

cided to abide by them to the last. "If," said Mr. Gladstone, in words of solemn warning and prophetic significance, "if the Liberals acceded to the appeals of the government, the result would be a retrogression. The Irish people would return to ask some things which Liberal efforts had already partly remedied. So long as Ireland continued in her present course of moderation, so long would Liberals be bound to persevere in their endeavors to assist her. The time would soon come when to the many now supporting the cause of Ireland would be added many more, when deplorable proposals such as those of the government would be no more associated with the name of Ireland, and when it would be seen that in doing what they could now to serve the Irish cause they were also serving the cause of the wide empire of Great Britain."

We can scarcely believe that the measure of the government will become law, but prepared must we be for the worst. Our brethren in Ireland who enjoy not the blessings of self-government, and whose hands it is now proposed to tie, look to us who do enjoy the blessings to assist them in their hour of trial. False should we be to freedom and to honor, ay, even to humanity itself, if we refuse to act on their appeal. Of itself Ireland is weak. With fewer than five millions of people, she is forced into conflict with the most powerful government in the world. True, she has the sympathy and support of a large portion of the English public, but that sympathy and support, she will not, we must bear it in mind, have, if the Irish throughout the world do not show that in the supreme crisis in this history of their dear motherland they make common cause with her—ready if need there be to shed the very last drop of their blood in resistance to tyranny. The battle must be fought in the main by the children of Ireland in America and Australia. Their influence and their assistance it is that have wrought such a mighty change in British public opinion on the question of Home Rule. Their influence, their assistance, and their endurance it is that will yet, we believe, achieve victory for the cause—the cause of freedom—equality and humanity. With Roscoe Conkling, the prince of American parliamentarians, does not only every Irishman, and son of an Irishman in America, but every freeman, whatever his origin, creed or color, declare, in the face of mankind:

"In heart and judgment I am in sympathy with the people of Ireland, and wholly against any and every scheme to trample on their rights. It will be ennobling if England, the land of Magna Charta, the land of trial by jury and the due process of law, the land of eight centuries of Parliament, the land of Westminster Hall, shall now at this stage of the world turn around and march back towards barbarism. For a Government to uphold itself by force against those who would overthrow it is one thing; this is the right of self-defense; the right to be. But it is a widely different thing to make laws oppressive and repugnant to the great majority of those affected by them and then to violate the principles of government itself in order to enforce such laws. Such a proceeding is not a resort to the right of self-defense nor a resort to any other right. It is might—brutal might. It cannot be defended by the extremity of the occasion; still less by the possession of power great enough to promise impunity to the act. Should the events of the day bend come to pass, Great Britain may make a home question which mankind may make a question of its own—so deep and universal is the sentiment of liberty."

A BASE CALUMNY.

Even John Bright, in his fierce hatred of Home Rule for Ireland, is not above resorting to calumny, as the following from the *Mail* of March 22nd establishes: "Mr. John Bright says the majority of the people in Ireland would vote their country to be a State of the American Union, if their leaders instructed them to do so, but that that would be no reason why the British Parliament should." There is no man at all acquainted with Ireland, who does not know, that not alone is there no feeling in Ireland even among the most extreme of those Irishmen who seek for national independence, in favor of making Ireland a state of the American Union, but that any such proposal would be sure to meet with universal and unconquerable opposition from the Irish nation. Ireland feels for America the warmest regard and affection, but Ireland, for very good reasons, has no desire for political connection with the American republic. The Irish are not ignorant of the necessities of their geographical position. They wish to be one with Great Britain, but on terms just to both nations. They know full well that, as things now stand, it were better for the two countries to be wholly dissociated than attempting to live in undignified civil strife. But they, at the same time, recognize, that it is in the interests of both, as it is within their reach and capacity, to live in union, peace and harmony. Ireland has indeed a warm feeling for America. She loves her people and admires her institutions. She glories in her history and delights in her success. She remembers with pride that America was once known as the "greater Ireland," and also "St. Brendan's Land," the latter

appellation derived from the daring but saintly Hibernian navigator, who, in the sixth century, first visited the shores of the New World. Mr. Patrick Egan, in a masterly and touching speech, lately delivered at the banquet of the Travellers' Protection Association of Nebraska, portrayed the feelings of Ireland for America. He said that the Eastern sycophants, who are so anxious to claim England as the mother of America, little know of what they speak. He showed that the Irish people, forced by English tyranny to seek homes in foreign lands, early turned to the greater Ireland of America, and were, before the tide of immigration had set in from other countries, flocking here in large numbers. He triumphantly rectified the fact that as a result of the Irish exodus to America, borne testimony to in presence of a committee of the English Commons, where Washington flag to the breeze the flag of American freedom, one half of those who fought—aye, and conquered—beneath its glorious folds, were Irish, while before the same committee it was testified that there were more native Americans enlisted in the British corps in the colonies than in Washington's army. Mr. Egan then recalled the memory of Benjamin Franklin's visit to Ireland in 1771, when the distinguished American was by a unanimous vote accorded a seat on the floor of the Irish Commons, a privilege never before granted a stranger. He found the Irish friendly to America, and the continental congress on two separate occasions felt, by gratitude constrained, to warmly thank the Irish nation for their sympathy and support in the struggle of the infant nation for liberty. Not alone in the Irish and English Parliaments did Irishmen advocate the claims of America; on the battlefield, too, did they fight for the liberty of the new world.

The speaker then alluded to the timely aid of the Irish American merchants of Philadelphia to Washington's famishing army at Valley Forge, and with just feelings of satisfaction claimed Ireland as the mother country of nine of the signatories of the Declaration of Independence, while some of the principal framers of the American constitution were likewise of Irish blood and race. And then, giving full play to his feelings, Mr. Egan declared:

"From that time down to this, suffering, struggling, but unconquered and unconquerable Ireland, and glorious, free America have been fast friends. During your terrible war for the abolition of human slavery Ireland's undivided sympathy was with you. On every field, from the first disastrous battle to the final glorious victory, Irish blood flowed like water in defence of the union and freedom; and Irish Americans, amongst whom were General Phil Sheridan, our late lamented friend, General Logan, General Birney, Meagher, Sweeny, Lalor, Shields, Corcoran, and hosts of others, covered themselves with glory. Your great and glorious country has received my countrymen with open arms, when ruthlessly driven from their own land, and given them happy homes and freedom. You have generously aided our people in Ireland when afflicted with artificially created famines. You have, by moral support, and, above all, by the force of your example, stimulated and sustained us in our struggles against oppression and wrong; and our people give you in return their love, their admiration, their loyalty. Many years since, John Bright—before he had become a mugwump Conservative—described Ireland as standing with her back towards England and her face to America; and his description is doubly true to-day. In addition to the other favours, we have to thank you in great measure for a leader who has, for the first time in our history, combined every great quality that can be called Irish under one National banner; for Charles Stewart Parnell, the worthy grandson of Commodore Charles Stewart—"Old Ironsides" of the American navy—is more American than Irish."

He concluded with the following appropriate sentiment:

"It is not, therefore, inappropriate that patriotic American citizens should couple the names of Ireland and America; and I think I can promise that one of the first acts of an Irish Parliament—and I expect to see one sitting in Dublin before '88 is out—will be to pass warm resolutions of thanks to the people of America for the whole-souled sympathy and aid they have given in winning back Home Rule for Ireland." Here we have summed up the real state of Irish feeling towards America, a feeling of affection, admiration, gratitude and closest kinship. Here we have the relations of the two countries as they have been, and as Ireland wishes them still to be, fully, clearly, touchingly set forth. Ireland's ambition is not to be a state of the American Union, but a free, self-governing and integral portion of the empire with whose greatness she is so closely identified, to whose maintenance she has sacrificed her blood and treasure, and whose unending prosperity she wishes to secure by the enfranchisement of the masses—English, Irish, and Scotch races—whose union God's goodness has decreed for the liberation, purification, enlightenment and elevation of humanity. Two empires have these chosen peoples founded—the one free, happy and glorious because of its fidelity to the cause of human liberty, the other divided, weakened and distracted because of injustice continued and inequality maintained. On the side of justice and inequality are ranged former advocates of justice and equality, Bright and Chamberlain, victims of blackest prejudice.

REV. L. N. BEAUDRY.

We have great pleasure in publishing the following for the delectation of the readers of the RECORD. We defy Mr. Beaudry and his threats. Our comments on the letter of the Rev. Dr. Kilroy were simply what the case called for. We refused to publish Mr. Beaudry's letter for the reason that it is not a refutation of Rev. Dr. Kilroy's statements, but a mere tissue of abuse and malignity. Mr. Beaudry and his like have been living for years on the dirty work of libelling their fellow-countrymen and stirring up hatred and ill-will amongst the Christian denominations of the country. Let Mr. Beaudry compare.

FLOCK & FLOCK, Barristers, Solicitors, Notaries Public, &c.

London, Oct. 4, April 4th, 1887.

To the Editor of the Catholic Record:

SIR.—The Rev. Mr. Beaudry has called on us with reference to a letter of Rev. E. B. Kilroy, D.D., published in your paper of the 2nd inst., and comments thereon, which are libellous in their character and tend to bring him into disrepute in the community.

He informs us that he has requested you to publish his reply to that letter, which he has shown to you, but that you have refused to do so.

It is to be regretted that you have come to that decision and we trust you will reconsider it, otherwise he will be obliged in vindication of his position and character to take such legal measures as will have the effect of placing him right before the public.

We will await your reply until next Wednesday.

Yours truly,
FLOCK & FLOCK

HOW THEY WORK THE MACHINE IN IRELAND.

Jury-packing is an old, a very old practice in Ireland. It dates from the very first establishment of English law in the country and has been employed to cover up more infamy than any other land has ever witnessed or endured. Murder, massacre, robbery, iniquitous seizure of persons, and any crime that tyranny must resort to, for the maintenance of its sway, have all found justification at the hands of packed juries. The Irish judicial bench, the last refuge of the place hunter, the parasite and the plunderer, and the disgrace of the civilized world, has had, and still has, its fitting coadjutor in the Irish jury system. The late state trials in Dublin, wherein Messrs. Dillon, O'Brien, Crilly, Shelby and Redmond were prosecuted for the part they had taken in the prosecution of the Plan of Campaign, is the latest instance of the Castle's resort to the infamous practice of jury-packing. The *Freeman's Journal* tells us how the Castle minions work the machine:

"The Sheriff, in impanelling the jurors from whom the jury were selected, performed a curious feat. He discarded the provision of the Act which exempts jurors who have served 'during the current or next two preceding years.' He did not follow the progressive order so explicitly laid down, but by dropping names that should have been taken up, by turning back upon the alphabet instead of going forward, he impanelled 250 jurors, not one of whom was properly listed. The late Sub-Sheriff, who had sixteen years' experience of the practice, was called, and his testimony was that the practice, as well as the Act, was not observed; and Mr. Justice Murphy himself observed that 'supposing Mr. Omsby—the late Sub-Sheriff—was acting here, he would have returned the panel in a different way; and again, if the course which Mr. Omsby had followed in constituting the panel had been followed in this case, I do not think there would have been any objection raised.' Yet his Lordship held against the challenge, and sustained the new method of selection adopted by the Sheriff. What has been the effect upon the complexion of the jury of this selection? Names such as Byrne, Bryan, Cullen, and Murphy, names with the prefixes O and Mac, were excluded, and patronymics like Dagg, Vance, Young, Usher, Irwin, Jacob, Haddock, Bagnall, Bagot, and others of even a more specific tone preserved. Further, we are in position to state that while the religious proportion of the present panel is 95 Catholics to 215 non-Catholics—33 being allowed for deaths, removals, etc.—the panel as it ought to have been constituted would embrace 150 Catholics to 100 non-Catholics."

The indignation of the Catholic people at this outrage, shamelessly perpetrated in the broad burning light of this nineteenth century, can be more easily imagined than portrayed. Again and again, especially in recent times, were the Irish people assured that they were one with their English fellow-subjects; that the sole desire and earnest purpose of the representatives of British rule in Ireland was to enable them to enjoy on a footing of perfect equality all the blessings of British freedom; that in view of this desire and this purpose they were not only invidious, but ungrateful for the Irish masses to continue an agitation for Home Rule. The true value of these contentions the *Freeman's Journal's* exposition of official rascality very emphatically indicates. We have it in that recital most unmistakably demonstrated that the Irish government, to accomplish a comparatively small end—to gratify feelings of momentary vengeance—prepared to aim a deadly blow at the constitution of the country, and invade the dearest rights of individual men, in a manner so atrocious as to threaten society with disruption, revolution and chaos. Emerson has it that in "dealing with the state, we ought to remember

that its institutions are not aboriginal, though they existed before we were born." Then he admonishingly observes "that they are not superior to the citizen," and again: that "politics rest on necessary foundations and cannot be treated with levity," and further on, "that the state must follow and not lead, the character and progress of the citizen." These great truths are all alien to the minds of the Irish official who uses the machinery of government, not for the subvention and development of civic growth and strength, but for its destruction and effacement. The luminous intellect of Ireland, to which the duties of the State and the rights of the citizen are equally clear, has not failed to apprehend the danger created by the jury packing outrage and to find an adequate mode of expression for its protest against this assault upon the citizen and this menace against the very existence of the state. The learned Archbishop of Dublin, whose services to Ireland entitle him to profoundest gratitude, and whose high position, as well as exalted virtues, commands the respect of the whole nation, lost no time in raising himself on the side of justice outraged and liberty assailed. He wrote as follows:

4 Rutland Square, E. Dublin,
16th Feb., 1887.

DEAR SIR—I send you enclosed a cheque for £10, my subscription to the Defence Fund, which, I assume, will at once be opened in your columns, in response to the timely appeal from Mr. Gray, published in this day's *Freeman's Journal*.

I should gladly co-operate in any way in my power in an effort to secure, if it were possible, a fair trial for the traversers. But in the present instance a fair trial is no longer a matter of possibility. The first essential element of fairness—a fairly empanelled jury—is wanting. The jury before which John Dillon and his fellow traversers are now arraigned in Green-street, has not been fairly empanelled. It has been most unfairly packed.

And as this most recent instance of jury packing has been effected by the wholesale exclusion of Catholic jurors of the county Dublin, I send this subscription to the fund, not merely as a mark of my sympathy with the traversers, but as a protest, which, as Archbishop of Dublin, I feel it my duty to make against the gross insult that has thus been inflicted on many upright, conscientious, members of my flock—I remain, dear sir, most faithfully yours,

WILLIAM J. WALSH,

Archbishop of Dublin.

The temporary acquittal of the traversers, through disagreement on the part of the jury, while giving momentary gratification to the people, cannot be looked upon as a final or satisfactory solution of the difficulty raised by the conduct of the Castle agents, so accurately detailed in the *Freeman's Journal*. The blow aimed at individuals struck the very foundations of society, now shaken and convulsed as rarely they are even in Ireland. How exactly the words of Andrew Jackson in his farewell address to the American people apply to Ireland as a part of its United Kingdom: "The constitution cannot be maintained, nor the union preserved, in opposition to public feeling, by the mere exertion of the coercive powers confided to the general government. The foundations must be laid in the affections of the people: in the security it gives to life, liberty, character and property, in every quarter of the country; and in the fraternal attachments which the citizens of the several States bear to one another, as members of one political family, mutually contributing to promote the happiness of each other."

THE RIGHTS OF PEOPLES.

A timely and forcible article on this subject lately appeared in *L'Univers*. Its substance we feel it a duty to convey to our readers, as indicative of the perils, threatening and suggestive, of the remedies demanded by Europe. *L'Univers* justly deprecates the frequent violations of the rights of nations in our day. This transgression of Christian law is in fact the shame and the danger of modern Europe. The criminal who robs or kills a single man is branded with infamy, consigned to the galleys or the guillotine, but the aggressor who robs a whole country and assassinates a nation is praised and glorified. Here is a return to paganism, an imitation of Islamism, a negation of Christian law. The number of smaller states constantly decreasing, the possessions and armament of the greater states ever increasing, while all safeguard of the weaker nations must disappear if spoliation and brute force are to be glorified, Jesus Christ has commanded the mighty, whether nations or individuals, to be just and merciful. Wars would not be cruel, nor treaties of peace unjust, were the commands of the Saviour respected. Before His coming scant attention was given to justice or humanity, the most ancient historical data testifying to the universal reign of merciless cruelty. In his cruciform inscription, the Assyrian monarch boasts of having butchered or buried alive the chiefs of vanquished nations, and recites with pride the list of cities destroyed whose inhabitants he massacred or reduced to slavery. The Egyptian Pharo represents himself with his foot on the heads of his enchained prisoners of war. In these ancient days the person and the property of the con-

quered became the prey of the conqueror. The Romans themselves followed these barbarous customs. They pillaged, plundered and slaughtered before assimilating the nations they vanquished. Later on, the Mussulman and the Mongolian delighted in plunder and slaughter. Everywhere that Jesus Christ reigned not, violence, cruelty and injustice held full dominion. The church softened the hearts, by enlightening the souls of men. Her constant teaching was that of clemency and equity. Christianity, a Christian institution, devoted itself to the defence of the feeble and oppressed. The influence of the Pope was ever exercised in favor of justice and of peace. They defended against German Caesarism the liberty of Italy and the freedom of other countries. This just and incontrovertible statement of historical teaching recalls the admission of Macaulay in his famous chapter on England before the restoration: "It is better that men should be governed by priestcraft than by brute violence, by such a prelate as Dunstan than by such a warrior as Penda. . . . Mental power, even when abused, is still a nobler and better power than that which consists merely in corporeal strength. We read in our Saxon chronicles of tyrants. . . . who abdicated their crowns and sought to atone for their offences by cruel penances and incessant prayers. These stories have drawn forth bitter expressions of contempt from some writers who, while they boasted of liberality, were in truth as narrow-minded as any monk of the dark ages, and whose habit was to apply to all events in the history of the world the standard received in the Parisian society of the eighteenth century, yet surely a system which, however deformed by superstition, introduced strong moral restraints into communities previously governed only by vigor of muscle and by audacity of spirit, a system which taught the fiercest and mightiest ruler that he was, like his meanest bondman, a responsible being, might have seemed to deserve a more respectful mention from philosophers and philanthropists."

And again: "It was surely good that in an age of ignorance and violence, there should be quiet cloisters and gardens, in which the arts of peace could be safely cultivated, in which gentle and contemplative natures could find an asylum, in which one brother could employ himself translating the *Æneid* of Virgil, and another in meditating the Analytics of Aristotle, in which he who had a genius for art might illuminate a martyrology or carve a crucifix, and in which he who had a turn for natural philosophy might make experiments in the properties of plants and minerals. Had not such retreats been scattered here and there, among the huts of a miserable peasantry, and the castles of a ferocious aristocracy, European society would have consisted merely of beasts of burden and beasts of prey." The eloquent English historian, then speaking of the comparison made between the church and the art of which we read in Genesis, declares: "Never was the resemblance more perfect than during that evil time when he alone rode, amidst darkness and tempest, on the deluge beneath which all the great works of ancient powers and wisdom lay entombed bearing within her that feeble germ from which a second and more glorious civilization was to spring." To the spiritual supremacy of the Pope he bears this reluctant but emphatic testimony: "Even the spiritual supremacy arrogated by the Pope was, in the dark ages, productive of far more good than evil. Its effect was to unite the nations of Western Europe in one great commonwealth. What the Olympian chariot course and the Pythian oracle were to all Greek cities from Trebizond to Marseilles, Rome and her Bishop were to all Christians of the Latin communion, from Calabria to the Hebrides. This grew up sentiments of enlarged benevolence. Races separated from each other by seas and mountains acknowledged a fraternal tie and a common code of public law. Even in war, the cruelty of the conqueror was not seldom mitigated by the recollection that he and his vanquished enemies were all members of one great federation." The celebrated English writer is even forced to admit that the Catholic Church is the friend of freedom and slavery's uncompromising foe: "The benevolent spirit of Christian morality is undoubtedly adverse to distinctions of cast. But to the Church of Rome such distinctions are peculiarly odious, for they are incompatible with other distinctions which are essential to her system. . . . To this day, in some countries where negro slavery exists, Popery appears in advantageous contrasts to other forms of Christianity. It is notorious that the antipathy between the European and African races is, by no means, so strong at Rio Janiero as at Washington. In our own country this peculiarity of the Roman Catholic system produced, during the Middle Ages, many salutary effects. . . . At a time when the English name was a reproach, and when all the civil and military dignities of the

kingdom were supposed to belong exclusively to the countrymen of the conqueror, the despised race learned, with transports of delight, that one of themselves, Nicholas Breakspear, had been elevated to the papal throne. . . . It was a national as well as a religious feeling that drew great multitudes to the shrine of Becket. . . . A successor of Becket was foremost among the refractory magnates who obtained that charter which secured the privileges both of the Norman barons and of the Saxon yeomanry. How great a part the Roman Catholic ecclesiastics subsequently had in the abolition of villenage we learn from the unexceptionable testimony of Sir Thomas Smith, one of the ablest of the Protestant counsellors of Elizabeth, when the dying slaveholder asked for the last Sacraments, his spiritual attendants regularly adjured him, as he loved his soul, to emancipate his brethren for whom Christ had died. So successfully had the Church used her formidable machinery that, before the Reformation came, she had enfranchised almost all the bondsmen in the kingdom except her own, who, to do her justice, seems to have been very tenderly treated." Having cited so much of Protestant testimony it is time to return to *L'Univers*. The Protestant hereby, continues that journal, weakened the church and the spoliation and cruelties of the religious war were varied and multiplied. But even in the midst of these sanguinary struggles, Christian law asserted itself. The prisoner of war was no longer considered the property of the conqueror, and following the imitation of the Catholic Francis of Guise, combatants made provision for the care of the enemy's wounded. With the exception of the struggle with the Turks and the atrocities committed in Ireland, the wars of the seventeenth century, profoundly religious in character, were generally conducted in a spirit of kindness and humanity. Rivals in valor on the battle field, the combatants met each other afterwards without animosity. A chivalric spirit, conformable to French character, then the preponderant power in Europe, manifested itself throughout the continent, the plunder of the Palatine alone standing out as an exception to this luminous tableau. In the following century scepticism prevailed and the rights of nations diminished. The infidel Frederick II. dismembered Poland with the connivance of Catherine of Russia, and the unbelievers Konitz—the Pope alone protesting against this crime. The revolution of '89, at once Pagan and atheistical, professed absolute contempt for right, national or individual. For that ravaging monster might was right. Napoleon, acting on this principle, abused his successes—mutilated vanquished states and aimed at universal monarchy, whence the dread and hatred of which France has since been the victim. The rancor generated by the treatment meted out to the Prussians by Napoleon never left the breasts of the people. It was, in comparison with the treaty of 1807, that Prince smarak declared the pact of 1871, signed at Versailles, so cruel, in reality, for France both Christian and humane. An abuse of force by any nation leaves it open to terrible retribution. To day, a Pagan replaces a Christian polity and no moral or religious safeguard arrests the cupid-ity of the conqueror.

If they did their duty Christian people would live in fraternity, the strongest among them protecting the weaker. The clemency of the victor would alleviate the distress and humiliation of defeat. Contrary feelings, however, prevail. A nation will now seize without scruple adjacent territory badly defended, and after a struggle between two rival powers the conqueror strives to reduce to misery and impotence the vanquished people. The Pagans and Mussulmen of the extreme east cut the fingers of their prisoners of war; soon perhaps a triumphant Christian nation will call itself generous if it leave one healthy hand to a rival but conquered people. When the African despot of the Ouganda orders an attack on a neighboring tribe, he says to his general, "Go devour that country." This saying may be justly applied to the numerous armies of Europe. They devour the country they invade. Hence every people arms itself in the most formidable manner to prevent or repel invasion. To this they are forced. But no nation has a right to seize on a promising occasion to precipitate itself on a neighboring power. Unjustifiable aggression is as blameworthy in Germany as it is in France. The great majority of Germans and of Frenchmen are animated with sentiments of peace. We may on this account hope for its maintenance. Imprudent and ambitious spirits have, notwithstanding, driven the two nations into seeming unfriendliness by declaring war inevitable. Here is the essential error and the real danger. There is but one step from the inevitable to the necessary. A nation that looks on war as inevitable will seize on the first available moment to fight. This is the argument of the advocates of war in the two countries, but it is not just, nor prudent, nor Christian speech. *L'Univers* concludes with an advice to the French people to be reserved and patient in their patriotism and in their purely defensive strength, and to be hopeful that this attitude will make them respected. Guilty indeed would be the government that in such circumstances would declare war. Victory could not be decisive for France, even were she triumphant, for France is lacking in internal stability and in foreign friendship. Were she, however, to be defeated, Belgium, Holland, Denmark and Switzerland would lose their independence, and Austria herself run good chance of being crushed between the rival empires of Northern and Central Europe. The Catholic world would suffer very grievously and socialism acquire great strength. *L'Univers* urges the French nation to be vigilant and prudent without provoking any other power. Upon French wisdom and strength depend the rights of many peoples and the liberty of a large portion of Europe.