

same time the retention of local self-government afforded the precedent for the gigantic federal union of the United States. At least the principle of federation was there if not the name.

The example of the United States has been the model patterned after by Mexico and the South American Republics. The strength of this mode of forming political aggregates was tested by England and France in their contest for supremacy on this continent.

The French method was the Roman method of conquest and incorporation. As the ruler of Paris gradually overcame his vassals one after another by warfare or diplomacy, he annexed their counties to his royal dominion and governed them, not by lieutenants from the subject county or province as representatives chosen by the people themselves, but by those of his own appointment sent from Paris. Self-government was crushed out in France.

It was preserved in England. The people which preserved self-government could plant colonies that were self-sustaining not only, but they also added strength to the Empire.

The people which had lost the tradition of self-government, could not plant self-sustaining colonies and France lost her hold in the New World. The people which had preserved self-government acquired the dominion of the sea and extended their empire over the outlying parts of the earth unexplored and unoccupied by civilized man. English-speaking people today dominate the earth in the matters of government and industry, and this sway is destined to be universal.

Throughout the turmoil of the historic period which seems such a chaos, there have been definite tendencies toward larger and larger political aggregates and towards the more and more perfect maintenance of local self-government and individual freedom in all its parts. This two-sided movement began with the beginning of industrial civilization. It has aided the development of industry and in turn has been aided by it. The result is the gradual elimination of warfare.

The nineteenth century has witnessed a development of industrial civilization, with its attendant development of arts and sciences, unprecedented in all the preceding centuries. There has been a corresponding diminution of the primeval spirit of war.

We are not rid of war. We have one on hand now. Nevertheless the proposition is true. War is in the process of elimination. Of the total wealth and productive energy of the civilized nations today a smaller per cent is devoted to war than at any former period.

Take our own history. We have had only two really great wars. The Revolution was fought in behalf of the pacific principle of equal representation—a question of local self-government. The

second in behalf of the pacific principle of federation. In each case a long step was taken towards the elimination of war. Since the Napoleonic wars, the same tendency is seen in European wars.

So, whereas war was once dominant over the face of the earth and threatened the very existence of industrial civilization, the conditions are reversed today. War is tolerated today among civilized people only on humanitarian grounds.

We have found a better way of settling international difficulties than by killing one another after the manner of the primeval man, but we have not yet adopted it because we lack a majority vote. Our ethical ideas are yet too narrow and selfish. The brute inheritance is not yet sufficiently eliminated. But the war now on is a step in the new social birth of the English-speaking race. The idea of the nation is unfolding.

When in the process of social evolution men surrendered their private right to avenge injuries to their persons and property and handed that right over to the state, a long stride was taken towards the ideal state and freedom. This condition now exists among all well-ordered communities in a state. If a man robs me I don't have to get my gun and pursue him to recover my property and punish the criminal. I call on the state-police. An injury to one is an injury to all. The state avenges my wrong. Man becomes a person when he subordinates his individual will to the general will of the state.

The time is coming when the so-called nations—political units—through the principle of federation will enter into a compact to submit international differences to a high court of arbitration and abide the decision. They will be forced to do so, as now individuals abide the decisions of the courts within a single state. Then will be realized the dream of the philosophic poet:

"Till the war-drum throbs no longer, and the
battle-flags are furled
In the parliament of man, the federation of
the world.
There the common sense of most shall hold a
fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in
universal law."

And that universal law shall be the public weal.

This condition of mankind is the nation—the conscious recognition of the organic unity of the race.

The phrase, "The Federation of the World," expresses the political idea of the nation. "The brotherhood of man," expresses the ethical idea. The organic unity of the race, or the solidarity of the race, expresses the philosophic idea of the nation.

"Those who have been the masters of political science have all expressed this conception. Says Aristotle: "The end of the state is not merely to live but to live nobly." And Hegel gave a wider expression to modern thought than did

Aristotle to the ages before him. Says Hegel: "The state is the realization of the moral idea." And again: "The state is the realization of freedom, and it is the absolute end of reason that freedom should be real." And again: "The state is no mechanism, but the rational life of self-conscious freedom, the order of the moral world." And again: "There is one conception in religion and the state and that is the highest in man."

Says Elisha Mulford: "There is no other conception which has such power in the thoughts of men and in this age it finds its expression in the literature of a people rising to a great political might." That sentence was written after the close of our civil war. It is devotion to this idea, *self-sacrifice* for this idea, that constitutes patriotism.

Shakespeare had this idea or an idea when he said:

"There is a mystery—with whom relation
Durst never meddle—in the soul of state;
Which hath an operation more divine
Than breath or pen can give expression to."

And Milton: "A nation ought to be as one huge Christian personage, one mighty growth or stature of an honest man, as big and compact in virtue as in body, for look what the ground and causes are of single happiness to one man, the same ye shall find them to a whole state."

And Burke: "The state ought not to be considered as a partnership agreement to be taken up for a little temporary interest and dissolved at the fancy of the parties. It is to be looked on with other reverence because it is not a partnership in things subservient to the gross animal existence of temporary and perishable nature. It is a partnership in all science; a partnership in all art; a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection."

Jesus Christ announced the nation in the message, "Peace on earth, good will to men." Thus statesman, philosopher, poet and seer have disclosed the nation.

The dictionary definition of a nation as a body of people organized under one form of government and usually occupying a definite territory is the objective definition of a nation, but all the "A" Nations are evolving into the nation, the conscious recognition of the organic unity of the race.

The "new Americanism" which we hear so much about is none other than the dawning consciousness in the minds of the people of the idea of the nation, the idea of an universal spiritual empire, the organic unity of the race, the brotherhood of man, the federation of the world.

It was this idea that fired the shot in the harbor of Manila and which is echoing around the world.

Before giving the genesis and function of the school, permit me a word about the church. The church is the institution of religion. In the process of man's psychical evolution religion arises first