

The Independent

FEBRUARY 16, 1899.

Survey of the World	451
Army Controversies Adj.-Gen. Avery D. Andrews . . .	456
The Great Virginians Pres. Ethelbert D. Warfield, LL.D. .	460
Observations in Porto Rico William Hayes Ward, D.D., LL.D. .	463
Sunday Work in Colleges Pres. Charles F. Thwing, D.D., LL.D. .	465
Fighting the Filipinos Capt. William G. Bates	468
The Senate and the Treaty A Floor Correspondent	471
Bread Cast Upon the Waters (Story) Thomas Dunn English	474
The Naval Officer Who Is Poor Lieut.-Com. Albion V. Wadhams . .	480
The Samoan Armies Llewella Pierce Churchill	482
Dreyfus (Poem) Florence Earle Coates	485
Recollections and Letters of Presi- dent Hayes Murat Halstead	486
Literature	490
Editorials	498
Religious : Those That Fail James M. Ludlow, D.D.	507
Syro-Arabians in the United States Isabel F. Hapgood	508
Biblical Research	513
Financial, Insurance, Pebbles, Puzzles, Personals	514

THE INDEPENDENT, 130 FULTON STREET, NEW YORK.

Five Cents a Copy.

Two Dollars a Year.

The Independent

VOL. LI

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1899

No. 2620

SURVEY OF THE WORLD.

The Peace Treaty.

The ratification of the Treaty of Peace, on the 6th inst., was preceded by a vote in the Senate upon a resolution offered by Mr. Vest, in which the terms of the agreement with respect to the Philippines were made identical with those relating to Cuba. This resolution was rejected by a vote of 33 to 56. When the doors were closed for the vote on the Treaty itself, it was not known that it would be ratified, for only fifty-eight votes in the affirmative could be counted. Three were added just in time—those of Mr. McLaurin of South Carolina, Mr. McEnery of Louisiana and Mr. Jones of Nevada. Mr. McLaurin's purpose had been changed by the fighting at Manila, and it is probable that the other two Senators had yielded to the same influence. The vote was 61 to 29 (with pairs included), and the number required for ratification was sixty. All but two of the Republicans—Senators Hoar and Hale—voted in the affirmative, and there were ten Democrats on the same side, while twenty-four Democrats were in opposition. There was an understanding that before the close of the day there should be a vote upon Mr. McEnery's resolution, which disclaims any intention to annex the Philippines permanently and declares that our Government's purpose is to prepare the inhabitants for local self-government, and in due time to make such disposition of the islands as will best promote the interests of both the Filipinos and our own people. When the resolution was taken up, two amendments offered by Mr. Hoar were laid on the table by a vote of 46 to 30. The resolution itself went over until the following day, when, after two hours' debate, it was placed on the calendar, the opinion of some of its friends appearing to

be that further discussion and final action ought to be postponed.

Another Victory in the Philippines.

Immediately following on the fight in the vicinity of Manila the Filipinos massed their forces at Caloocan, where it seemed probable that Aguinaldo would undertake to make a stand and retrieve the disaster at Manila itself. General Otis having full authority to follow out his own judgment, first cleared away all obstacles near Manila, captured the water works, which had been in the hands of the Filipinos, and made his plans for a sharp attack upon Caloocan, and the navy joined with him. The double turreted monitor "Monadnock" moved up the bay to a point within range, and on February 10th the attack commenced. The "Monadnock" opened fire and greatly damaged the enemy's earthworks with her shells. Soon after the Utah Battery and the Sixth Artillery, which had taken position, bombarded from the land side. Then the Montana and Kansas regiments and Third Artillery advanced, supported by the First Idaho and the Fourth Cavalry. The Filipinos reserved their fire until the advance, but they accomplished very little. The American troops pressed on through the woods and over the field until they reached the intrenchments, from which the Filipinos hastily fled. There had been some fear of danger from the sharpshooters, but they scarcely deserved the name and were scattered promptly by shrapnel sent into the fields. The losses of the Americans were slight, but the enemy suffered heavily both in killed and wounded. Just what will be done now is uncertain, but it is thought that Aguinaldo will gather his troops

THE GREAT VIRGINIANS.

A WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY APPRECIATION.

BY PRES. ETHELBERT D. WARFIELD, LL.D.

THE world is never tired of revising its judgment of the men whom it has chosen to call great. Every generation delights to go over the roll, calling upon each and all of the mighty dead to "stand up and be measured." The "new criticism" which every age produces is never so happy as when it is rescuing some unhappy shade from obloquy, except when it is casting down the idol of its immediately preceding epoch. The result is that we are constantly called upon to present the character of those who have done noble deeds and wrought righteousness on the earth in new lights lest the new generation refuse to recognize their claims to homage.

One of the definite principles of contemporary historical criticism is that a man is greatest when he is the most glorious figure in a great age. While it may be urged that such men are more often the products of their times than the builders of their own fortunes, it is obvious that the highest product of an age of storm and stress, the supreme intellect in a group of powerful minds, the most strenuous actor upon a stage of stirring movement, is the repository of powers and the exorter of forces unknown to the man who is the easy master of men and molders of events in a quiet and peaceful period. To use the time-honored simile, the mountain which rises sharp and sheer from the sea, like Teneriffe, however lofty it may seem to be, is never to be compared in actual height to the most aspiring summits of the lordly peaks which dominate the great ranges like the Himalayas and the Andes.

The character of George Washington, soldier, statesman and patriot, admirable as it might be, was long viewed by the world of thought and letters with the easy self-satisfaction of a man armed with an inverted telescope. That England which called the Americans of 1776 a lot of pestilent rebels could not easily grasp the greatness, let us not say of the leader of those rebels, but of

the first President of the New-World Republic. Even in France an easy condescension was inevitable. The jealousy of Spain can scarcely be expected to rise to admiration. And the ignorance of men and things beyond the Atlantic which possessed the rest of Europe was too dense to admit of any estimate. But America has been re-discovered by Europe in the nineteenth century.

"The little seed they laughed at in the dark
Has risen and cleft the soil, and grown a bulk
Of spanless girth, that lays on every side
A thousand arms and rushes to the sun."

Men everywhere have awakened to the fact that the American Revolution was the first definite expression of a world movement, that American constitutional methods were the sound outcome of mature thought and ripe experience, and that the history of American democracy has a profound significance to the European statesman. The inevitable result is that George Washington, widely recognized as the embodiment of the American Revolution, more vaguely but scarcely less widely regarded as the central figure in the establishment of constitutional government for the United States, has loomed larger and yet larger upon the western horizon. European students, beginning with Benjamin Franklin, very readily extended their knowledge of American history enough to include Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, tho with very unequal appreciation. Beyond these, the real makers of the nation are but vague and shadowy names serving only as accessory figures in the background of their mental pictures. Even Mr. Goldwin Smith showed in his so-called "History" an utter want of knowledge of so striking a personality as Patrick Henry. Even in our own country a provincial point of view is by far the most common. In the early struggle the Rutledges are famous where Otis is unknown, and in a later epoch James Wilson and Rufus King are as completely forgotten in one section as

are the Lees, the Randolphs and the Pinckneys in others. In the Northern and Middle States, as a result of this, Washington is usually associated with a group of Northern statesmen; Franklin, Hamilton and the Adamses. In the furthest South he is associated with a group of Southern leaders; Rutledges, Pinckneys and Hamptons. It is very easy to see that Washington is the national hero, and we are coming to realize that in the men associated with his fame there are enough names of permanent renown to indicate that Washington was not the one great man of a mediocre epoch, but the dominant nature of a splendid age.

Not only is this so, but despite a tendency to treat it as a genial idiosyncrasy on the part of Virginia to glorify her past, the mere fact that Washington stands clearly forth as the great Virginian of Virginia's heroic age is sufficient justification of his fame.

Washington, the general, cannot, indeed, summon about him from his own State a military establishment worthy of his reputation. General Gates, despite the splendor of Saratoga, was neither a good soldier nor a Virginian by birth; General Morgan, altho a good soldier and a brilliant leader of light troops, did not rise to the rank of a notable general of division; Gen. Henry Lee, the "Light Horse Harry" of popular applause, was but a fine partisan commander; and Gen. William Campbell, the "Hero of King's Mountain," has one successful exploit to his credit, and little more. But, tho this is so, where in the whole history of the war is there another, save only Gen. Nathaniel Greene, who exhibited military genius worthy of the standard set by the commander-in-chief?

When, however, Virginia began to prepare herself for the too-certain conflict a group of men of really high capacities put themselves at the head of the movement. Some of these were only men of respectable talents whose strength lay in their social position. Yet among such a coterie as that which consisted of Thomas Nelson, Jr., Peyton Randolph, Edmund Pendleton, John Page, George Mason and Robert Carter Nicholas, to name no more, there was enough ability to make their leader no mean man. When to these more conservative men was

added the fiery and intensely active Henry, the party became a powerful weapon ready for action, or a broken reed doomed to split or fray with the first blow. Henry, like all true Englishmen, was conservative in thought, but radical enough in conduct. It is no small evidence of the quiet mastery of Washington that he had the confidence and recognition of the ambitious Randolph, the calm and judicial Pendleton and the eager Henry, and bound them together for hard and long service. Henry's testimony in his comment upon the men of the First Continental Congress, "If you speak of solid information and sound judgment, Washington is undoubtedly the greatest man of all," is of great weight. As we follow him moving about among these men on their plantations in Virginia and at the colonial capital, calmly but conclusively laying down principles and silently giving form and substance to the glowing figures of Henry's oratory, we realize something of the spell he began to exercise over men. "If this man is the embodiment of rebellion it is a very sober thing, very resolute, very sure," we can fancy men saying. And when he assumed in the Congress the uniform of the colonel of Virginia militia, we can well understand how permanent and haunting the impression of his presence must have been. Men might question the wide application of the politics of the town meeting even while they looked into the face of the astute Mr. Samuel Adams of Massachusetts; they might sleep and wake with only a dim recollection of Patrick Henry's tocsin-like appeals, but how could they shake off the presentiment of coming battle so palpably set before them day by day.

Presently he was gone to the field. Counsel dragged along more or less efficiently till peace visited the travelling land and a nation sprang to birth. Counsel dragged along ever less efficiently thereafter, till men began to murmur and despair for the Republic. A new race had come to being in Virginia. Richard Henry Lee remains in active service, indeed, eloquent and impressive as he stands with his fine figure only marred by his injured hand swathed in black silk wrappings. Patrick Henry shares with Lee a growing discontent with national tenden-

cies, but devotes himself to his large legal practice. A new Randolph, a master of the art of persuasion, but too much a slave to his own emotional temperament, now rivals Henry at the bar. Two new men, of widely different natures but destined to closely united careers, have appeared in Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. There are not a few others conspicuous at this time whom Virginians cannot well forget. But we must be content to note these. Lee wasted his brilliant powers in opposing fate and the new Constitution. Edmund Randolph, after securing a large place in his country's history, by presenting the Virginia plan, vacillated, and eventually sank under the penalty of indecision. But James Madison rose to a great occasion in the Constitutional Convention and stamped his personality not only on the Constitution of the United States but on the constitutional thought of the succeeding century. Thomas Jefferson, both attracted and repelled by the fellow-countryman whom for a time he followed and then forsook to develop a wholly different element in our national Government, constantly shows his consciousness of his inferiority to Washington, and by his ignoble hostility exhibited the vast gulf between their characters.

These men were orators, jurists and diplomats, but among those who did battle for the Constitution in the Virginia Convention was a young man of peculiarly lofty legal gifts—the greatest jurist America has yet produced. He had been early associated with Washington during his service in the war, and near the close of his administration Washington had offered him a place in his Cabinet as Attorney-General, thus showing the reciprocity of their appreciation of each other. When Washington died his younger friend found it a grateful, if not a thoroughly congenial, task to write his biography. This was John Marshall. His great work was the interpretation in legal decisions of that Constitution which Washington had interpreted in a broad and powerful administration. Through his long and noble career the great

jurist was the able exponent of the large views of the great President.

Can we hesitate to claim a very high rank among men for him who thus dominates so varied and so capable a company? Tho we rank the best of them, Henry, Pendleton, Madison, Jefferson and Marshall, round him, he simply and serenely rises far above them all. Yet have not these men wrought as enduring institutions as the more praised Walpoles and Pitts, Metternichs and Talleyrands, Cavours and Bismarcks, and is there a figure in modern history quite worthy to be compared with him who as soldier and statesman, deliverer and administrator, stands forth as the highest exemplar of New World courage, capacity and self-control?

He was indeed the great Virginian. His fellows were only great Virginians. It is not easy to find many like those of that titanic time. Thomas may, indeed, be hailed as not less a patriot and only second to Washington among Virginia's generals. Farragut upon the sea was, like Gates and Morgan, only an adopted son. Henry Clay went forth into the daughter State, but there kept alive the traditions of eloquence and of supreme loyalty to the nation and to a liberty which is for white and black alike. It is to Abraham Lincoln, a child of the daughter commonwealth, a son of a sectionless country, to whom we must, however, look for the best representative in recent times of the deepest, strongest and most enduring elements of the lofty characters of the great Virginians.

So history written by the hand of God accepts no human guidance. The England of George the Third refused to recognize the successor of Simon de Montfort and John Hampden in George Washington. And Virginia could not trace in the gaunt figure and rude visage of the Western stump speaker the lineaments of the adored first President. But time lifts the human judgment slowly up to universal points of view, and we rejoice to think that the United States of today is still in purpose and in fact the land of Washington.

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, EASTON, PA.