

THE TREND TOWARD CENTRALIZATION

BY THOMAS WILLING BALCH

THE history of England in the seventeenth century shows that the people of England at that time looked to their Parliament for protection against the exactions of the Stuart Kings, who desired to tax their English subjects heavily to fill the royal chest, and to control and direct the people of the country at large in many ways and things according to their own arbitrary royal will and pleasure.

The whirligig of time brings changes in the affairs of both men and nations. In the eighteenth century Great Britain was engaged with France in many places in a world war. In North America she was assisting the British colonies to repel and overcome the attacks launched by the French and their Indian allies from both Canada in the north and the region south of the great lakes in the west. To carry that purpose more effectively into action, Major General Edward Braddock was appointed in 1754 commander-in-chief of His Majesty's forces in North America.

Shortly after the General's arrival with his troops in Virginia early in 1755, he took up his headquarters at the Carlyle House in Alexandria, which has ever since been known as "Braddock's Headquarters." To help in preparing for an aggressive war against the French, General Braddock called on the governors of the leading colonies for advice and support. And on the 14th of April, 1755, and the two subsequent days, the General held a Council in the historic Carlyle House.

There were present at that Council besides General Braddock and Commodore Keppel, Governors Morris

of Pennsylvania, De Lancey of New York, Sharp of Maryland, Dinwiddie of Virginia, and Shirley of Massachusetts, the latter being the most important personality among the quintet of governors. They were attended by Colonel William Johnson and other notable colonials.

The Council agreed on a general plan of campaign, in which General Braddock was to command the attack against Fort Du Quesne.¹ But perhaps the most momentous result of its deliberation was the announcement of the five governors that no funds to carry on the war against the French could be expected from the colonies themselves, and the further recommendation that the British Parliament should be called on to tax the colonies to help defray the cost assumed by the homeland in waging war for the defense of the colonies. Accordingly, a few days later, on the 19th of April, General Braddock wrote from the Carlyle House to Sir Thomas Robinson, one of the Secretaries of State to King George the Third, and urged the view of the Council that the colonies should be taxed by the Parliament to help pay the expenses of carrying on the war.²

This suggestion from British officials in Council, was one of the first, perhaps the first, proposal that the colonies should be taxed by the British Parliament. After the annexation of Canada to the British Crown, the policy of the British Parliament of taxing the colonies was started. To this action of the Parliament of the homeland, in which there were no representatives from America, the colonies objected and eventually the American Revolution resulted. After the rule of the British King, his British Ministers and the British Parliament had been thrown off by our fathers

¹*The Documentary History of the State of New York*, edited by E. B. O'Callaghan, Albany, 1850, Volume II., pages 378-379.

²Winthrop Sargent: *History of an expedition against Fort DuQuesne in 1755 under Major-General Edward Braddock*, Philadelphia, 1856, page 153. Richard Henry Spencer: *The Carlyle Family and the Carlyle House and its Associations*, Richmond, 1910, page 46.

under the leadership of George Washington, the Americans, with a keen sense of the injustice that both King and Parliament had attempted to impose upon the colonies, took to heart the advice of Montesquieu in framing the Federal Government. Having ranged the history of law the world over, that profound scholar, drawing some of his inspiration doubtless like all great thinkers from those who had gone before, pointed out in a famous passage (1748), the importance of separating the fundamental functions of government from one another and placing them on an equality. Montesquieu says: "There is no liberty if the power to judge is not separated from the legislative and the executive powers. If it were joined to the legislative power, the authority over the life and liberty of citizens would be an arbitrary one, for the judge would be legislator. If it were joined to the executive power, the judge might have the power of an oppressor."

The members of the Federal Convention, to whom *The Spirit of the Laws* was known, drew the Constitution of our country, so that the powers of the Federal Government should be divided into the three separate and co-equal divisions, the executive, the legislative and the judicial.

Especially, in giving the judicial division the right to pass upon the constitutionality of the acts of the legislative branch of the government, they established something new in government. Another French commentator, de Tocqueville, in his magisterial book, *Democracy in America*, points out with clearness what a bulwark against tyranny this power of the courts is.³ He says:

There have been confederations elsewhere than in America. Republics have been seen on other shores than on those of the new world; representative government has been adopted in several of the States of Europe; but I do not think, that up to

³Alexis de Tocqueville: *De la démocratie en Amérique*, Paris, 1850, Volume I., pages 118 and 124. De Tocqueville (1805-1859) visited America in the early thirties. The first part of this book was published in 1835. The venerable statesman Royer-Collard said of it: "Since Montesquieu there has been nothing so good."

now, any nation of the world has established the judicial power in the same way as the Americans. * * *

Restrained within its limits, the power conferred upon the American tribunals to pass upon the constitutionality of legislative enactments, forms one of the most powerful bulwarks that have ever been raised against the tyranny of political assemblies.

This innovation in government, was the product in large part of a gradual growth in the conditions obtaining in the colonies in reference to the power of review by the King in Council upon many of the disagreements that arose between colony and colony. It has become one of the two palladiums of the liberty of the American people. The other is the maintenance of the sovereignty of our individual States, all of which together form our Federal Union.

While in the past the English people relied on their Parliament with its power over the purse, to protect them against unjust enactments and tyranny on the part of the King, to-day in the year nineteen hundred and twenty-five, the situation has so far changed in this country that the American people are feeling the evil effects of the reckless legislation of Congress. As a result, oppressed by the needless taxation imposed by the Federal Legislature, and curbed in their individual actions and liberties by the restraints imposed by that heedless body, the American people are looking to the President of to-day to safeguard the nation against Congress in its blind ignorance to foolishly destroy the local self-government of the forty-eight sovereign States that together form our Federal Union. For like many individuals who are always eager to spend other people's money if they have the chance, Congress hardly pauses in its reckless creation of bureaus at Washington for spending the people's money and centralizing power at the national capital.

Samuel Vauclain of Philadelphia, Henry St. George Tucker, member of Congress from Virginia—and other leading citizens have pointed out in the past year (1924) that Congress could confer a boon on the coun-

try by staying at home for several years. The constructive criticism of these far seeing men is worthy of serious consideration. Perhaps the country would be the gainer if the meetings of Congress were restricted to biennial sessions. It certainly would be if the membership of the lower house were reduced. But to maintain the balance of power between the legislative and the executive branches of the government, the power of the Senate to confirm treaties, appointments, etc., should not in any way be curtailed.

In connection with the centralization of power now in process of development at Washington as a result of the Congressional legislative mill, it will be of interest and use to look at some points in the political career of one of our past Presidents, who, like the President of to-day (for both of whom I had the pleasure of voting), did all he could to guard the Constitution and also to defend the interests of all the people against the lavish spending by Congress of the public revenue. This former chief magistrate of the Nation was born at Caldwell in northern New Jersey, the 18th of March, 1837, and was christened Grover Cleveland.⁴ The son of God-revering parents, he was brought up in an atmosphere that taught that there is a right and a wrong. And his parents wrought into his character the sense of personal responsibility. When he had grown to manhood and he was called upon several times to assume public office—for he never sought an office, the office in each case sought him—the sense of the personal responsibility was supreme. In every public position that he held, whether as assistant district attorney, sheriff, mayor, governor or president, Grover Cleveland ever tried to do what seemed to his human judgment to be right regardless of the political consequences to himself.

⁴*The Congressional Record*, during the two Cleveland presidential terms. George F. Parker: *The Writings and Speeches of Grover Cleveland*, New York, 1892; *Recollections of Grover Cleveland*, New York, 1909. Robert McElroy: *Grover Cleveland, the man and the statesman*, New York, 1923.

In a short address, it is not possible to give a detailed account of the career of such a busy public man. I shall touch upon only one or two salient features of his public services to the country and the people which seem to be of especial interest in the light of human events at this time.

The high moral purposes and far seeing aims of President Cleveland were shown in countless ways. In internal affairs he maintained successfully the independence of the executive against the attempted encroachments of the Senate. He halted the practice of giving pensions on bogus pretences. He upheld during the riotous Pullman strike the sovereignty of the nation. He saved the standard of the national currency from debasement. In foreign affairs, he resisted and held Bismarck at bay in Samoa. He induced Great Britain to submit her ancient boundary dispute with Venezuela to an International Court of Arbitration for judicial settlement, thereby promoting for the future the continuance and increase of friendly relations between America and Great Britain.

As Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, Cardinal Richelieu of France and Oliver Cromwell of England were thinking always in their management of foreign affairs first of all of the interests of their own country, as are the political men of Europe to-day, so, too, Grover Cleveland invariably at all times placed the well-being of America before those of the rest of the world. Never for an instant did he forget that his duty primarily was to his own fatherland.

Cleveland's appeal was not made in grandiloquent words and sonorous phrases to the imagination of the people, but in a rather ponderous style to their intelligence and power of reasoning. He did not rely either in his state papers or public speeches on bluff covered with a smoke of words. And, except for the Venezuela message, there was nothing dramatic in the two Cleveland presidencies to carry the people suddenly off their balance.

During his political career, Cleveland was always thinking in whatever office he held of the best interests, according to his lights, of the constituency that he represented at the time. He never was thinking of the political future of Grover Cleveland. Repeatedly he risked his political life by the position that he took either in his state papers or public speeches. He never played politics.

The political course and character of the man is summed up in the saying of the pilot of Seneca, which James Russell Lowell, at the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Harvard University, quoted as he looked straight at the President of the United States:

Oh! Neptune, you may sink me, you may save me,
But I will hold my rudder true.

On the 4th of March, 1893, Grover Cleveland was inaugurated as President for a second term. He was the first and to the present day only defeated President ever re-elected to that high office. It was the will of the people themselves who had forced his third nomination and then elected him for the second time. As he took over the helm of the ship of state for his second term, the country was faced with the perils of a de-based currency through the silent workings of the great unwritten law of money—that when two currencies of unequal value are in circulation at the same time in a country, the poorer drives out the better.

First hand knowledge of the immutable workings of that monetary law was obtained in the past both by sovereigns and peoples on many occasions in numerous lands. However, the experience thus dearly bought whenever that currency law has been disregarded for any appreciable length of time, apparently has to be re-learned by subsequent generations. For while the instructed few know of it and appreciate its irresistible power when set in motion, the masses of a new generation know nothing of it and have to be enlightened in case of necessity. Thus it came about, in spite of the abundant illumination in American history previous

to the Civil War of the power of that unwritten law of money, that the political men and the people of America insisted not only upon an inflation of the currency to carry on the Civil War, but after peace had come, they continued for a long time fooling with it. And had not a man of the highest political courage been placed in the presidential chair at the opportune moment, the people and their political leaders would have learnt that they had tackled an economic and political buzz-saw. Happily for the country, however, in Grover Cleveland there sat in the presidential chair a man who did not fear to face the storm wind of popular ignorance and passion that others foolishly had sown.

During the Civil War, the Federal Government, in its task to carry on the struggle against the Southern Confederacy, was caught in the toils of an inflated paper currency, and all its attendant evils to the country and the people. In 1873, only eight years after the close of the war, the American Government, however, was able to resume specie payments on a gold basis, with silver as a subsidiary currency. At once that legislation was attacked by a large political section of the people. With congressman Richard P. Bland of Missouri as leader, the resumption of specie payments in gold, with silver relegated to the position of a subsidiary metal, was denounced as the crime of 1873; and an agitation was begun that something must be done for silver.

As a result of this clamor, "Do something for silver" the Bland-Allison bill was passed in 1878 by both Republican and Democratic Senators and Representatives over the veto of a Republican President, Rutherford B. Hayes of Ohio. It provided for the coinage each month of from \$2,000,000 to \$4,000,000 of silver at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury. At that time a silver dollar had about the same value as a gold dollar. They were minted at the legal ratio of sixteen ounces of silver being considered the equivalent of one

ounce of gold. But, owing to the much greater output of silver than of gold throughout the world, the value of a silver dollar measured by the value of silver in the markets of the world, slowly fell below that of the gold dollar and continued to fall. In the course of years the value of the silver dollar fell so far below that of the gold dollar that it was perfectly clear to all students of the unwritten laws that govern money as a mechanism of exchange, that if the coinage of silver dollars at the legal ratio of sixteen to one were not stopped, it was only a question of time when the great law of money, called by the British economist MacLeod, "the law of Oresme, Copernicus and Gresham," would be set in motion, and gold as the more valuable money would begin to leave the country.

Upon becoming President for the first time in 1885, Grover Cleveland realized that the continuance of coining silver dollars as provided by the Bland-Allison Act of 1878, would eventually set the law of Oresme, Copernicus and Gresham in operation, and so in the course of time transfer the country from a gold or higher standard of currency to silver or a lower measure of values. In his first annual message to Congress in 1885, President Cleveland for that very reason urged strongly the repeal of the Bland-Allison Act. The President said:

Every month two millions of gold . . . are paid out for two millions of silver dollars to be added to the idle mass already accumulated.

If continued long enough, this operation will result in the substitution of silver for all the gold the government owns applicable to its general purposes.

* * *

When the time comes that gold has been withdrawn from circulation, then will be apparent the difference between the real value of the silver dollar and a dollar in gold, and the two coins will part company. Gold, still the standard of value and necessary in our dealings with other countries, will be at a premium over silver; banks which have substituted gold for the deposits of their customers may pay them with silver . . . thus making a handsome profit; rich speculators will sell their

hoarded gold to their neighbors who need it to liquidate their foreign debts, at a ruinous premium over silver, and the laboring men and women of the land, most defenceless of all, will find that the dollar received for the wages of their toil, has sadly shrunk in its purchasing power.

Congress, however, did not heed President Cleveland's sage advice. His administration ended in March, 1889, leaving an overflowing treasury.

After the Republicans came into full control in 1889 of Congress as well as the executive, a majority in the two branches of Congress made up of both Republicans and Democrats passed the Sherman Silver Law. Under the Bland-Allison Act of 1878, every Secretary of the Treasury had coined only \$2,000,000 of silver a month, the minimum imposed by the law. The Sherman Silver bill provided, however, that upon its passage the Government should buy four and a half million ounces of silver, each month, paying for this metal with silver certificates issued against the silver bullion that was bought. As a result the amount of depreciated silver money or its representative paper was increased at a faster rate than before, and so hastened more rapidly than ever the time when the silent work of the great unwritten law of money would become apparent. The Sherman Silver Act was passed by Congress in 1890, many of the leading Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, voting for it, and it was signed by President Harrison. In the elections of 1892 the Republican Administration was defeated, but it did not leave office until the law of Oresme, Coperincus and Gresham, as Grover Cleveland had pointed out and predicted in 1885, had visibly set to work, and gold was steadily leaving the country. The Harrison administration prepared just before it left office to sell bonds, in order to replenish the gold reserve of the government which was running low. Incidentally, too, it left the Treasury in a sadly depleted condition. President Cleveland when he retired from office the 4th of March, 1889, handed over

to his successor, President Harrison, \$281,000,000 of which \$196,689,614 was in gold. When President Harrison, four years later, handed back to his predecessor, Grover Cleveland, the helm of the ship of State, there were only \$112,450,577 in the Treasury and of that sum only \$103,500,000 was in gold.

The 4th of March, 1893, when Grover Cleveland for the second time took up the reins of the Executive portion of the government, the country was face to face with the danger of having its currency lowered from a gold to a silver basis. This was because of the continued increase of depreciated silver dollars as provided, first by the Bland-Allison Act of 1878, and then the Sherman Silver law of 1890. The President could not by his own act alter or repeal the Sherman Law, and he could not change the legal ratio existing between silver and gold dollars of sixteen to one as fixed by Congressional legislation, and cause it to conform with the commercial ratio of nearly thirty to one then existing between the two metals as fixed in the commercial markets of the world. The President had to allow Secretary Carlisle of the Treasury to continue to buy four and a half million ounces of silver a month, as provided by the Sherman Silver law. This unhappy currency situation in which the country was involved in 1893, was due to the stupidity of all the political parties in the past—the Republicans, the Democrats, the Greenbackers and the Populists. Had Congress given heed to President Cleveland's advice concerning the monetary situation of the United States in his first annual message in 1885, and passed suitable remedial currency legislation, the country would have been spared the terrible financial crisis of 1893. But Congress, oblivious of the public good, refused during the first Cleveland administration to do anything to safeguard the maintenance of the standard of value of the country.

The 8th of August, 1893, when the commercial and financial situation of the country had become desperate,

Congress assembled at the call of the President in extra session. It was convened expressly to repeal the Sherman Silver law in order to stop the purchases of Silver. The presidential message, which was not written in fine emotional phrases put the case for repeal strongly in a practical way. A majority of the House, both Republicans and Democrats, soon rallied to the President's support and passed such a measure. But for weeks, while the commercial distress among the people of the country was growing with every passing day more acute, the Senate wasted precious time with all manner of obstruction and delay. Only at the eleventh hour would the upper house yield to the heroic trustee of all the people, the President, and agreed to repeal the Sherman Silver law. The vote in the Senate was 43 to 32. The repeal bill became a law the first of November. And that day marked the end of an insane policy begun in 1878 and persisted in for fifteen years by Congress, to wit, of tampering with and as an ultimate result lowering the American monetary standard of values. All through that ordeal John Sherman, a Republican Senator, did his duty manfully and stood shoulder to shoulder with Grover Cleveland.

Just as a physician, however, cannot at once stop the ravages of a disease which he is called upon to cure, if it has gained great headway, so the stoppage of silver purchases could not at once halt the operation of the law of Oresme, Copernicus and Gresham. Because of the great mass of silver with which the currency of the country had been saturated, and the lack of confidence of the world in the ability of the American Government to maintain gold specie payments, gold continued to flow from the country. This was accomplished by the presentation to the Treasury of the greenbacks and outstanding United States notes, amounting to about \$450,000,000 for redemption in gold. But under the statute law all that paper currency had to be re-issued and so they became again available to draw more gold from the Treasury. Thus, in the apt phraseology of

Secretary Carlisle, as an "endless chain," the paper currency was cutting the gold reserve of the government continually downward.

In the trying situation confronting and threatening the solvency of the United States, Grover Cleveland sought Congressional aid to better the situation. But the President appealed to the legislative branch of the government in vain. That body preferred to listen to the eloquent but merely emotional oratorical appeals of the silver leaders than to heed the sound and sensible presentation of the needs of the country as expressed in the matter-of-fact messages of the President. The latter asked for aid to sell bonds on the most advantageous terms possible to the government so as to replenish the gradually vanishing gold reserve. When Congress refused to help, the President was not satisfied in merely pointing what Congress could and should do in the premises to uphold the financial honor and credit of the national currency. While that body wasted precious time in negations, the President, availing himself of such powers as the existing laws gave him single handed protected the nation's credit and commercial honor by the issue of bonds to replenish the gold reserve of the government. Four times the President found it necessary to sell bonds to meet the outflow of gold.

The mental attitude of Congress was shown by the refusal of the House to agree that the third loan should be payable in gold instead of in coin as provided by the existing statutes. Could that loan of bonds to run thirty years have been made payable in gold, the bonds could have been issued at three per cent instead of four per cent, as was necessary to float the bonds payable merely in coin. That error in judgment on the part of Congress, cost the American people something over \$16,000,000.

With the fourth issue of bonds, which was for \$100,000,000 and brought into the Treasury \$111,000,000 in gold, the work of liquidating the workings of the

great unwritten law of money—that Congress in its blind folly had insisted years back on starting up—was successfully accomplished. All told \$262,000,000 of bonds had been sold by executive action under the sanction of existing laws of the country. As a result \$293,000,000 of gold was added to the gold reserve in the Treasury. While Congress in its ignorance of the workings of money as the mechanism of exchange, had refused to do anything to help the country, the President had acted and, in spite of the foolishness of Congress, saved the people of the United States from a debasement of their currency.

Leaders of great popular movements have been called great men because they used their intellectual powers to steer those human tides to success, often to benefit their own selfish ends as did Napoleon for instance. But Grover Cleveland did something more rare than that. Single handed, he held back practically a whole people, from madly rushing to financial disaster. The more carefully our financial legislation is studied, the more clearly does it appear that the fact that the United States to-day are on a gold basis of exchange is due primarily to one man. For had it not been for President Cleveland's foresight and determination, the country would have been cursed with a debased currency, and its attending evils as a result of the vicious and fallacious currency legislation of the past for which all political parties were responsible. When the appeal was made in 1896, whether the mints of the United States should be opened to the free coinage of silver at the legal ratio of sixteen of silver to one of gold while the commercial ratio between the two metals was about double that amount in the commercial markets of the world, the American people rallied to the policy of President Cleveland by defeating the candidacy of Congressman Bryan, the leader of the free silver men. After four months of discussion and arguing *pro* and *con* in the press and upon the stump, the American people decided that

Congress may talk and talk, and talk the livelong day,
But you can't make a dollar out of fifty cents, for a dollar isn't
built that way.

Another phase of government where President Cleveland fearlessly led the way, was his defense of the right of the people to be as free as possible of the strangulation of governmental control and bureaucratic regulation. In every way he championed the cause of individualism upon which the country had grown, for more than a century, great and prosperous. Against the insidious growth of paternalism in whatever form of sugar coating it was advanced, he upheld the ancient American doctrine that, while the people should support the government, the government should not support the people.

Since the close of his second administration there has occurred a marked advance towards paternalism both in this country and in Europe. Since then, America has moved nearer and ever nearer toward a centralized bureaucratic system at Washington like that which prevailed at St. Petersburg in the times of the Tzars and against which the Russian people rose in revolt. The slow but steady absorption by the Federal Government in all manners of ways of the powers reserved to the individual States, thereby destroying local self government or home rule, is hastening that centralization at the national capital. And yet that dual form of our sovereignty—an idea which seems to have originated first, as Mr. Justice William I. Schaffer has pointed out, with the compact of Utrecht in 1585—together with the power conferred by the Constitution upon the Federal Supreme Court to pass upon the constitutionality of legislation, is one of the most important and vital safeguards of democracy or individual liberty. The proponents of paternalism who wish to change our democratic form of government to a bureaucratic one, are eager to attack and destroy those two palladiums of the freedom and liberty of the people.

Flinders Petrie has rediscovered and pointed out recently a truth of history or law of nature. When the record of the human race is looked at as one continuous whole since the first glimmers of historic times until now, it becomes apparent that after each great summer of civilization there is a long winter of chaos and darkness and ignorance. This great winter is in its turn succeeded by another period of summer. This law of nature was known to the Etruscans and others of the ancients. It is just beginning to be recognized and known in our own epoch.

Toward the close of each period of civilization, the masses of the population acquire the power to take gradually the accumulated wealth from the possessions of the few who have had the foresight to create and conserve it. And as fast as the masses acquire that wealth, they consume it, until finally the capital is so far reduced that the population as a whole is undernourished. When the people have been sufficiently weakened in the course of several generations by undernourishment, each civilization in the past has fallen before the attack of and been conquered by the barbarians. "The consumption," Petrie says, "of all the resources of the Roman empire, from the second century when democracy was dominant, until the Gothic kingdom was built on the ruin of the Roman state," is an excellent example of this. After a civilization has been conquered and destroyed, in the great winter of darkness that follows, the two races, conquerors and conquered, gradually in the course of several centuries, mix and blend thoroughly. With the barbarian race representing the role of the male, and the civilized race that of the female, a new birth takes place and a new civilization starts on its span of life.

It is by studying the events of the past of the human race that it is possible to see in a measure into the future, and so far as possible avoid the pitfalls that have been destructive in the past.

The peace of Westphalia which ended the Thirty

Years' War in 1648; made plain to the European world of that time the gradual transformation that had taken place in European policy from feudalism to nationalism. How this process was going on in the fifteenth century is well brought out by Bernard Shaw in his *Saint Joan* in the following conversation between John de Stogumber, a cleric, and the Earl of Warwick, a nobleman.

The chaplain: He is only a Frenchman, my lord.

The nobleman: A Frenchman! Where did you pick up that expression? Are these Burgundians and Bretons and Picards and Gascons beginning to call themselves Frenchmen, just as our fellows are beginning to call themselves Englishmen? They actually talk of France and England as their countries. Theirs, if you please! What is to become of me and you if that way of thinking comes into fashion?

The chaplain: Why, my lord? Can it hurt us?

The nobleman: Men cannot serve two masters. If this cant of serving their country once takes hold of them, goodbye to the authority of their feudal lords, and goodbye to the authority of the church. That is, goodbye to you and me.

That change from feudalism to nationalism was of slow progress for a long time before the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War. It was a natural growth. The re-arrangement of the political map of Europe by the negotiators assembled at Münster and Osnabrück made it patent to all men of education.

So, too, the close of the Great War of 1914-1918 showed clearly that a fundamental change had gradually occurred in the occidental world of the concept upon which government rests. May it not be, indeed, do not the signs of history point out that the change to which the peoples of Europe are marching is still further away from individual freedom or democracy and towards socialism with its destruction through State control of individual liberty and initiative.

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, a great change has occurred in this America of ours in substituting in large measure governmental control for

the former individual freedom that used to be the glory and boast of every American. Indeed, the change in the United States from the freedom that formerly was the envy of Europeans, to governmental control and regulation since the time when Grover Cleveland left the presidency at the end of his second term in 1897, has been immense. And President Cleveland, who fought bravely at all times to protect and perpetuate the freedom of the people instead of merely following their lead in helping to forge anew in this country the chains against which the people have risen on many occasions in the past in other lands, seems almost like a paladin of old rather than a President of only a generation back, so much have the people turned their backs on the old freedom of the individual for which Cleveland stood and fought as they bow their necks more and more under the yoke of bureaucratic control.

Any one who has studied the history of America will note how the two great parties of the country have changed places gradually in large measure as regards individualism and States' Rights. It was the Democracy that before the Civil War was the defender of States' Rights, while the Whig Party in those days, as the Republican Party during the war and for many years afterwards, pressed to increase the powers of the National Government at the expense of the sovereignty of the States. Today the position of the two leading parties are largely reversed in that respect. The line of cleavage on these issues now cuts across both parties. Thomas Jefferson and Grover Cleveland both led in the fight for individual freedom and in opposition to the centralization of all power at Washington. But now the mantle worn by those two great chiefs is upon the shoulders of President Coolidge who to-day leads the battle on behalf of the American people against the efforts of Congress to centralize power in Washington upon the basis of the European model of bureaucratic control.

We know that for each of us there is an end to the

span of life beyond which we cannot hope to live. Nevertheless, if we take care of our bodies, we can expect, barring accidents, to live the length of time allotted to our individual family or race. So, too, history shows, it is with the life of nations. If a nation is governed wisely and intelligently, it will last longer than if it is ruled foolishly.

The whole trend of our history should cause the American people to pause and consider well, before changing from the old American freedom of individualism, a form of polity upon which our country has grown great and prospered, to the European idea of bureaucratic control, an inheritance that has come down from feudal times.

For it is by the importation and grafting of European feudal ideas upon our body politic that American freedom is surely disappearing. The creeping political paralysis, known to our civilization as state socialism, is gradually destroying the freedom of the American people. And the only way the people can defend themselves against this insidious disease of the political world, is to educate themselves in the history of mankind.

Copyright of Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society is the property of American Antiquarian Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.