

Americans very well; was certain they would not fight; they would never dare to face an English army; and that they did not possess any of the qualifications necessary to make a good soldier; he repeated many of their commonplace expressions; ridiculed their enthusiasm in religion, and drew a disagreeable picture of their manners and ways of living." The speech produced much mirth in the house and obtained implicit credit from the majority. As a writer says: "The pusillanimity of the provincials served as an enlivening topic for the circles of fashion, and the clubs of the coffee-houses, as well as for the august body of parliament."

Gloomy Prophecy.

Let us now, as touching the present predictions concerning the Filipinos, read some of the prophecies concerning our own nation. Josiah Tucker, dean of Gloucester, was one of the ablest writers on political economy of his time. It is no belittlement to the members of the Philippine commission to say that Dean Tucker far outranked them on the intellectual side. In 1781 he wrote:

"As to the future grandeur of America, and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or monarchical, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that was ever conceived by writers of romance. The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their difference of governments, habitudes and manners, indicate that they will have no center of union and no common interest. They never can be united into one compact empire under any species of government whatever; a disunited people until the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will be divided and subdivided into little commonwealths and principalities, according to the natural boundaries, by great bays of the sea, and by vast rivers, lakes and ridges of mountains.

The moment a separation takes effect, intestine quarrels will begin; for it is well known that the seeds of discord and dissension between province and province are now ready to shoot forth; and that they are only kept down by the present combination of all the colonies against us, whom they unhappily fancy to be their common enemy. When, therefore, this object of their hatred shall be removed by declaration on our part, that, so far from usurping all authority, we, from henceforward, will assume none at all against their own consent, the weaker provinces will entreat our protection against the stronger; and the less cautious against the more crafty and designing; so that in short, in proportion as their factious republican spirit shall intrigue and cabal, shall split into parties, divide and sub-divide, in the same proportion, shall we be called in to become their umpires and referees."

Union Could Not Exist.

Frederick the Great can also, no

doubt, be favorably compared with the members of the Philippine commission, so far as judgment and prescience are concerned. In 1782 he told the British minister that "he was persuaded the American Union could not long subsist under its present form. The great extent of country would alone be a sufficient obstacle, since a republican government had never been known to exist for any length of time where the territory was not limited and concentrated. It would not be more absurd to propose the establishment of a democracy to govern the whole country from Brest to Riga. No inference could be drawn from the states of Venice, Holland and Switzerland, of which the situation and circumstances were perfectly different from those of the colonies."

In the light of the falsification of such prophecies should not fair-minded men hesitate to deny to the Filipinos the possibilities of self-government? Is it seemly that a republic should harbor the presumption that a race, which, against giant odds, has bravely sealed its aspiration for independence with the blood and lives of thousands and thousands, cannot succeed in governing itself? Would such a presumption ever have lifted its noxious head in our midst if it had not been conceived and nursed by the demons of greed and military ambition? Let us, in the light of our own history, not set bounds to the possibilities of a people who, under the light and inspiration of freedom, are willing to work out their own destiny! As Washington said, "Liberty, when it begins to take root, is a plant of rapid growth."

English Sympathy.

Today we revere the memory of those Englishmen who, despite the enraged feeling and clamor of their time, proclaimed the justice of the American cause. Our blood tingles when we read courageous, elevated expressions like the following:

"I wish from the bottom of my heart that the Americans may resist and get the better of the forces sent against them."—Duke of Richmond, 1774.

"Were I an American I would resist to the last drop of my blood."—Lord Camden, 1774.

"I am an American in my principles and wish you would let them alone to govern and misgovern themselves, as they think proper."—David Hume, 1775.

"If we were reduced to the dilemma of conquering or abandoning America, I am for abandoning America."—Charles James Fox, 1776.

"If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would

lay down my arms; never, never, never!"—Earl of Chatham, 1778.

Have we sunk so low, and are we so enslaved by party spirit and by our petty, selfish considerations, that these patriotic voices of the past speak to us in vain? Most men who have pondered on the history of nations will agree with Franklin when he said: "The longer I live the more convincing proofs I see that God governs in the affairs of men." God is not dead.

This nation cannot sin with impunity. As Jefferson says: "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, and that his justice cannot sleep forever." This is an hour which calls for independent thinking, independent acting men, and which, under the strain of a national crisis, is shifting the statesmen from political puppets, the patriot from frothy party declaimers, and the lover of mankind from the apostles of national greed.

As I have spoken mainly with the tongue of others, may I close with the noble words written by Edmund Burke in 1775:

"All this, I know well enough, will sound wild and chimerical to the profane herd of those vulgar and mechanical politicians who think that nothing exists but what is gross and material; and who, therefore, far from being qualified to be directors of the great movement of empire, are not fit to turn a wheel in the machine. But these ruling and master principles are in truth everything and all in all. Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom; and a great empire and little minds go ill together. If we are conscious of our situation, and glow with zeal to fill our places as becomes our station and ourselves, we ought to elevate our minds to the greatness of that trust to which the order of Providence has called us. By adverting to the dignity of this high calling, our ancestors have turned a savage wilderness into a glorious empire, and have made the only honorable conquests by promoting the wealth, the number, and the happiness of the human race."

LOUIS R. EHRLICH.

Colorado Springs, May 5, 1899.

—Springfield Republican.

THE TEACHINGS OF NATURE.

At this season of the year, when nature revives so beautifully and we behold so many surprising adaptations indicating to the ordinary observer, or to the more careful student, evidences of design,—we cannot wonder that during past centuries, and even up to our own times, the teleological argument has seemed satisfactory and indeed, irrefutable. The numerous volumes of the Bridgewater treatises all endeavor to elucidate this phase of opinion. It is an inspiring thought to consider all things working together for good, and as