is bound by the opinions of any other Freethinker, these are Freethinkers who must not be restrained, and who are at liberty to regard with contempt as the "muffs" of their order, those who are still so much under the influences of the Christian centuries as unconsciously to continue by custom to prefer the lives of moral citizens. Meantime, how comes it, on M. Taine's principle, that a genius, the sole product of certain circumstances obtaining in Europe two hundred years ago, has so vividly painted for us a true representative of what we find amongst ourselves to-day in the antipodes—of our *Maitre de Philosophie*?

IN the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for May 15th, M. A FORMIDABLE GEORGE PICOT gives a review of a work by Saint-Simon the author of the "Memoirs," which has recently been found in manuscript amongst certain State papers in Paris. It is entitled *Parallèle entre Henri IV., Louis XIII., et Louis XIV.*, and its object is the exhibition in his true light of King Louis XIII., whom the writer represents as a prince whose virtues as a Christian were only equalled by his abilities as a soldier and a statesman, and whom he asserts to have been the master and guide of the great Minister, Richelieu, rather than governed by him as it has been supposed. There are, however, one or two quotations in this review which we find of especial interest, and the first of them is that in which Saint-Simon describes the condition of the Huguenots at the time of the issuing of the edict of Nantes by Henry IV. The writer is eminently trustworthy, and religious prejudices by no means find a place in his work. As it will be seen further on he treats the Huguenots with the utmost consideration, and we may receive without suspicion the following account he gives of them:—They were so long accustomed, he says, to obtain everything that they could not make up their minds to suffer a falling off under a king from whom they considered they had a right to aspire at all things and to gain possession of all things, because he had been brought up amongst them; whose sole effective existence had been long that of their chief, and whom they had largely contributed to make king. Besides these reasons common to all their party, they also had their leaguers, their support amongst the Protestants of all Europe, with whom it was Henry's powerful interest not to embroil himself. They had their factious members who only longed for a renewal of taking up arms and the election of leaders, such as Marshal de Bouillon, who was consumed by a fiery zeal to put himself openly at the head of a party, thus to treat with the king on equal terms, and whose private end was to place his party under the protection of a Protestant

sovereign, whose lieutenant-general Bouillon should be, whose authority he should fully exercise, and whom, with the other Protestants, he should have at his back. He would thus erect a state within a state, and become, in some sort, the equal of the king, since they would each find himself the chief of a party equal to the other in numbers and strength, but unequal in support, for the Huguenot party would be secured by the power of its foreign protector and the other Protestants, whilst Henry could not rely upon the feeble temporal power of the Pope nor on the jealousy and infidelity of the Houses of Austria and Savoy. The writer adds that it was no small proof of the abilities of King Henry that he succeeded in persuading the Huguenots to accept the edict he proposed to them. Such then was the difficult nature of these people, and their dangerous attitude even to a king whom they must have regarded as most friendly to them, and we can thus easily understand how they could have been considered as formidable enemies without the introduction of the religious question into the matter. It is not difficult, therefore, to see a purely secular foundation for the massacre of St. Bartholomew.

BUT still more interested are we in the account of DETESTABLE the persecution of the Huguenots by King LOINGS DULY XIV. of which we also find a description in this DETESTED. work of Saint-Simon's. It exhibits the matter in a very different light from that in which it is viewed by those who lay it as a heavy crime at the door of the Church. A crime, nevertheless, we recognise it to have been, but a far heavier crime committed against the Church than even against the unfortunate Protestants who so grievously suffered from it. That the wretched transaction may, however, be more clearly understood it will be necessary for us to say a few words as to the relations of Louis XIV. towards the Pope before we quote from Saint-Simon. To set out, then, this king had no sooner himself assumed the reins of government than he began to seek occasions to humiliate the Holy See. There was, for example, the "affair of the Corsican Guard," in which certain hangers-on of the French embassy at Rome attacked the Pontifical soldiers, and which led to the invasion of Avignon, to the sending of an army into Italy, and to the proposal of several insulting and unjust conditions by the king to be accepted by the Pope, before he would condescend so much as to treat with him,—the conditions being refused by the Pope, and peace only made two years afterwards through the intercession of Spain and Venice, but with territorial loss and humiliation to the Holy See. There was also the affair of the Regale, in which the king strove to extend to all the bishoprics and benefices in France the right which the kings of France possessed over certain bishoprics and benefices founded by their ancestors and whose revenues, when they became vacant, fell in to the crown. In this matter, strange to say, the bishops sided with the king and against the Pope—a fact to be remembered when we read of the part taken by the greater number of these bishops in the persecution of the Huguenots as described by Saint-Simon. Again, there was the matter of the four Articles, directed especially against the Pope's influence in France, but also capable of a wider and more sinister interpretation, and in which more than a third of the bishops were with the king. There is much more which we might advance in illustration of Louis' unfriendly relations with Rome, but this is enough for the purpose, as well as to show how the bishops, presented to their bishoprics by the king, were for the most part his majesty's obsequious servants rather than the faithful shepherds of their flocks and subjects of the Holy See. They were, in fact, to a large extent men chosen for advancement by the policy of Mazarin in gaining over the nobility of the Fronde, or, perhaps, still worse appointments made by Colbert and Le Tellier, from their own creatures or relations, and their piety or fitness for the episcopacy had been the last thing thought of in connection with them. It was under such circumstances that the king undertook his bitter persecution of the Protestants. Saint-Simon writes of it to the following effect:—The whole plot was conducted by Louvois and Madame de Maintenon, unknown to every one else. . . . Louvois, who only too well understood the consequences, found a double advantage in it, because the execution he thought of could only be performed by troops, and consequently by himself, who would thus be brought into continual relationship with the king, which peace had made rarer, and because such an event would long alienate all the Protestants of Europe, and urge them to a war that he desired most ardently, and these two reasons drew him on to bring about all the horrors of the execution. Colbert, the only man he could have feared in the participation of the secret, and certainly staunch, and resolute when in opposition, had been dead for two years. Thus, perfectly free, he egged on the king to the glory of exterminating people, who, leagued together and supported by the foreign powers belonging to their communion, had opposed a firm front to all his predecessors, from the time of Francis I., and, however subdued they might find themselves, would never lose the hope of raising themselves up again, nor that of succeeding in establishing a State within the State, with all the independence and forms to which they had always aspired. Thus glory, authority, policy, religion, all was put forward without contradiction, and