

as himself—men capable of being raised, by a swifter and slower process, to his own level. The nature of man was the same whether he had a wider or a narrower sphere for his work. The narrower sphere had some advantages over the wider. It was in small communities, where men were brought closer together, where every man had a personal share in the political life of the community, that the faculties were raised to their highest levels and sharpened to the finest point. It was, from a political point of view, the great merit of modern scientific discoveries which had enabled people of a great community, or of a nation or kingdom, to have that direct personal knowledge of the political life of the community of which they were members, and that direct personal share in it which once could not be had save where the State was confined to the territory of a single city. Instead of despising earlier times, because they had not printing, railways and telegraphs, let them rather say that it was by these inventions that they raised large States to the level of small ones—that it was by means of these inventions Englishmen of our day had become far more like the Athenians in the age of Pericles. Even fifty years ago the utmost that an ordinary Briton could do was now and then to give a vote, if he had one, at the Parliamentary election, and to read or hear most meagre accounts of what was going on in Parliament and in public life. Now, however, we saw and heard our leading men almost daily. They walked before us as the leaders of the Athenian democracy walked before their fellow-citizens. We had a share in political life, only less direct than the share of the Athenian freemen—a share which our forefathers, even two or three generations ago, never dreamt of. Did the popular phrase

"Greater Britain" take in the United States of America? If he rightly understood the phrase "Greater Britain," it was sometimes held to have the same meaning as the phrase "British Empire." If so, assuredly the United States did not come under this definition; but sometimes the phrase "Greater Britain" seemed to be used as bearing the same meaning as the federation of the English-speaking people. Now, the people of the United States surely formed so large a part of the English-speaking people that a federation which was to include all the branches of that people was strangely imperfect which left out a branch so fruitful as that which spread the English tongue from ocean to ocean. Again, if the phrase "Greater Britain" meant the "British Empire," it must include India, which was the head and front of the Imperial power of Great Britain, but which could hardly be looked upon as in itself a Greater Britain. If Egypt and Asia were not Greater Greece, India was still less Greater Britain. Greece looked somewhere else for her Greater Greece, and Britain could not fail to look elsewhere for her greater self, and not where the influence of Britain took the shape so largely of domination and so slightly of assimilation. If the phrase "Great Britain" answered to the federation of the English-speaking people, it took in the English-speaking people of America, Africa, Australia, and other parts of the islands and continents of the ocean which were not of the same political condition as the United States. He was not arguing for or against any scheme of federation. He wished simply, as a matter of accuracy, to know what was really meant. The difficulty with respect to the federation of the English-speaking people was that the great part of what it was fashionable to call