

solid west (i. e. north and central-west) because the west has been settled by a great variety of people and its population is too heterogeneous to be solid. But from the days of the colonies until now there have been distinct types of people in both New England and the south, and for the most natural reasons, therefore, they have been solid.

For one I believe that it is best they should be "solid." By their solidity they work out for themselves the best results, and at the same time they thereby make the best contribution to the well-being of the entire country. In a land which is filling up with multitudes of miscellaneous people from every part of the globe it is vastly important that in one or two sections at least there should be some stable forms of life and civilization.

The south especially possesses certain characteristics which should be perpetuated at all cost. They are of the utmost value to the republic, and they must not be minimized or modified.

In the south is found the purest type of what may be called original Americanism. Among its people are more men and women who trace their descent directly to colonial sires than in any other section of the union. Its social forms and domestic life, as well as its architecture, tend naturally to the colonial type, and they should not be exchanged for any other.

Its religious life is orthodox in creed and evangelical in spirit. The variegated and eccentric ecclesiastical bodies which abound in New England have but a small and negligible following in the south. Southern Christianity has not been weakened by sending forth from its roots all sorts of isms, which like suckers weaken the main stem without producing any good fruit themselves. We have had few heresy trials, for we have had few heretics. Our people have accepted the Bible as the word of God, and have relied for salvation upon the atonement of Jesus Christ the Lord. By consequence the southern churches have more nearly succeeded in winning the whole population of the south to Christian living than have the churches of the other sections of the country succeeded with the people to whom they make their appeals. There are more church members in the south in proportion to population than can be found in any other part of the United States.

In the south we have also the best observance of the Sabbath, and insofar as we have anywise fallen from grace in this important matter our fall may be traced to influences which have come in upon us from without. If we had remained more "solid" with respect to the observance of the Sabbath we would have done far better than we have by following, even for a little way, modish vice and foreign airs.

The south is the soberest part of the United States. There are fewer bar-rooms among us and fewer people who want bar-rooms than are found in New England or the west. Prohibition counts for more in the south than it does in any other sections of the union.

There are also fewer grafters and less graft in the south than any other sections. Pennsylvania; the land of William Penn and great solidity, has shown more corruption in the building of her capitol and the government of one city of Pittsburg than has been known in all the south during a half-century. The southern people have not been without their faults, but they have been remarkably free from the cowardly, sneakish vice of stealing. Public officials in the south have not been given to pilfering public funds.

Many other characteristic excellencies of the southern people might be enumerated, but let these suffice for the present. Is it proposed that we shall change our principles with respect to these or any other matters? If so, why? Have our principles been demonstrated to be unsound? If so, in what particular? If we are to renounce our principles what set of principles shall we put in their place? Has New England anything better to teach us? Is the land of the Pilgrim Fathers to maintain an unyielding solidity while the south is to break up into classes of convenient size for instruction by New England? Let New England show more Christianity, more children, a better observance of Sunday, less drunkenness, and less graft before we sit humbly at her feet for instruction. We might have learned much from the New England of the Pilgrim Fathers, but we can learn little of value from the New England of their back-slidden children.

But it may be said that we must change our view of the relative powers of the state and federal governments. This is not the time for that. It is true our picturesque president has

assured the country that "we need through executive action, through legislative action, and through judicial interpretation and construction of law, to increase the power of the federal government;" but at the risk of initiation into the "Ananias Club," or classification with the "undesirable citizens," we are bound to tell him such talk is perjury to his official oath. He swore to support the constitution, not to stretch it; and secession against the constitution is worse than secession against the union; for the union draws its life from the constitution. The union without the constitution is not the federal union, but the organized tyranny of an unscrupulous majority doing as they wist with the rights of the minority. If the federal government requires more power to fulfill its mission under the conditions of the present day, there are easy and constitutional ways of giving to it such power; but it does not belong to the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of the government to filch power from the states or from the people even though they purloin it in order to lay it in the lap of the federal government.

But does the federal government need so much more power? It is said that there is going on in our country a perilous concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. Suppose we centralize the government at the same time this process of concentrating wealth goes on, and that eventually the concentrated wealth seizes the centralized government. What, then, would become of the rights of the people? What would be done would simply be a question of what might be desired by the men wielding this immense combination of financial and political power. If they failed to find precedents for their usurpations they could plead the illustrious example of our present president, and call for the enlargement of the powers of the federal government by "executive action," "legislative action," and "judicial interpretation and construction of law." Doubtless, however, they would not stop for even that much formality of law. Under the lead of the president's rough-riding example the limit of their power would be only the limit of their desires.

Moreover, expansion of territory demands more and more the shifting of weight from the federal government to the local governments of the states. Otherwise the strain on the center will become too great and the whole structure will crumble. The security of the union is in the sovereignty of the states.

This is certainly no time for the south to cease contending for the strict observance of the constitutional limitations imposed upon the federal government. A surreptitious revolution is proposed, and it must be resisted as vigorously as if it were an armed force attempting to subvert the government. Let us stand solidly against it, and if any other section wishes to stand with us we shall not object. But if any other sections of the country invite us to abjure our devotion to the fundamental principles of the government in order to obtain political spoils in the form of office and appropriations let us give them to understand that neither we nor our fathers have been accustomed to accept bribes.

It should also be said that our long established view of the tariff is not to be surrendered. With possibly one exception the professors of political economy in every respectable college and university in America, (the experts on this subject) unite with us in our unwavering opposition to protection. I am not sure that there is one exception, but I understand that in the university of Pennsylvania the heresy of protection is entrenched. The location of such instruction discloses its inspiration. Why should we renounce what is demonstrably correct? Certain protectionists are fond of calling themselves the "standpatters;" very well, if they can stand pat for an erroneous economic dogma we may well stand pat for a sound economic principle. The truth is, the system of protection is not founded in reason nor based on righteousness; it is maintained by trading and mutual concessions among the representatives in congress of clamant and domineering interests. To employ the taxing power of the government to enrich certain interests at the expense of all the people comes dangerously near robbery under the guise of legislation. It is utterly puerile to say such a system is necessary in order to maintain the wages of the laboring man. Who shall make the protected manufacturer, who has not scrupled to rob all the people, divide his spoils with his employees? Wages are not thus determined. And even if it were true that protection raises wages, it is also true that it raises the expenses of the laborer more, and

thereby it reduces the amount of his net income.

We have nothing to take back as to the tariff. If other sections wish to unite with us in embodying in law the sound and honest views which we have held on this subject, we will welcome their association and assistance. But if they unite with us in our contentions, what then will become of their own solidarity, concerning the dissolving of which we hear nothing?

Other subjects might be brought forward, but I forbear for the present. Let me inquire with reference to the matters herein presented and other issues which naturally suggest themselves, what principle, or set of principles, which have operated as cohesive forces to make the south solid in her place, as New England is solid in her place, is it now proposed that we shall renounce? If we all go together into some new movement, will we not be as solid as ever? If we divide, will we be happier and more harmonious among ourselves and more influential with other sections by reason of the strife which division will engender? Were any people ever made more powerful or prosperous by discord? Willy enemies have been known to pursue the policy of dividing a people in order to conquer them, but those who have most faithfully resisted the foes of peoples thus threatened have always insisted that their security was their unity.

I take it no Trojan horse will be admitted within our gates. Our people may gaze on such devices with a certain sort of interest, but they will not be so simple as not to see that the contents of the animal are something more warlike than grass.

I beg to commend to careful consideration of all concerned the following paragraph which I have extracted from one of the most ably conducted papers in the south:

"That the south is dissimilar from other parts of the republic in important social, political, and religious matters is a proposition too plain to be disputed for a moment. That these differences are radical, historic, and persistent it would be easy to show. That they are to the advantage of our section is a belief that we hold without asking leave or license of any. The south is the social, political, and religious residuary legatee of American civilization. Its day is coming; indeed, is now. It has no need to fret, or to be impatient of fortune; for it holds the illuminating lamp of the future of our national life. Only we must preserve our vantage and push our way toward a complete realization of our historic ideals. Nor must we be in haste to give up either our solidarity or our isolation. This may seem a reactionary or non-progressive sentiment, but it is neither. Both the solidarity and the isolation of peculiar peoples have been employed of history and Providence in hastening the world's better destinies. This isolation and solidarity is no barrier to intercourse and co-operation in all common enterprises, but it is that eclecticism of people which puts their exceptional ideals above the thought of compromise or accommodation. The South can agree to no coalescences, ecclesiastical or otherwise, that will for a moment jeopardize its ideals."

That is what might be called "interestin' readin'." It is also quite suggestive. Southern courtesy and hospitality must not be mistaken for the renunciation of southern convictions.

It may be added that the task of breaking up the "solid south" will not be found an easy one. The unifying processes of more than a century are not arrested and turned backward in a day. Blood and tradition, ancestry and history, the compacting power of war and the solidifying struggles of peace, common interests and common dangers, common memories and common hopes, count for something; and all these things must be reckoned with when men undertake to break up the "solid south." Where will they find a solvent powerful enough to disintegrate in a moment what has been forming for more than a century? Can the seductive wooings of an artful partisanism put asunder those whom Providence hath so manifestly joined together? Can the crafty pleadings of a thrifty expediency compass such an end? Can the saccharine sentiments which are wont to flow around banqueting boards dissolve the affiliations of generations? Hardly.

The "new south" is just the "old south" going on its way—and "happy on the way." If any civil person is traveling the same road the south has no objection to his company, but it is not bowed down beneath an insupportable sense of desolation and lonesomeness. Its happiness is not dependent upon the presence

(Continued on Page 6)