

A DREAM.

I HAD a dream of Love.
It seemed that, on a sudden, in my heart
A live and passionate thing leaped into being
And conquered me. 'T was fierce and terrible,
And yet more lovely than the dawn, and soft,
With a deep power. It roused a longing
To do I know not what — to give — ah yes!
More than myself! and failing that — to die —
(If only death were harder) could it make
One moment happier for that other soul.
This was the dream — but what is Love itself?

Hildegarde Hawthorne.

PRESENT-DAY PAPERS.

CONTRIBUTED BY THE SOCIOLOGICAL GROUP.

CHARLES W. SHIELDS.	SETH LOW.	FRANCIS G. PEABODY.
HENRY C. POTTER.	RICHARD T. ELY.	WILLIAM F. SLOCUM, JR.
THEODORE T. MUNGER.	HUGH MILLER THOMPSON.	EDWARD J. PHELPS.
WM. CHAUNCY LANGDON.	CHARLES A. BRIGGS.	WILLIAM M. SLOANE.
SAMUEL W. DIKE.	WASHINGTON GLADDEN.	CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER.

It is understood that each writer has had the benefit of suggestions from the group, but is himself alone responsible for opinions expressed in a paper to which his name is subscribed.

THE ATTACK ON THE SENATE.

RELATION OF THE STATES TO THE UNITED STATES.



THAT a government theoretically founded upon the rights of man, and on the hypothesis that the object of life is the pursuit of happiness, could exist for more than a century, and be stronger than it was at the beginning, requires some explanation. For, logically, Mazzini is right in expecting that a government so founded would end in despotism or anarchy.

In commenting on the French Revolution he says: "The political theory which dominated alike the great achievements and the great legislative manifestations of that revolution was the theory of Rights; the moral doctrine which promoted and perpetuated it was the materialistic doctrine which has defined life as a search after happiness on earth. The first inaugurated the sovereignty of the Ego; the second inaugurated the sovereignty of Interests. . . .

"The rights of different individuals, or of different orders of society, when neither sanctified by sacrifice fulfilled, nor harmonized and directed by a common faith in a providential moral

law, will sooner or later come into collision and lead to reciprocal shock; and each reassertion of such rights will wear the aspect of war and hatred. The absence of a law of duty, supreme over all rights, and to which all can therefore appeal, gradually and inadvertently leads men to the acceptance of *les faits accomplis*; success is gradually taken for the sign and symbol of legitimacy, and men learn to substitute the worship of the Actual for the worship of the True; a disposition which is shortly after transformed into the adoration of Force." And Force, says Mazzini, is in France translated into "administrative centralization."

And again: "The error of the French Revolution was not the abolition of monarchy. It was the attempt to build up a republic upon the theory of Rights, which, taken alone, inevitably leads to the acceptance of *les faits accomplis*; upon the sovereignty of the Ego, which leads us, sooner or later, to the sovereignty of the strongest Ego; upon the essentially monarchical methods of extreme centralization, intolerance, and violence — upon that false definition of life of which I have spoken above [of well-being as the aim of life], given by men educated

by monarchy, and inspired by a materialism which, having canceled God, had left itself nothing to worship but Force."

This government has not only endured for a century, but it has been steadier than any of the great powers existing at the time of its birth; it has changed less in form, and been subject to fewer fluctuations, and it has shown itself quite as adaptable as any of them to meet the changes in modern society. These changes have been so universal and deep as to affect all existing institutions. They are not alone the result of inventions which have revolutionized labor, production, distribution, and intercourse round the globe, but of the new spirit of this era, namely, that of associated humanity, which seems to be the providential and logical sequence of the extreme development of individualism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These associations are many of them only an enlargement and continuation of the struggle for rights, the conflict of classes, the formation of hostile camps; but the very fact of association, though selfish in motive, is a recognition of the interdependence of men, and in its way a dim perception that there are duties as well as rights in the social state. The United States has not only borne the strain of this revolution in modern life with quite as little disturbance of its fundamental economy as any other nation, but it has shown an elasticity and adaptability in it that is of good promise for the future.

This is the more remarkable, and the more requiring explanation, considering that we came into national being in the epoch in which individualism came to its extreme exposition in the French Revolution, when the very air was hot with the rights of man, and all minds were given up to a dream of well-being in *laissez-faire*; it requires explanation the more because we have not remained stationary with a territory and a population small and easily handled. We have increased our territory from a narrow strip on the Atlantic to the dimensions of a continent, and our population from three millions and a half to sixty millions, and meantime have been trying to assimilate a greater diversity of races, languages, and religious and irreligious conceptions than ever before were thrown together into a forming nation in the same space of time.

What is the secret of the stability and development of the United States?

It is a truism to say that no nation was ever made, out of hand, by statesmen in a closet, nor was any enduring government ever created by politicians. It is a growth, a perfectly logical growth, out of a past, and no form of government worthy the name is without traditions. The American Revolution did not create any-

thing; it severed our connection with Great Britain, and left us free to continue our historic development. Courage and action were stimulated doubtless by a solid as well as a rhetorical consideration of the rights of man. The Declaration put these into a proclamation which was a trumpet-call throughout the world. But the Revolution over, separation attained, the instinct of nationality on historic lines began to construct not only a *modus vivendi*, but a permanent form of national life in the most practical and businesslike manner, without the slightest reference to the *doctrinaire* propositions of the Declaration of Independence.

This, then, is the first word of explanation of the perpetuity of a government popularly supposed, especially by foreign observers, to be founded on the doctrine of the rights of man and the pursuit of happiness. It was not built on phrases. Even so sympathetic an observer as Mazzini did not apprehend our political discovery, nor the freedom of development in our double political state, which in a manner corrects the tendencies of that theoretical American school "which [he says] makes of the individual the center of all things; and by its doctrine that the law is atheist, and its belief in the sovereignty of rights and interests, instills materialism, individualism, egotism, and contradiction into the minds of men."

How early a national consciousness was defined and diffused among the independent colonies, become sovereign States, it may not be possible to determine. On June 21, 1783, Congress in the city of Philadelphia was threatened by "armed soldiers in the service of the United States." This was more than two months before the recognition of our independence by Great Britain in the Treaty of Versailles, and more than four years before the adoption of the Federal Constitution. In view of the peril to Congress, a proclamation was issued summoning the delegates to meet at Princeton on June 26:

BY HIS EXCELLENCY, ELIAS BOUDINOT, ESQUIRE.

President of the United States in Congress assembled.

A PROCLAMATION:

Whereas, a body of armed soldiers in the service of the United States, and quartered in the Barracks of this city, having mutinously renounced their obedience to their officers, did, on Saturday the twenty-first day of this instant, proceed, under the direction of their Sergeants, in a hostile and threatening manner, to the place in which Congress was assembled, and did surround the same with guards. And whereas Congress, in consequence thereof, did on the same day, resolve, "That the President and Supreme Executive Council of the State should be informed, that the authority of the United States having been, that Day, grossly insulted by the disorderly and menacing appearance of a body of armed Soldiers, about the Place within which Congress was assembled; and that the Peace of this City

being endangered by the mutinous disposition of the said Troops then in the Barracks; it was, in the opinion of Congress, necessary, that effectual Measures should be immediately taken for supporting the public Authority." And also whereas Congress did at the same time appoint a committee to confer with the said President and Supreme Executive Council on the practicability of carrying the said Resolution into due effect: And also whereas the said Committee have reported to me, that they have not received satisfactory assurances for expecting adequate and prompt exertions of this State for supporting the Dignity of the federal Government.

And also whereas the said Soldiers still continue in a state of open Mutiny and Revolt, so that the Dignity and Authority of the United States would be constantly exposed to a repetition of Insult, while Congress shall continue to sit in this City, I do therefore, by and with the advice of the said Committee, and according to the Powers and Authorities in me vested for this Purpose, hereby summon the honorable the Delegates composing the Congress of the United States, and every of them, to meet in Congress on Thursday, the Twenty-Sixth day of June instant, at Princeton, in the State of New Jersey, in order that further and more effectual Measures may be taken for suppressing the present Revolt, and maintaining the Dignity and Authority of the United States, of which all Officers, of the United States, civil and military, and all others whom it may concern, are desired to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

Given under my Hand and Seal at Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, this Twenty-Fourth Day of June, in the year of Our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty-three, and of the Sovereignty and Independence of the United States the seventh.

ELIAS BOUDINOT.

Attest

SAMUEL STERETT, *private secretary.*

[NOTE. This proclamation is printed, except that in the last line "our" is erased and "the" written in before the word Sovereignty, and "of the United States" is written in after the word Independence.—C. D. W.]

The proclamation began with this title: "By His Excellency Elias Boudinot, Esquire, President of the United States in Congress assembled." It contained the phrases, "supporting the Dignity of the federal Government," "the Dignity and Authority of the United States," "all Officers of the United States, civil and military," and was dated as "of the Sovereignty and Independence of the United States the seventh" year.

If a document of this importance and notoriety, assuming the style of "President of the United States in Congress assembled," and using as comprehensible and descriptive such terms as "Dignity of the federal Government" and "Authority of the United States," passed without contemporary challenge, there must have been at least a tacit conception of nationality such as these terms imply. This is, however, a minor consideration in view of the historic consciousness in the colonies that they were set apart from the rest of the world, and were so far one that the main business of the Constitution of 1787 was to form them into "a more perfect Union."

When the convention of 1787 came together it had in hand the practical business of putting in shape a national idea, already well grown, and which could be fulfilled only in one way—that is, in a political system which should present it as a unit to the other nations of the world. It was probably not much concerned with theories, either of rights or of duties. It had to deal with facts, and these facts compelled it to construct the best political machine which had ever been devised. I am speaking here of politics in its lower sense, of a political machine which is able to keep in motion and on the track, and which, so far as we can see, is giving as fair play as any other to the great ideas that are transforming the world, bringing in that high conception of God and the human race recognized, but not much lived, in the Christian formula of "Love God supremely, and thy neighbor as thyself." I believe, indeed, that no other form of government can so easily adapt itself to the coming political conception of worship and duty as ours.

Fortunately for the result, this national idea was confronted at the outset by another idea, just as firmly fixed in the consciousness of the colonies, now become States, as the need of federal union, and that was the consciousness of State autocracy and sovereignty. Neither could be surrendered. It was like the problem in mechanics of the meeting of an irresistible body with an immovable body; or like the dogmatic pillars of foreknowledge and free will. For union there must be concession and compromise. Now compromise of principle never settles anything; but compromise of methods, where the aim is the same, is the universal law of effective human action.

The result, in brief, was the organization of a kind of government absolutely new in the world. It was neither an Amphictyonic League nor a new dominion; it was not a confederation or a democracy; and if it could best be called a republic, it was a republic of a new type. Grouped around a national necessity, already having historic traditions and substance, was a congeries of sovereignties. The Constitution declared that the powers not delegated to the United States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. Both the surrender and the retention became not only parts of a bargain in a constitutional compact, but integral and necessary parts of the system of government itself. That which was surrendered—and it may be larger than at the time supposed—can never be recalled, and that retained can never be absorbed by the central authority without a fundamental change in the form of government—a form on which we are justified by the experience of a century in basing our expectation of the perpetuity of

the national entity which we call the United States. The portion of sovereignty retained is as essential as the portion surrendered to the perpetuity of the central authority.

Into the nature of the growth and the organization there entered a certain elasticity. It is fortunate that from the outset different views were taken of the Constitution. This fact gave play to the centrifugal and centripetal forces, to the conservatism and the radicalism that are the necessary constituents of every vital human society or government. This conflict of views badly strained the government in our civil war; but better that conflict and strain than the death involved in an absolute acquiescence in the sole sovereignty of the Federal Nationality on the one hand, or of the sole sovereignty of the individual States on the other.

The lesson of the war, to those who can see straight and think clearly, is that we cannot have an indestructible Union except of indestructible States—that is to say, that the life of the Union is in the life of the States.

The resistance to Federal centralization, that impairs the retained dignity and privileges of the States, is not a criticism upon our Federal government as it stands in its constitutional limits. The Federal government is to-day better administered than any State government, in regard to financial integrity, and freedom from bribery, and the undue influence of powerful corporations. But one reason why it is so is found in the liberty of diverse action in the freedom of the individual States. The peculiar double government gives room for experiment, for ambition in many arenas, and saves us many a time from what would be irreparable failures if tried in an absorbing centralization. Our system from top to bottom allows immense play for the vagaries as well as for the wisdom of men; in this way the States save the Federal government, and the towns save the States. Individual initiative, which might be fatal in a consolidated government, is comparatively harmless in one in which powers and duties are so distributed.

The forces which make for progress in humanity continually swing backward and forward. It is a continual fight to keep or restore the equilibrium. In this present moment of our national life the struggle must be to preserve to the States their territorial integrity, their dignity, their equality as States in the Federal union. If the theory is correct as to the two forces that make our peculiar national life, there can be no doubt that there is danger in the impairment of either of these forces. In a historic and true sense the Federal government was a growth inevitable in the circumstances, but the States ratified the Constitution. There can be no dispute about this origin, and the origin determines

forever the relation. The form of government can be changed, but it can be changed, except by revolution, only by the action of the States in the manner that they prescribed in the Constitution.

It seems to me that these simple statements cannot be made any plainer by argument and illustration. Accepting them as true as to the nature of our government, the practical question is, Whether the government would be better suited to the conditions of the people of the territory of the United States if the power and dignity of the States were abased, and the Federal authority grasped continually—for power grows by exercise—new authority and right of interference in State affairs. It is a very practical question, and vital. We are yet far from being a homogeneous people. Our territory embraces all climates, soils, industries, productions, with the consequent diversity of interests. In all these respects no two countries of Europe are more dissimilar than Maine and Louisiana, Florida and Minnesota, or the Atlantic coast and the Pacific slope. Close inspection increases the appearance of dissimilarity; it extends to habits, social and political methods of action, institutions, all educational and economic matters, and the spirit of the popular life. Nothing else is so striking in our history as this development of distinct State characteristics, in spite of similar bills of rights and general laws. Nothing should be more gratifying to the statesman who believes in the American system than the strong State pride which springs up in it the moment a new State is organized, as vigorous as it exists in any of the original thirteen.

This diversity of State development has another important aspect. It tends to make the United States interesting, and all our energies and ambitions are comparatively fruitless unless they make an interesting world for us to live in. A great part of the charm of Italy, in the outcome of both art and character, is due to the free evolution of local peculiarities in the self-governing cities and states.

It is as clear as sunlight that the harmonious expansion of the United States nation would have been impossible without this State autonomy and pride, and free play for diverse interests and character in real local self-government; and that its perpetuity and destined further expansion, in soundness and integrity, will be impossible if central authority should absorb and dominate all important State action.

I know that it is the opinion of many who would call themselves practical statesmen, that the government has already vitally changed, that it is not at all that which the founders made, and that it is fortunate that it is not; for the original Constitution was not, they say, a

working instrument, in our unexpected growth, and in the influx of new ideas and methods in modern society. It is true that every government, whether it holds by a written instrument or by custom and tradition, unless it is dead or moribund, must grow and adapt itself to the spirit of its age. But it must grow according to its nature, and it must not lose sight of its aim. We can accept great changes with equanimity so long as we adhere to the vital principle of our government, that which distinguishes it from all others. The danger is — and it is our especial danger — that we put success in the place of merit, that the immediate seeming advantage assumes greater proportions than the traditional sense of right, that a sordid materialism obscures our conception of the very foundations of our prosperity, and that more and more we have an easy-going acquiescence in *les faits accomplis*, with scarcely a protest or a struggle for the violated principle.

So powerful is the Federal government when it can be got to throw its weight on one side, and so accessible is it to a log-rolling combination of different interests, that the temptation is very strong to invoke its interference. Notwithstanding State pride, materialism has so eaten away patriotism and manliness, the desire for quick success is so exigent, the hunger for uninterrupted trade and far-reaching financial combination is so pressing, that there is a growing impatience of State limitations, and even of State lines. The same impatience is exhibited by politicians, — not by all politicians, — whose chief aim is personal gain by party success, when they find the States individually not as manageable as they fancy a more democratic and consolidated government would be. Even the Federal authority itself, in the presence of certain exigencies, like the New Orleans Italian incident, feels cramped, and inclined to take or demand new powers in the affairs of the States, apparently forgetting for the moment that the vital system of our government is of more importance to us than the opinion of any foreign nation concerning it. And these hosts of well-meaning men who have schemes of uniformity and conformity, — many of them excellent, and which the separate States ought to adopt, — unable to get State action, or even to try seriously for it (take divorce as an illustration), are rushing to the Federal government for interference, disregarding the fact that the morale and character of the nation will suffer much more from an attack upon its vital distinctive nature than from bearing these inconveniences, serious as many of them are.

The indications of impatience with State autonomy, and even with State lines, are many. These are some of them :

A lack of delicacy in the Supreme Court in

reaching into State conflicts, and too great readiness to take out a kink which it were much better for the State's honor that it should take out itself, at any inconvenience.

A demand, arising every four years, after the election, for a popular election of President, disregarding State lines.

The opinion that the small States should not have the same representation as the large States in the United States Senate, nor their senatorial weight in the electoral college. A practical illustration of this is the recent action of Michigan, voting to choose Presidential electors not on a State ticket, but by congressional districts, by which the weight of the State as a unit is lost. It is one of the vagaries of democracy. Originally in the formation of the government the democratic idea opposed a strong Federal union, and insisted upon greater reserved powers in the States; now the democratic idea seems to see its prosperity in an extension of Federal power, in centralization, and in weakening the weight of the States as units.

The abolition of the United States Senate altogether; as if this democratic representation of the States had any analogy whatever to the House of Lords, which represents an aristocracy.

The demand that the Federal government shall take larger control of education and agriculture, and according to some views become actually schoolmaster and farmer.

The demand that the government shall become the factor of productions, and that it shall push certain powers — like that to regulate interstate commerce — to any extent that greed and combination on the one hand, or agrarianism on the other, may dictate.

The demand for pecuniary relief and aid in every State emergency, as if the States were merely dependents on Federal bounty.

The statement of these proposals, in view of the principles here laid down, ought to be their refutation; for each one of them tends to lessen the dignity and importance of the States, and to cultivate that centralization which it is the glory of our American system to avoid. Of course none of these arguments affect those who desire, in place of our republic of republics, a vast democracy with an absolute centralized administration. It is the testimony of history that such governments have fallen into the grasp of the strongest hand, and then have disintegrated in confusion. Those who prophesy that this great nation cannot hold together, but must ultimately separate into East, South, West, and North fragments, contradict their fears only by their hope that the individual States, retaining their dignity and independence, will give full play to diversity of temperament and of interests.

If this conception of the nature of our government is the true one, the abolition of the Senate, or its change into a body representing population instead of States, would be a long step toward degrading the States and to removing the conservative element in our system; for the Senate, representing the States, is not merely a second chamber to check hasty legislation, but, chosen just as it is, an integral part of our peculiar government. The objections to the Senate at present are two: that it is an obstructive body, and that it is becoming a club of rich and incompetent men. As to obstruction, it can be said that the double chamber is the best safeguard against hasty, immature, and class legislation. If what is alleged against the character of the senators were true (as a matter of fact, comparatively few of them are rich¹), the deterioration would not be due to the form of our government, but to our general false, materialistic conception of life. And the character of the senators will be raised by the appreciation of the dignity and importance of the individual States, as it will be lowered by a degradation of the States. In the effort to maintain the equilibrium in a nation of home-ruled communities, it becomes imperatively necessary for the States, and especially the small States, to put forward their best men to represent them. The elevation of the State idea, therefore, contributes to the national character and greatness. It is a question in government, as it is in literature, of ideals. If the ideal is materialistic, of success without merit, no form of government can long hinder national degeneration.

The discontent with the American system,—the sovereignties limited within a sovereignty

¹ There were 88 senators in the Congress of 1892. Of them 6 could be classed as millionaires; 16 others as rich or very well off, having fortunes of from \$100,000

limited,—so far as it is expressed in the efforts to give the Federal government increased control over the States, is not a reasoned dislike of home rule. It mainly comes from ignorance, from a misconception of the power of legislation to better all individual material conditions. It is an ancient illusion that a change in the form of government is pretty certain to be for the well-being of all citizens. A man is unsuccessful and poor; he is in debt; he can get no help from his neighbors, for they are also in debt; business is dull; crops are poor, or crops are abundant and the market low; no help in the town, in the country, in the State. In this stagnation the man fancies that there is somewhere a power that can put new life into his affairs. Naturally he thinks of the distant, powerful Federal government. This unknown, vague power appeals to his imagination. Why does not the Federal government do something? This cry came from the West not long ago in tones of irritation, if not of threatening. It was the cry of the wagoner to Jupiter when his cart was stalled in the mire. If the Federal government had not power enough to make agriculture, manufacturing, transportation, in short all business, prosperous, then give it more power. It was the duty of the Federal government to give everybody money, and to make every speculation profitable.

In all this the political conception of the strength of our government is lost sight of, and the moral conception of what makes a great nation is wholly obscured. A great nation is made only by worthy citizens, and the American system, shorn of its distinctive feature of States tenacious of their ungranted powers and full dignity, joins the experiments that have failed. to say \$700,000. The remainder of the 88 were of very moderate fortunes, and many of them could fairly be called poor.

Charles Dudley Warner.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the above paper was written, over two years ago, there have been some changes in the personnel of the United States Senate. There have been also new causes of popular irritation against it, as an obstructive body tied to inaction and impotency by its own rules, and by its own conception of senatorial courtesy. However well founded this irritation may be, it should be directed against the individual members, and the methods by which some of them are chosen, and not against the Senate as an institution. The preservation of the Senate, with its full constitutional powers, as an integral part of our peculiar form of government, was never more necessary than at the present time of wild populist and communist agitation and misconception. The Senate is no more a rich man's club than it was when this paper was written, though it contains members who would not be there if they had not been rich, and members who were elected by methods subversive of all pure and permanent government. Even granting everything that has been charged against the Senate, a case is made out for its reformation (in material) and not for its destruction, or for any impairment of its powers and dignity. And that is a matter which rests with the people of each State, acting as a State. If the Senate at any time lacks ability and integrity, that is because the States choose to send their inferior and untrustworthy men. The voters alone are to blame. No good government can exist with ignorant and corrupt voters.

C. D. W.