

not whither. It is for this that we are asked to return to militarism, with its grievous burdens and sordid ideals. It is for this that we are to surrender our splendid and unique position. It is for such a mess of pottage we are to exchange our noble birthright. In our desire to save Cuba and the Philippines from excessive taxation we are to take it upon ourselves in perpetuity. In a vain effort to share our institutions with half-civilized men we are to destroy their character.

Those among us who have so suddenly awakened to what they are pleased to call our national "isolation," exhibit a growing impatience with the counsels of the fathers. They even lightly refer to them as puritanical and timid old souls, whose advice was well enough for a boy. They have just discovered that the nation has become a giant, who "is no longer content with the *nursery rhymes* which were sung around his cradle."* They are especially certain that the Farewell Address is outgrown, and is no longer of value to a nation that has suddenly become a "World Power," and that even the Monroe Doctrine has become somewhat shopworn, or at least of but one-sided application. Yet the counsels of the fathers were not born of either weakness or fear. The policy of non-interference by us in the affairs of Europe was early announced in the face of the pressing demands of France that we redeem the supposed obligations growing out of her assistance in our revolt against England. That of non-intervention by European powers on this continent was suddenly proclaimed in 1823 by a nation of less than twelve million souls in opposition to the "Holy Alliance," which had been organized by the emperors of Russia and Austria and the king of Prussia to conserve and maintain absolutism in Europe and over all lands claimed by European powers. The policies thus announced were believed by their authors to be of permanent application. It is, of course, possible that Washington was mistaken, but his counsels if wise are for all time. His solemn admonitions were not for temporary purposes. They ring in our ears today with the added weight of a century of successful application.

"Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. * * * 'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world. * * * Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity and interest." Again, "The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them

as little political connection as possible."

These are not the words of transient wisdom or temporary expediency. Only what Washington and Hamilton expected has happened in America. We have merely reached the position which they clearly foresaw, "when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war as our interest, aided by our justice, shall counsel. Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Shall we dash to the ground their splendid vision of a national life that shall lead the world to higher things by a spectacle of peace, liberty and prosperity? Shall we adopt a policy that will mark a complete departure from our well-considered course for a century, and convert a nation whose chief glory it has been to achieve a position to command permanent peace—the opportunity for the steady pursuit by an entire people of their chosen occupations—over a vast area, into a high priest of militarism? Taxation without representation is still tyranny. Government by force is still despotism.

This intolerance of the counsels of the father has led directly to ill-concealed contempt for our past and indifference to our present. Our great questions of administrative and monetary reform have suddenly become "parochial." The business of a mighty nation has as suddenly become "artificial and transient." Our people are called to abandon "the treadmill round of domestic politics" for "new thoughts, new questions, new fields, fresh hopes, broader views, wider influences."* They are asked to surrender the work of self-government to behold the inauguration of despotic power at Washington. To encourage their support of this new departure at the then pending congressional elections, party managers were everywhere promising "the boys' additional spoils. These promises are to be kept by an early "revision" of the civil service rules, which shall break the solemn promises of a great party and its leader, thoroughly and honestly to enforce and extend wherever practicable the civil service law, and to take no step backward in the cause of a vital reform.

And even this is not all. The growing contempt for the counsels of the fathers extends to the constitution itself. This was inevitable. Those counsels, including the Farewell Address, were in fact but popular expositions of the fundamental principles of the constitution.

It and they must stand or fall together. It is now said that "a constitution and national policy adopted by thirteen half-consolidated, weak, rescued colonies, glad to be able to call their life their own, cannot be expected to hamper the greatest nation in the world."* It is even assumed that the ambiguous cheers of popular gatherings at railroad stations to greet the president while on a political pilgrimage, constitute a sufficient warrant for a vital change in the character of the government.

The suggestion that the constitution be amended is impracticable. But if not, are we ready to surrender or even impair the bill of rights? Are we so soon prepared to limit the universal citizenship of the fourteenth amendment? Shall we give congress power in its discretion to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* in time of peace, to deprive citizens of personal liberty without conviction for crime by arbitrary confinement in certain places, to say in what parts of the United States imposts, duties and excises shall be uniform? In a word, shall congress be given discretionary power to make the application of the constitution and laws of the United States general or special? These questions are fundamental if free government is to continue. The supremacy of the constitution must be preserved unless ours is to become a government of men instead of a government of laws.

It is in strict accord with a policy so revolutionary that no hint of it is to be found in the republican platform of 1896. There it is merely declared that "all our interests in the *Western Hemisphere*" should be "carefully watched and guarded;" that "the Hawaiian Islands should be *controlled* by the United States, and no foreign power should be permitted to interfere with them;" that, as to the Cubans, "our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined contest for liberty;" and that "the government of the United States should actively use its *influence and good offices* to restore peace and give independence to the island." The use of power thus obtained to commit the country to a revolutionary policy is itself a gross betrayal of representative government.

It is solemnly urged in high places that we have no choice in this matter, that the unauthorized action of our public officials is in direct obedience to the Divine will. It is novel doctrine that public servants may substitute what they guess to be the will of God for the constitution and laws of the land. There is none so exalted but that his whole public duty will be performed by a strict observance of his official oath to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States," leaving it to those who make constitutions to

*President Northrup, University of Minnesota, at Chicago Peace Jubilee banquet.

*Attorney General Griggs.

*Franklin McVeagh in Chicago Times-Herald.