

inorganic power of the multitude is not liberty but despotism, with the populace acting as a fickle monarch. Speaking of elections, he says: "It pleases the ignorant to be called upon to vote yes or no. . . . Huzzahing crowds are never substantial indications of any opinion." Nearly the opposite was lately expressed by Senator Morton in the *North American Review*. Mr. Morton says: "The experience of a hundred years with the American people has demonstrated the fact that the great mass are opposed to change—are steady, conservative and consistent in their views." This is true, relatively, but not abstractly. It is true the Americans are conservative, but their institutions make and keep them so. Take away our Anglican and American institutions, and there is no reason that we should not become unstable like uninstitutional France.

Liberty is power; but power unchecked is absolutism, and absolutism is despotism. Liberty, therefore, is power resting with checks and guarantees called institutions. To perpetuate liberty we must cleave tenaciously to institutions. The author is not so biased as to say that our institutions are all American; but he shows that most of our institutions are of Anglican origin. By thus tracing our checks and guarantees beyond our own brief history, they become more deeply rooted. Institutions that are manufactured instead of being evolved are lifeless. This is clearly shown through the appalling history of France. As a corollary it is plain that liberty can not suddenly spring into existence. In the author's language, "Liberty is a thing that grows, and institutions are its very garden beds."

The great value of this work consists in warning the rising generation to guard our country from becoming too consolidated and concentrated. Previous to the civil war we would often hear public men in the North speak of our country as the great confederation of states. President

Buchanan, in his inaugural address, used the following language: "This trade is carried on railroads and canals, on noble rivers and arms of the sea, which bind together the north and south, the east and west of our confederacy." But this term is no longer heard.

Indeed, it is seldom we hear the name, union. It is now spoken of as our country or nation, which is proper; but why should we evade more definite terms? By degrees we are enlarging the powers of Congress, and restricting those of the state legislatures. We are, imperceptibly passing from the extreme of state rights to the extreme of national rights. All this plainly indicates a tendency towards consolidation and concentration, which Dr. Lieber shows to be destructive to civil liberty and self-government.

This is a result of our swaying from our Anglican and American institutions. Had we closely adhered to our institutions, we would not hear the present relations of our government with the unsettled South spoken of as an experiment. It is certainly not an experiment when local self-government has ever been the very foundation of the bulwark of our civil liberty. Interfering with her local self-government, will not prepare the State for self-reliance. And unless she is prepared for this she will ever be a dangerous element to our nation. States, like individuals, can govern themselves only by learning to rely upon themselves; for the aggregate partakes of the nature of its units. If to command and obey are the great essentials between the government and the state, then military despotism is superior to institutional self-government, and we had better exchange our institutions for the more stringent and vindictive governments of the orient. England has rarely interfered with local self-government, and when she has there has been open rebellion. Her unjust treatment of the American colonies previous to the revolution, is an illustration.

Had the South known that the institution