

bath, and open infidelity to social law. Radicalism would put up the bars of limitation as a measure of protection to our free institutions endangered by the horde of corrupt and ignorant classes who are concentrating in all the large centres, to control them. Conservatism fights against the Australian ballot system, and fears it cannot steal another election. Radicalism, trembling for the maintenance of a pure civil government, calls loudly for its adoption by every state in the union. Conservatism believes that if, for any reason, husband and wife shall not desire to continue their relations, a bill of divorcement may be granted them, that they may go out and befool society, and each despoil some other life. Radicalism, alarmed by the shameful statistics that tell of its rapid increase, makes solemn appeal to public conscience for arousal on this subject. Here, then, are the two conflicting forces traced out like a thread of gold and silver through all the warp and woof of human history. Both are in the loom today, and both, under the guiding hand of an all-wise Providence, unite to weave the majestic robe that wraps society about with protection and progress. When these grand conceptions of the radical element shall be realized in human consciousness—and they will be; when the dull comprehension of the conservative element shall be more reconciled to advancement—and it will be; then may we expect the growth of society to be like that of nature. Revolutions will no longer call for the sacrifice of human blood; if a dogma shall become obsolete, it will pass away; if a constitution ceases to express the will of the people, the transition will come like that which created the Brazilian republic. The change forced by radicalism will no longer mean the marshaling of armies on the field of battle; it will no longer mean the carnage of Hastings, Waterloo, and Bunker Hill; it will no longer mean the beheading of Charles I, or the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. But the old will be merged into the new, as quietly as a summer night breaks into dawn; as peacefully as "the sudden blooming of the flowers, or the sudden softening of the air." Conservatism and radicalism will join hands, and, calling on the author of all truth to sanctify the union, will purify science, philosophy, and art, religion, politics, and ethics, and with faces bright with hope and hearts quickening with emotion, they will march out into the resplendent light made glorious by the gleamings of the millennial dawn.

DEMOCRACY THE DOMINANT IDEA.

ROBERT TUCKER, Buchtel College, Akron, O.

The slow movement of the masses has made the epochs in the story of the nations; to kings a problem; to the world a blessing; on mankind it has ever been the source of power. To it ambition has bowed and despotism paid allegiance. Leaders of all lands formulated their plans in harmony with the spirit of the people. From the battlefields of France; from the charter-making halls of England comes the prevailing, dominant idea of democracy.

Democracy is a fact and in the evolutions of nations the governments have conformed to that idea. True, in Russia the autocrat sits upon the throne, but nihilism is abroad in the land. In Germany there is socialism. The relations which have existed between the governing and governed have been reversed. In the Eighteenth century Louis XIV said "I am the state," but in the Nineteenth century Herbert Spencer declared that there was more legislation done outside of parliament than there was in it. The power which was centralized in the ruler has become diffused throughout the social organism; the ruler is not so much the leader as he is the follower of the people. He no longer acts in accordance with personal feelings but adjusts the exercise of his power to the ways of the masses, as slowly the elimination of the differences between prince and peasant has gone along.

Governments of necessity have conformed to this new order of human relations and exist to execute the will of the people.

Institutions shaped in accordance with the revolution idea of the divine right of kings have gradually been supplanted by social structures reared on the dominant idea of democracy. Where lies the cause? Is it to be found in the mere accidents which fill the history of human affairs? Do we discover it in the fact that rulers have been despots and humanity thereby suffered, or in the fact that humanity rebelled and tyrants were thereby dethroned? Not so. The cause lies beyond these results. It is to be found in the necessity of humanity

to pass from a state of simple actions and relations into a state of complex actions and varied relations. Along with the growth of thought and knowledge of persons with the right of citizenship there has gone the development of the democratic idea. In the progress of the individual from that condition when he was his own warrior, his own priest and his own law giver, to that condition when he became the recognized leader of the government, comes the recognition of that idea. The idea of democracy, then, exists in the land. The idea that the individual is a governing as well as a governed factor, is a growth which is commensurable with and inseparable from the history of the world. The history of the ideal is the history of humanity struggling to assert the worth and dignity of a single life. The growth of democracy has been manifested in history by results. All the lines along which the Greek spirit acted and which terminated in a democracy at Athens, cannot be traced, but are lost in mystery and multiplicity of social relations. Yet the result becomes the initiative bond from which sprang the greatness of the Athenian state. The genius of Socrates was confined by the same force;—their force was one and the same, the Greek nature. The spirit which lifted the man to the true level of human dignity is the same spirit which animates the philosopher, Socrates. The one makes possible the other. The Athenian democracy is the foundation of the philosophy which had—as no other out of which that intelligence must proceed can have—that mind must be conscious of the noblest relations of life, must hold the highest institutions of mankind, of the soul, must be free. This philosophy is a whole democracy—the law of self.

Likewise the genius of Michael Angelo lived while the spirit of democracy directed, and when the human soul can grow in culture, in art, in commerce—all life grows. Marble is fashioned into the poetry of form. Art is not soulless, but immortal;—the product of brain and hands is carried by the winds of the heavens and the clouds of the earth. Throughout history, governments have been founded with kings—the nation with its ruler,—institutions stand as the expression of the will of the individual and not as the embodiment of the national character, but whatever the form of government, whether monarchical, theocratic or democratic, it is still the expression of the social view;—it still marks a point in the national advancement or degeneration, for social forms,—the common environments of man in any age, are simply results built upon the opinions of those affected by those conditions. Is there an upheaval and a shifting of the steady stream of human affairs with its civilization and customs? If so, the institutions which are founded upon these must conform to the level to which they have risen or fallen. Is there a revolution in the thought? The social structure is modified. Are their ideas broadened as the legitimate changes appear? Then the giving yields a thought. Is there a strong despotism in the state? Its days are numbered. In short, the institutions of government must grow as the social organism grows. When governments—no matter what their forms, have their sources in the people, it becomes clear that with a progressive nation the idea that the king is the personification of power must be gradually supplanted by the idea that the people are the sources of power. The one must sink to the level of the many as the many rise to the level of the one. It becomes the law as the masses gain in strength and intelligence, the ruler loses in power and prerogative. Witness the history of England. The people pass the act of settlement and name their own ruler; the people make the cabinet responsible for the administration of government and effect a democratic revolution. The people pass the *habeas corpus* act and thereby declare that a civil growth shall be secured before the law. The agnosticism of England may make these many stages in its evolution. They neglect that inevitable law that the character of the people and the character of the government must conform. Witness, too, the history of France. That, likewise, proves the state to be the formulated idea of the people. It aroused the people into ungovernmental action and plunged them into revolution. With the reform and revolution of the people the idea advanced to the dignity of a truth. Out of all chaos,—out of all the terror and peril, there arose a Robespierre,—a monstrosity of revolution, but the spirit of democracy brought forth also a Rousseau, who fought each custom, a Martineau who sang, and a Hugo who consecrated his genius to the public, and a Romoleau who was the soul of man, going forth strong and free.

Witness also our own country,—a democracy of the highest type, it stands as the most perfect illustration of the spirit and tendencies of the English-American people. Despite the fact