DYNAMIC AMERICANISM

DYNAMIC AMERICANISM

By

ARNOLD BENNETT HALL

Department of Political Science,
University of Wisconsin

INDIANAPOLIS
THE BOBBS-MERRILL COMPANY
PUBLISHERS

Printed in the United States of America

TO THE MEMORY OF

THEODOSIA PARKS HALL

PREFACE

The author believes that Americanism implies an adequate understanding of the ideals and aspirations of American democracy, a profound conviction as to their fundamental worth, and, above all, a deep sense of personal accountability for their development and defense. The great war afforded a dramatic demonstration of the utility and power of organized patriotic sentiment. For it was under its driving impulse that the people of America gloriously accepted the burdens and sacrifice of war.

It is significant, however, that we do not always find the same degree of chivalry, devotion and self-sacrifice evidenced in our domestic conflicts. The reason is that our patriotic education has been too much restricted to the exploits of the battle-field and the achievement of martial glory. But the creation of patriotic sentiment need not be so confined. The instinctive and emotional life of the nation can be just as effectively mobilized around the tragic problems of domestic controversy and translated into constructive acts of social and political achievement, if we only will. An analysis of the vital problems of domestic life, in terms of the dramatic human interests that are at stake, will create a profound emotional response, which can be molded into a patriotic sentiment as dynamic in peace as it has been powerful in war.

The purpose of the present volume has been to suggest ways and means by which the study and observation of American government, life and politics, whether in the local

community or the nation's capital, may be made the basis for the development of such a sentiment of dynamic Americanism. This involves less emphasis upon political forms and more attention to the needs and functions of government and the dynamic forces of human nature that function through it. If the legal skeleton of civics is thus clothed with the flesh and blood of human interest, it loses the monotonous drone of chronological detail and takes on the gripping interest of the drama.

The critical reader may complain of the "damnable reiteration" and the use of superfluous illustrations. There is no justification for the former other than the author's zeal to carry conviction to the reader. In the abundant use of illustrative material, the writer has sought to practise what he preached, and to make his theories vivid by expressing them in terms of modern life. It is to be hoped that this material will be found of special value and significance to many readers.

In the bibliography at the end of each chapter are found only those references which would seem to be most useful in connection with the topics therein treated. Throughout the preparation of the work and particularly in selecting the bibliography, the author has received the generous and valuable assistance of his wife.

ARNOLD BENNETT HALL.

CONTENTS

DYNAMIC AMERICANISM

Dynamic Americanism

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION—THE NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE PATRIOTISM

AN ELECTION was pending in a city of the Middle West. Public interest was at fever heat. The lines of battle seemed sharply drawn. The issues were cleanly cut. It was a conflict between the forces of righteousness and iniquity. The candidates of the opposing ranks personified their respective forces, one appealing directly to the idealism and intelligence of the public, the other to its prejudice and cupidity. One promised the fearless and able enforcement of the law; the other pledged a lawless and wide-open town. The records of the candidates were such as to afford sufficient evidence of their good faith. On the one side were marshaled those citizens who were ready to fight in defense of public decency and civic honor; opposed to them were gathered the forces of evil and corruption. The white-slaver, the vice king, the gambler, the crook and the boodler, all seeking freedom from legal restraint in their pernicious callings, rallied their forces to the conflict, spent their money with prodigality and worked with unceasing toil.

Election day found both parties prepared and confident. Every possible precaution had been taken to prevent corruption and fraud. Detectives had been employed in scores to safeguard the ballot. For the first time in years a campaign had been forced along lines that would divide the sheep from the goats. It was a fair fight between good and

evil. There was no confusion of issues. It was honesty pitted against dishonesty, the law against the white-slaver, the public conscience against commercialized vice, public health against public disease, public morality against public immorality, public welfare against the public enemy. Patriotic citizens were elated with the coming triumph. At last the day had come. The people were on trial. Democracy would be vindicated.

A group of faithful citizens was gathered in a downtown room to hear the election news. The results never were in doubt from the first returns. Little by little the lead of their enemy increased until his victory was acknowledged by a comfortable majority. The little band broke up, disappointed, hopeless and dejected. The people had been tried and found wanting. Democracy had not been vindicated.

Among this little group was a school-teacher who had fought hard in the campaign. He had entered the contest with enthusiasm, for he saw an opportunity to try out the reforms which he had so long taught as the hope of democracy. He had taught his students in high-school history and civics that efficient government would come only with the enthronement of the people's will. He had argued with conviction that this would be accomplished with the advent of the primary and the safeguarding of the ballot. He had depicted the rôle of the political boss in scathing terms. To him had been ascribed the tragic horrors of the crowded tenements with their filth and immorality. To him had been charged the epidemics of preventable disease, the virtual licensing of crime and vice, and the general inability of the government to serve the human interests of the community. But the primary had been used, the ballot safeguarded, and still the boss had won. What was wrong? Had he been misguiding his students all these years when he had sought to place upon the boss the sole responsibility

for governmental ills? Had his dogmatic support of the new reforms, which he had preached with a crusader's zeal, been without reason and in vain? Could it be that democracy, the hope of every true American, had actually been tried and found wanting?

These and similar thoughts crowded upon him in quick succession in the days that followed. Thousands of his fellow citizens who had shared the same hopes and suffered the same disappointments mingled their wondering doubts with his.

Then slowly there began to dawn a new understanding. As he talked with his friends and acquaintances he was continually astounded to find how citizens of intelligence and honesty had voted against reform. Some had voted for the winning side because they felt the importance of partisan victory. Others voted against common decency because they feared that if the evils of the city were brought to light it would hurt its reputation, unsettle business and impair its prosperity. Others feared the effect on public utility securities, which were widely held and in which were invested, no doubt, some of the savings of widows and orphans. A group from a better residence district feared that under the administration pledged to abolish the "red light" district, its denizens might seek the residence districts of the city for their nefarious callings, thereby threatening the children and homes of the "better classes," rather than the households of the poor. Still others had been so deeply absorbed in their personal affairs that they had neglected the opportunities afforded by the election, or failed to see how the whole contest was fraught with the gravest possibilities for good or evil to the civic and spiritual interests of the community. The teacher discovered that the second strongest organization of physicians in the city had refused to support reform unless its advocate would pledge

himself not to maintain free dispensaries nor inaugurate an effective campaign against disease. Such methods, he was told, would interfere with private business.

Amazed and disillusioned he began to realize that the citizens of the city did not want reform, or were too indifferent to make themselves effective. He faced the fact that every reform that is effective must, temporarily at least, encroach upon some sphere of private interest. He found that one can not promise to regulate public utilities in the interest of the public, without impairing the value of securities held by many influential citizens, banks and trust companies, whose sympathy for the widow and orphan investors was, perchance, largely dependent upon their personal holdings. The city can not clean up the tenements without imposing additional burdens for the time being upon the landlord and property owner. Public health can not be safeguarded without injuring the practise of physicians. Vice and crime can not be blotted out without taking away the abnormal rents landlords receive from property used for immoral and illegal purposes, and without threatening the more prosperous citizens with a portion of the inconvenience and danger to which they deliberately condemn the poor, who live in the segregated districts.

This teacher also found that a great many honest and respectable citizens, the kind we think of as the backbone of the republic, could only see those aspects of politics that affected them. Their vision was too limited and their sympathies too well controlled to allow them to view the issue in its broadest human aspects. They were indifferent because they had no direct personal interest at stake.

If these were the facts of our political life, and if these were the influences that controlled our elections, then his easy-going philosophy that the "remedy for the evils of democracy is more democracy" was impotent. The en-

thronement of the public will was not the only essential of social and civic reform. As far as he could look into the future, thoroughgoing reforms must always run counter, temporarily at least, to private interests. Opposition would always develop from those whose interests were threatened. The direct primary and the security of the ballot would not change these interests but only make their expression the more easy and effective.

Then what should he teach his class in civics? He had sought sincerely to make this a class for the development of citizenship. He had sought to equip his pupils with the ideas inherent in social progress, but these ideas had proved unproductive of results. Should he revise his philosophy of politics? Was democracy impotent? Could he go before his pupils with sincerity and power, and continue to espouse a system and a theory that had proved futile, that had not saved the city in a contest between right and wrong, and that had frustrated its noblest and highest aspirations? Could he defend a system of government that protected commercialized vice and immorality, that refused to oppose the spread of disease, and that encouraged individual selfishness to exploit the unhappy victims of the slums?

This experience of an unusually conscientious and able teacher ought to come as a challenge to the entire profession throughout the country. The conflict that awakened him, with its dramatic appeal, is being reproduced in lesser degrees in every portion of our land. There is scarcely a local community where needless deaths do not occur from preventable diseases, that would have been prevented by the same degree of efficiency in government that we demand in private enterprise. There is not a state that does not offer up its annual tribute of human life to industrial accidents and diseases that could be prevented. There is not a Congress that does not make wasteful appropriations

for river and harbor bills, when like sums invested in a nation-wide fight on tuberculosis would produce untold dividends in human life and human happiness. There are communities all over the land where public funds are wasted in extravagance, if not in graft, which might be devoted to providing ample playgrounds and civic centers that would produce better citizens and higher morals. These conditions lead one to question the vitality of our democracy and to challenge our citizenship.

Occasionally the public, aroused to a consciousness of its neglect, organizes a movement of relief against one ill or another. Some are pressed with vigor and determination until success is won, but many are mere abortive efforts, spasmodic and short-lived. Through the few that do succeed progress is being made. Our political life is growing better but the progress is slow and the mistakes are many. The cost of these failures is appalling and must be borne by the helpless and the weak. If the milk supply is uninspected, it brings death only to the homes of those too poor and ignorant to buy privately inspected milk. If housing conditions are unregulated, it is the unprotected children of the slums whose blighted lives must pay for democracy's mistake.

The teacher in the public schools to-day, whose mission is the training of boys and girls for participation in democracy, is facing greater difficulties than in any other period of our nation's history. The problems of to-day that challenge constructive democracy are vastly different from those of the early days of the New World. We are prone to worship the past as the great day for American democracy. We think of the New England town meeting as the ideal of democratic accomplishment. We sigh as we compare with it the inefficiency of the city government of to-day.

But the comparison is unfair. It leaves out of account

the tremendous difference in the nature of the problems to be solved. The New England town meeting was confronted with such problems as the location of a town well, the building of a schoolhouse or its repair, the fixing of the salary of the school-teacher, or the maintenance of the highway. With the Industrial Revolution, however, came a new set of problems, gigantic in size and complicated in nature. The factory system with its dangerous machinery created tremendous cities out of rural communities. The public utilities, with their financial power and political intrigue, menaced any government that sought to control them. Great trusts and monopolies, whose financial and political control threatened to vest them with autocratic power, seemed to spring up overnight. The industrial city came, with its problems of morals, diseases, sanitation and engineering projects, and challenged the deepest learning and the most constructive statesmanship that the nation could produce. In these facts the careful observer will find little basis for the pessimistic worship of the past, and ample challenge to the dynamic Americanism of the future.

The new problems of the day demand more than the casual study of the patriot; they demand technical research, infinite patience, and a capacity for sustained, patriotic interest. The problems of the New England town meeting were not different from the problems that the pioneers were meeting every day in their customary callings. They were problems calling for the exercise of common sense and honest judgment. Most of them were solved by a few hours' careful discussion and deliberation. Compare these problems with those of the present. The citizens of to-day are called upon to grapple with the vexing problems of water supply, involving tremendous engineering feats; they are to solve complex questions of sanitation and public hygiene based upon the learning of technical science; they

have to adjust innumerable conflicts between the interests of the public and private enterprise in public utilities and public service; they must protect the health and limb of the employees against all manner of disease and accident without unduly impeding the processes of production; they must attack the mighty struggle between labor and capital, protecting the interest of the public, with impartial justice to either side.

These problems can not be solved by momentary appeals to patriotic fervor. They are not amenable to solution by the application of good judgment and common sense alone. They require the patient research of the scholar and the technical efficiency of the expert. Back of these there must lie the eternal vigilance of the public, whose sustained interest will stimulate the fidelity and efforts of its servants, and whose ultimate judgment upon the results achieved must afford a rational and enlightened system of rewards or punishments for official effort. The formulation of public opinion and its application to modern problems through the media of scientific experts, preserving the efficiency of the expert and the point of view of the public, presents one of the most difficult problems of constructive politics.

On the other hand, the developing in the body politic of a capacity of sustained civic interest, sufficient to follow with unbiased zeal and discriminating judgment the slowly moving methods of scientific effort, is indispensable to social and political reform. Experts alone will tend to become bureaucratic unless closely followed by a patient though aggressive public, while public opinion will be impotent in the face of modern problems without the service of scientific effort. To arouse the public to a righteous and emotional protest against specific ills, especially if they appear in a dramatic setting, is easily and quickly done. It is the

national pastime of the politician and demagogue. But the public interest is too easily pacified by the impossible promises of the skilful politician. The public interest does not continue until the evil has been permanently eliminated. It is one thing for an aroused public to retire a public servant from office, and another thing to keep public interest up to the point of watching to see that the newly elected officer does not make the same mistakes. It is one thing to protest against an unjust and inefficient system of taxation until it becomes a political issue upon which a party comes into power, but it is a vastly different thing to keep the public interest centered upon the new administration for a length of time sufficient to produce a constructive system of finance. Thus it becomes evident that modern problems require for their solution a more virile and sustained civic spirit than was required for the solution of the more primitive problems of a century ago.

In spite of these obvious needs, popular and hysterical revolts still continue the order of the day. Cities will become outraged over the dramatic revelation of some evidence of graft or fraud, but will fall back into indifference again before the newly elected administration has entered into office. The periodic exposés afford accumulating evidence of this tragic fact. As a result progress is slow, scientific and progressive methods have but little chance, and pressing modern problems go unsolved.

To meet this condition many plans and panaceas have been suggested. Most of the panaceas have been mere changes in the form of government. The history of the last eighty years has witnessed a series of blind attempts to solve the problems of municipal inefficiency, by changing from one type of government to another and finally culminating in the present movement for the adoption of the

business manager form. But it has only been in the last portion of this period that any real progress seems to have been achieved.

The direct primary has been espoused by many as the final bulwark against the encroachments of special privilege and the domination of the political boss. This has been given a fair hearing but the millennium has not appeared, while the demagogue and boss continue to exercise tremendous power. The initiative and referendum has been defended by the exponents of direct democracy, as the instrument through which popular government would realize its higher self, corruption and inefficiency be banished from our legislative halls, and the complicated problems of modern politics be adequately solved. The recall of public officers, we are told, would afford the people an instrument by which the public servant would be compelled to give an administration that would be wise, beneficent and effective.

Again another group of political students has staked its hope of redeeming democracy upon the system of preferential voting, confident in the belief that if the wants of the citizens may be but accurately expressed, the problems of government will be safely met. The short-ballot movement, with its attractive program for simplifying the ballot and concentrating official responsibility where the voter may more easily make his influence effective, is another remedy which has rallied many to its cause with its promises of relief from the intolerable conditions of the present. To-day millions of our citizens are seeking hopefully, but impotently, for relief through one or more of these chosen methods. Like the school-teacher in the Middle West, they have a blind unquestioning faith in the efficacy of structural reforms. There is one thing, one great outstanding, fundamental fact they overlook—the mere change of governmental forms does not change the intelligence or civic interest of

the people who function through these forms. Every one of these suggested panaceas and remedies may be embodied in our fundamental law without necessarily solving a single problem, without wiping out a single evil, without bringing work to a single member of the army of the unemployed. The same problems would remain, the same conflicts in interest would continue, the same powerful, ingenious and autocratic bosses would still seek to hold the reins of government. It is true that new instruments will be available, and in so far as they might be better adapted to the problems to be solved, they would be helpful; but they are only instruments, and back of these instruments will be found the same lack of civic pride, the same want of a constructive patriotism, the same selfish and sordid interests, the same criminal indifference to the public weal, that have combined to produce the conditions and problems against which we righteously protest.

Does this, then, mean that there is no escape from the evils and failures of democracy? Must we continue to render tribute to the forces of indifference, ignorance and greed? Must we continue the annual sacrifice of life, limb and soul to the preventable horrors of our industrial life? Or does it not show the pathway along which permanent reform must lead? Does it not point with dramatic vividness to the social and moral education of our youth, as the means of democratic accomplishment? Does it not bring out in bold relief the fundamental fact, that in the youth of to-day, the citizenship of to-morrow, must be developed the new patriotism of civic achievement, that vital sustained interest in public problems, that unfailing fidelity to the public weal, which the gigantic, complicated and portentous problems of modern life so imperatively demand?

This, then, is the challenge of modern democracy to the modern school. Its fundamental basis is the fact that the

solution of modern problems requires more than the passing thrill of patriotic fervor, or the spasmodic protest of an outraged public. It requires more than the mere structural changes that are necessary from time to time. It requires a regenerated citizenship. It requires a keen sense of individual responsibility and a capacity for a sustained interest in civic matters. It requires that our process of education must build into the consciousness and soul of the child a new philosophy of life, the philosophy of service. There must be new ideals and aspirations aroused, strengthened and defined, the ideals of civic obligation. There must be a new morality evolved, and a new patriotism nourished, one that is both social and constructive.

The bane of the popular conception of democracy is that it is expressed in the terms of the rights of individuals. The patriotic oration, the flamboyant appeals of the demagogue, the "rule of thumb" conceptions of the reformer, are expressed in the term of rights. One of America's leading citizens has boldly declared that democracy had the right to make mistakes. It follows then that when democracy mistakenly allowed the institution of child labor to gain a foothold in our country, until hundreds of thousands of children had been sacrificed to human greed, that democracy had the right to exact the lives and souls of children as the price of its indifference and mistakes. The piteous appeals of suffering children have for years fallen upon the unhearing ears of American citizenship. Their shrieks have beat with tragic impotence against the bulwark of democratic rights. Whence came this inhuman conception of democracy's rights? Who gave into the hands of an indifferent people the despotic right to pay their obligations with the lives and suffering of others? Who released the citizens of a democracy from the obligation of being their brother's keeper? These are questions that

should be thundered from every housetop until America is awakened, and until the pernicious doctrine of democratic rights has been obliterated by the larger vision of democratic service, made possible through individual consecration to the sacred duties of democracy.

The teaching of this conception of democracy is of paramount importance, and experience would seem to indicate that if it is not done in our schools it is likely to go undone. The young citizen who can view preventable suffering without a sense of personal shame, or who can see the failures of our government to produce the largest possible dividends of human happiness without a twinge of conscience, is not yet morally equipped to fight the battles of aggressive, triumphant democracy. He lacks the necessary moral and spiritual equipment. It must be the mission of the school to supply that equipment. It must provide a sense of personal accountability. It must build up a dynamic theory of morality. It must produce a patriotism that is virile and constructive. It must produce a dynamic Americanism that will be practical and effective.

The influence of the schools in building moral standards and quickening moral perception in certain lines of thought and conduct, gives promise of tremendous good when directed to the positive morality required by the civic duty of to-day. But so far most moral teachings have been negative and personal, ignoring the positive and the social. Few graduates of our public school would not blush for shame if detected in an act of dishonesty or personal immorality, but these same people will idly boast of an ignorance regarding the current issues of the ballot box and the capacity of candidates for public office, for whom they are asked to vote. It is the exceptional citizen that follows the fate of political issues and administrative policy from its inception, through the necessary machinery of political parties,

to its concrete realization in accomplished fact. Thousands of citizens will deplore the inefficiency and waste of government, while only tens will study out the responsible parties and apply the doctrine of strict accountability. Thousands will rise in righteous indignation against the depredations and despotism of unscrupulous bosses, and yet very few will take the time and energy to organize effectively against their power. We cry out against government that is weak, corrupt, incompetent, and yet we are unwilling to pay the price of efficient government, or bear the burdens of efficient democracy.

The cry for reform is always in the air, but when a concrete measure is suggested that casts a burden upon a group or class, they are too frequently unwilling to bear the burden. They prefer the injustice and weakness of the present system, whose burdens may be shifted to others. Thousands of these same persons would rally to the defense of their ideals of national honor, were it assailed by a foreign foe. They would sacrifice their lives if need be in its defense. Let a weak sister republic fail to protect the lives of American citizens, and thousands will be found willing to make any sacrifice or bear any burdens necessary to avenge the insult to American honor. But industry and disease may claim its daily toll of hundreds, through the inefficiency of democracy, and the public sits by in complacent idleness. They see no blot on American honor in this useless sacrifice. They feel no patriotic call to fight against the disease, poverty and misery that follow in the wake of inefficient government. They have no conception of a nation's honor that calls for patriotic service in the cause of justice, righteousness and decency at home.

These are the conditions that confronted the schoolteacher of the Middle West, as he tried to adjust himself to the new conditions and problems of democracy, as evi-

denced to him by the results of the city election upon which he had staked so much. These are the facts, unpleasant though they be, that challenge the attention of America to-day. If it be said that too much is expected of the citizens of a democracy, that they can not be expected to fight for reforms that interfere incidentally with their personal pecuniary interest, that they can not be expected to give patient and careful study to public problems, the answer is, then, that such a people needs rulers, and not servants, to guide their destinies. If this be the answer, then it means that to America democracy is an idle shibboleth with which the boss and demagogue may play. It means that the ideals and aspirations of American heroes whose memories we revere, the ideals and aspirations that sustained Washington at Valley Forge, that steeled the nerve and provided courage for the pioneers in their conquest of the West, that gave to Lincoln that infinite harmony of tenderness and strength with which to guide the destinies of a troubled nation—these, the most cherished possessions of a great people, consecrated by the toil and sacrifice of millions, are prostituted to a selfish individualism that is both sordid and sterile.

But the American people have not lost their ideals. They have not lost their capacity to respond to the call of human need. The instincts of sympathy and the love of justice still smolder in every true American. Absorbed in the mighty task of developing a continent, blinded by the most prodigal prosperity any nation has enjoyed, the American people have been too busy to stop to count the cost. The individualistic philosophy that answered the needs of the pioneer, has been unconsciously outgrown. They have been so engrossed in the creation of their material wealth that they have failed to grasp the human problems that it presented. The appeal to individual ambition, as the mainspring of human action,

had gone unquestioned. The need of a broader vision and a nobler ambition had not been brought home. The old individualistic virtues were deemed sufficient.

The function of modern education is to show that with this change from a pioneer nation to an industrial state, there have come new problems and new demands upon the spiritual and moral forces of the nation. These problems are fraught with the gravest significance to human happiness. They touch human life at a myriad different points. They make every voter of the republic the joint guardian of helpless children against the evils of the slums, for the state must be the champion of the helpless and the oppressed. These problems can not be ignored. Our country's existence is at stake, for, in the last analysis, the strength of a nation depends upon its capacity to serve its citizens, and to advance the cause of righteousness and justice.

When these needs are brought home to the American youth; when he is taught to read in the complex problems of the day a challenge to his manhood; when he is brought to realize the most treacherous foes that assail his nation are the forces of greed, injustice and selfish indifference; when he is taught that patriotism is a virtue of peace as well as of war; when he begins to feel the thrill of exaltation that comes with civic duty well performed; when he is brought face to face with the gigantic problems of modern life with their challenge to his courage, his scholarship and his patriotism, the American youth will not be found wanting. The boundless energy, the inventive genius and the single-minded devotion which have characterized him on the battle-fields of Europe, in industrial conflicts and in professional effort, will be consecrated to the task of translating into actual life, the ideals and aspirations of American democracy.

This, then, is the task that awaits the teacher as he stands

before his group of young Americans. They must be brought face to face with the realities of life. They must be brought to a deep appreciation of the duties of democracy. They must learn that the price of liberty, and justice, and progress is eternal vigilance. They must learn that the comforts of modern life have brought with them corresponding problems that they must solve. They must learn in school what the school-teacher of the Middle West learned through sad experience,—that the instruments of democracy alone do not suffice. Back of these instruments and back of democratic government, there must be the moral vision, the spirit of sacrifice, the sustained interest of the crusader, the valor of the soldier and the constructive patriotism of the statesman. If the ideals of democracy are to withstand the stress and strain of modern life, they must be founded upon a citizenship inspired with such a vision and animated with such a spirit. The development of this vision and spirit of democracy is not the work of the moment to be done in time of pressing need. It is the slow and patient method of building into youthful thought the social view-point, and of guiding the dynamic instincts of the child into channels of socialized activity.

A representative of the Catholic Church is reported to have said that if it could have charge of a child's training and education until seven years of age, it would have no fear of the child's wandering away from the ideals and teachings of the church. In a democracy should it not be the aim of the public school so to select its methods, its curriculum and its teachers, that the youth of the land may go from its portals without danger of being lost to the vision, the ideals and the aspirations of democracy?

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. What was the underlying issue involved in the election in the city of the Middle West, described in the beginning of the chapter?

2. If the ballot was safeguarded and the direct primary employed in that city election, why was it that the side of decency suffered defeat?

3. Did the outcome of that city election prove the failure of democracy? If so, then what form of government would you substitute?

4. Will reform measures always run counter to the private interests of some group or class? If so, how can reform be permanently accomplished?

5. Will such measures as the initiative, referendum, recall, proportional representation and the short ballot afford adequate solutions for modern political problems?

6. Why does the public resent so indignantly the murder of American citizens by the mobs of Mexico, and yet make no particular outcry against the murder of American citizens by mobs in America?

7. What are the most pressing political and economic problems in your community, and why have they not been solved? What influences have prevented their solution?

8. Why do we so frequently emphasize the rights instead of the duties of democracy? What is the evil of this practise?

9. What particular specific qualities should the people possess in order to make democracy a success?

10. What specific meaning can we give to "Americanism" that will make it a practical working ideal for the citizens of a democracy?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Emery, Henry Crosby, *Politician, Party and People* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1913).

Baldwin, Simeon E., *Education and Citizenship* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1912).

Brewer, David J., *American Citizenship* (Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1902).

Chapter I, "Obligations of Citizenship."

Chapter III, "Service a Responsibility of Citizenship."

Chapter V, "The Duty of Striving to Better the Life of the Nation."

Bryce, James, *The Hindrances to Good Citizenship* (Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1910).

Hadley, Arthur Twining, *The Education of the American Citizen* (Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1901).

Folk, J. W., "The Responsibility of Citizenship" (*Vanderbilt University Quarterly V,* 155, 1905).

Dealey, J. Q., *The Development of the State* (Silver, Burdett & Co., New York, 1909).

Chapter XIV, "Citizenship."

Sharp, F. C., *Education for Character* (Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, Ind., 1917).

Chapter X, "Direct Training in Citizenship."

Chapter XI, "The Nature and Conditions of Effective Moral Training."

Inglis, Alexander, *Principles of Secondary Education* (Houghton, Mifflin Company, New York, 1918).

Chapter XVI, "The Place of Social Sciences in the Program of Studies."

Price, G. V., "Socialism of High School History" (*Education* 40: 307-16, January, 1920).

Gosling, T. W., "High School Program for Training in Citizenship" in *School Review* 28: 57-65, January, 1920.

Thaler, W. H., "On Education and the New Democracy" in *Educational Review* 59: 12-18, January, 1920.

Snedden, D., "Some New Problems in Education for Citizenship" in *International Journal of Ethics* 30: 1-15, 1919.

Seerley, Homer H., "The American Teacher in Politics" in *Educational Review* 59: 1-11, January, 1920.

CHAPTER II

HOW MAY CONSTRUCTIVE PATRIOTISM BE DEVELOPED?

THE tragic need of developing constructive patriotism, as a part of the educational process, was vividly brought home to me in the first year of my teaching experience. I was teaching a university class in American government. With a beginner's zeal I was trying to make of the subject something more than a description of statutes and constitutions. I was trying to clothe the legal skeleton with the flesh and blood of political and social realities. I described government as a great cooperative enterprise, intended to minister to human needs. I attempted to analyze the dynamic forces of sympathy and greed, of altruism and avarice, of patriotism and indifference that functioned behind the scenes. I tried to portray the ceaseless conflict in the interplay of these contending forces.

I was rewarded by the sustained interest of my students and their enthusiastic response. But my self-complacency was of short duration. One of the student organizations was found short in its accounts. An investigation followed. Ingenious grafting by student officials was discovered, and the dishonest methods employed were those learned in my course in government. I had so presented the corrupt influences at work that the pupils were impressed with the cleverness of the methods, rather than with the tragedies that they invoked. Instead of training effective citizens I was making expert grafters.

Nor could this conspicuous failure of the teacher be shifted to any moral delinquency of the students. They

were normal boys with normal instincts and emotions. I had depicted graft and cunning without the revolting and inhuman consequences that beset its path. I had given only part of the picture, the clever manipulations of the corruptionists, inadvertently omitting the shocking results that would have outraged the sensibilities of the class and visited upon the grafters, not an appreciation of their cleverness, but the opprobrium of righteous scorn. I had pointed out the ludicrous mistakes and inconsistencies into which the vagaries of an indifferent electorate had led the government, without following up with remorseless thoroughness the inhuman consequences that too frequently ensued. The students had smiled at the humor but missed the tragedy.

Students may smile admiringly at obstructionist tactics of ingenious leaders, but when they learn that the result is the failure of a milk inspection ordinance, and that the failure means the death of helpless children through the use of uninspected milk, the smile gives way to righteous indignation. They may view with complacent humor the devious methods of the demagogue to mislead the indifferent and uninformed, but when they learn that the success, so cleverly achieved, is at the expense of civic decency and honor, such indifference and ignorance becomes a challenge to their manhood and self-respect. The normal man hates injustice, resents the oppression of the weak, and will fight a denial of the square deal to his fellow men. And yet corruption in government, inefficiency in public office, or indifference among the electorate, is always followed by these pernicious evils. Had this connection been made definite, graphic and real, my students would have learned to loathe rather than to tolerate these fundamental ills.

And this does not mean that class-room instruction must degenerate into "uplift" moralizing. Nor does it mean in any sense a sacrifice of scientific accuracy or exacting

scholarship. On the contrary it means an accurate portrayal of our institutions, the forces that function through them, and the results that are achieved. To do less would be unscientific, because it would be but a partial truth. To do more is useless. The instinctive reaction of the normal boy and girl when confronted with the human results of the failures and achievements of government will be far more effective than moral preachments. Let the people of America see our government and our democracy in its naked reality and in its fullest human significance; let them see the dividends of happiness that it can yield and the tragic suffering that it can cause; let them visualize with the dramatic vividness that the truth alone can give, the infinite possibilities of government for human weal or human ills, and there will develop a social consciousness and a constructive patriotism, that will function as long as men are endowed with the nobler impulses of the race.

Civic indifference has not been due to lack of social instincts. The capacity of our people to respond generously and heroically to the call of humanity has given the lie to those who declared that our prosperity and love of ease had destroyed our nobler instincts. Absorbed in individualistic enterprise, or lulled to a false security by a too credulous faith in the capacity of the government to run itself, we have been blind to its possibilities and neglectful of its failures. Our task is to awaken our people to the realities of our political life, in order that our instinctive love of justice and the American sense of chivalry may be stimulated into effective action. For it is from these instincts that we must draw the virile power of social consciousness and dynamic Americanism.

The possibilities thus afforded are evidenced by the successful work of the public schools in developing the patriotism of war. There is scarcely one among us that can not

recall the thrill of patriotic fervor with which we learned of the heroic exploits of Concord and of Lexington. Who has not felt the generous ardor of patriotic impulse in the story of Paul Jones and his ringing words, "Don't give up the ship"? What boy has not been prompted to heart-searching inquiry of his own loyalty by the heroism of Gettysburg and Chickamauga and the brilliant victories of San Juan and Manila Bay? These memories stand out as emotional epochs in the drab background of our educational careers. They were the occasions when daily lessons escaped the confines of the unreal and the pedantic, and when we lived as well as learned in the educational process.

Has this work been well done? Has the school imparted to the average boy the lessons of love of country? Has it developed from his instinctive life a dynamic power of patriotism upon which the country could rely in the hour of national peril? The answer is found in the prompt enactment and remarkable enforcement of the draft law, in the fidelity and enthusiasm with which the public voluntarily accepted restrictions upon their traditional liberties; in the marvelous generosity with which our people poured forth their gold in voluntary offerings to their country's cause; and in the crusader's zeal of our soldiery and the deathless valor of our arms. Never was a great peaceful democracy converted into a resistless military power in so short a time. Never was a great citizen army of like dimension raised, equipped and trained so speedily and effectively. Never was industry revolutionized to the stern purposes of war with such precision and despatch. When all the mistakes are counted and all the blunders tabulated, the fact will still remain that America's response to the call of humanity surpassed, in speed, efficiency and magnitude, all previous achievements.

America may seem to have hesitated at the beginning of

the struggle. Her response may seem to many to have been too long delayed. But the cause is to be found in the traditional ignorance of our public in regard to world affairs, and the naive confidence of our people in the perfection and saving grace of our isolation. Our delay resulted from ignorance and not from ignoble desire. We were slow in realizing the sinister character of the struggle, but when the real issues became apparent, we did not hesitate. America's real spirit has been accurately portrayed by an English critic who declared that our neutrality was the only possible course "until the great majority of the American people shared in the president's knowledge and insight; and, deep as was the ignorance of European affairs among the mass of the British people in 1914, it was still more profound among the mass of Americans, thousands of miles away from Europe. The enlightenment of this vast body of opinions was slow, but it was sure. The truth would out. Prussianism at war inevitably unmasked itself; it boasted of its strength and its project of dominion; it displayed, on a wider scale and in a more terrible and indiscriminate fashion than the world had yet seen, the evils that flow from irresponsible power. And so the American people, like their British kinsmen, were awakened to the facts; more than that, they were forced, as we were, to forsake a tradition of isolation from Europe and an indifference to its destiny that was older and stronger than our own."

America's magnificent response, when the issue became clear, is sufficient evidence of the patriotic education of our people. But how has it been accomplished? When we have been so successful in developing the patriotism of war, why have we so nearly failed in inculcating a patriotism of peace? The same men and women who will willingly give their all to defend their national honor, will frequently view domestic tragedies and disgrace with indifference and un-

concern. An insult to American citizens in foreign lands is met with unified hostility and resentment, but the useless loss of a million lives through the ravages of preventable disease is viewed in complacent ease.

The answer is not hard to find. War is an intensely dramatic subject. Its appeal to the basic instincts is clear, vital and resistless. It takes no careful preparation by the teacher, no penetrating powers of analysis, no wealth of descriptive genius, to arouse an emotional response. Its heroism, its tragedy, its sacrifice are self-apparent. The appeal to the instinctive love of conflict, the instincts of chivalry, of sympathy and of the heroic are automatic. The barest study of our military history can not help but arouse the thrills of patriotic fervor. It can not help but inculcate into the consciousness of youth an admiration and a love for martial glory. Youth becomes enamored with the thrill of generous emotion. It is the only manly outlet for his nobler instincts that his contact with life has afforded him. He delights to give himself up to its exhilarating experiences on stated patriotic occasions. It is in this way that the patriotic education of our youth has been accomplished. It has followed the line of least resistance, and the more difficult and important problem of creating patriotic interests in the problems of peace has been neglected. In fact, it has sometimes seemed that we have been unconscious of the need of such an interest. We seem to have forgotten that for every year our nation has spent in war, we have lived fifteen years in peace. We have ignored the gigantic problems of domestic justice, of public health, and of social amelioration that daily cry out for settlement. We have forgotten that their successful solution requires the spirit of self-sacrifice and the resistless devotion to the public weal that only a deep sense of constructive patriotism or dynamic Americanism can provide.

We are directly confronted with the problem of whether such a spirit of constructive patriotism or dynamic Americanism can be developed. Is war the only cause around which we can rally the emotional powers of man? Is war the only business of society that carries its appeal to the instinctive forces of humanity? Is there nothing in the study of the community, in the history of our years of peace, in the social and industrial conflicts of our national life, in the battle between political ideals, that has its appeal to the dynamic forces of instinctive life? This is the crucial point.

The superficial popular belief seems to be that problems of peace do not have their appeal to the instinctive forces of human nature. Certain it is that the appeal is not so self-evident or so automatic. Certain it is that if the appeal is there it will require careful preparation, the exercise of analytical powers and the use of accurate description to drive it home with telling force. But these difficulties can not hide the fact that in the problems of modern life, with all their tragic settings and implications, there are untold possibilities for effective appeals to the instincts that will produce great resources of emotional power. It is in the cultivation and direction of these instincts and their accompanying emotions that we may inculcate an effective spirit of constructive patriotism.

We must, therefore, consider the nature and character of instincts to ascertain what ones are available for our purposes and how they are to be utilized. For our uses the discussion of the instincts as given by William McDougall in his *Introduction to Social Psychology* is perhaps the most useful one. He defines an instinct "as an inherited or innate psycho-physical disposition which determines its possessor to perceive, and to pay attention to, objects of a certain class, to experience an emotional excitement of a particular quality upon perceiving such an object, and to

act in regard to it in a particular manner, or, at least, to experience an impulse to such action."

For purposes of illustration, let us examine an example of parental instinct with its accompanying tender emotion. Normal human beings, especially women, upon seeing a little helpless baby, experience the tender emotion and are conscious of a desire to extend physical protection to the child by throwing the arms about it. Here is an innate, inherited quality which causes one to pay attention to an object of a particular class, to experience a definite emotion and to feel an impulse to definite action regarding it. This inherited, innate quality then is an instinct.

Instincts are the sole springs of human action. They are the dynamic forces of life. They are the causes of all bodily and mental action. To control, train and cultivate the instincts is to control the thought and action of the individual. How far, then, may this be done is a vital question.

In considering the possibility of modifying the instincts, McDougall makes an analysis of the instinctive process which seems helpful. The innate psycho-physical disposition which we call instinct he divides into three parts, the inlet or afferent, the central, and the motor or efferent part. The afferent or inlet is that part of the process by which the impulses initiated by the perception of the native object of the instinct are received and elaborated. The central part is that which determines the distribution of the nervous impulses which are the correlates of the emotional aspects of the process. The efferent determines the distribution of impulses to the muscles which are to carry out the felt impulse to action. Thus in the case of the parental instinct, the afferent is that part of the instinctive process by which the perception of a child stimulates the psycho-physical disposition. The central part is where the nervous impulses are aroused and the tender emotion created. The efferent

is that part of the process which creates the impulse to throw the arms around the child in a protecting embrace.

The afferent or receptive part, and the efferent or motor part, are capable of great modification, independently of each other and of the central part, the latter persisting "throughout life as the essential unchanging nucleus of the disposition." This is of supreme importance, for in our complex civilization appeals to the basic social instincts, in their native forms, are rarely possible. They are apparently too remote, or so complicated and varied in their expression, as not to be recognized. And yet the hope of society must be based upon the virile effective action of citizens, motivated by their social instincts and directed by intelligent choice.

No group of American citizens anywhere would tolerate the sight of babies being poisoned by improperly adulterated milk. Yet these same men would witness the defeat of a milk inspection ordinance with scarcely a second thought, although the defeat of the ordinance means the poisoning of babies. But to comprehend that requires thinking and imagination to follow out the causes to their natural results. The two have not yet been associated in their minds, and until they are, there will be no popular demand for milk inspection, no adequately effective motive to secure its passage and enforcement. The real problem, therefore, is to educate the voter to the point where he understands the real human significance of such an ordinance, and until, therefore, a new afferent inlet into his instinct of tender emotion has been established.

Stated more broadly, the fundamental problem of civic training is to establish new afferent inlets to the basic social instincts of the voter, so that his response to the problems of peace will be as effective and virile as his response to the challenge of war. This is to be done by showing him that

the functions of government may be actually translated into terms of human happiness and human woe. Governmental inefficiency must be synonymous in his mind with the want, misery and immorality that flourish in the city slums; with the loss of life through preventable accidents, and with the poverty and desolation of the orphan children that frequently follow in its wake; and with the blighted opportunities of growing girls and boys whose school-days and idle hours have not been profitably employed. This conception of the human significance of government must be brought home time and time again, with countless incidents, until it has become a part of his daily thought and of his point of view.

But this is not all. Not only must our citizens be so trained that civic problems will find an inlet to their instinctive life, but the efferent part of the process must be directed to function effectively. It is not enough that the defeat of the milk inspection ordinance should outrage the feelings of the voter by appealing to his parental and pugnacious instincts. Unless there follows an intelligent and effective effort to create a public opinion and to hold the proper officers to strict accountability, the voter will be impotent. Training for civic responsibility must include a training in the essential nature of our democracy, in the relations of the voter to his community, his political parties and his state, and in the proper methods of making his voice effective. Finally it must include the driving home of the conviction that the tragic results of the defeat of the milk inspection ordinance continue their daily toll of life until the action has been reversed. If this is done the impulse to action in behalf of the helpless babies continues until its possessor secures the thrill of joy that comes from its fulfillment, or the pain and anger that results from effective opposition. For in the latter case the instinct of pugnacity

and the emotion of anger are aroused and a new dynamic force is available on the side of justice and humanity.

Any such effective program for the moral or social training of the youth invariably encounters many scoffers who will declare it can not be done. They take refuge in the old adage that one can't change human nature. The obvious answer is that no one is seeking to change human nature. Our whole program is based upon the elemental instincts which help to constitute human nature. All we argue for is to make human nature more articulate amid the bewildering complexities of modern life. To deny to human nature the parental instinct as a dominant factor in human life is a slander on humanity. To widen the scope of its activity by adding new afferent inlets, and to increase its efficiency by making the bodily and mental reactions more effective, is not defying but merely perfecting the nature of man.

Should I approach a man with insulting words and threatening assaults, his pugnacious instinct will be aroused; he will experience the emotion of anger, and will probably give expression to his impulse to fight me, although his efforts to do me bodily injury may be cumbersome and ineffective. But suppose this man is later carefully trained and drilled in the art of self-defense or pugilism. Then suppose some one approaches with insults, jibes and threats. His same instinct of pugnacity will be aroused, he will experience the same emotion of anger and he will feel the same impulse to fight him, but he will fight in a much more effective and improved manner. Has his nature been changed? The answer is obvious. There is the same instinct, and the same emotion, and the same impulse to fight, but the fighting is done effectively.

Now suppose the same man is trained and educated in a country where dueling is the established method of avenging insults and the thrown glove is the accepted method of

the challenge. Should a glove be thrown in his face, it arouses the same instinct, though the stimulus is vastly different. Here training has given another afferent inlet to the instinct of pugnacity. These illustrations should suggest how the instinctive processes may be adapted to the accomplishment of social and civic ends.

What instincts are the most available for our purposes, is another question that now requires attention. This is not the place for an extended classification of instincts, nor, in fact, does an authoritative classification seem possible. Apparently there are as many classifications as there are writers on the subject. It is obvious, however, that the instincts generally described as the social instincts are the ones in which we are interested. The instincts and innate tendencies of this class that we find the most readily available are the parental instinct, the instinct of pugnacity, the sympathetic tendency, and the self-regarding sentiment.

It is from the parental instinct with its tender emotion that are derived most of the nobler impulses, the feelings of compassion, and the spirit of altruism. Here, indeed, are unexploited possibilities for the building of civic character. McDougall argues that it was the operation of this instinct that led to the abolition of slavery and serfdom. Benjamin Kidd argues that the extension of political democracy was due to this instinctive source, since it frequently came as a voluntary gift from those who possessed the power.

The history of great reforms along the line of humanitarian legislation in the United States is replete with striking illustrations. The agitation for the prohibition of poisonous phosphorus in the manufacture of matches required a long and patient campaign of education before a sufficiently effective public opinion could be mobilized in its behalf. And yet surely this was the basis of a dramatic appeal that ought to have been immediately effective. One who had ever seen

a hapless victim of phosphorous poisoning never could forget it. The pictures of these human derelicts were published in the public prints. The statistics were given the widest circulation. Every intelligent person must have been aware of the inhuman practise as well as of the simplicity of the remedy, for a harmless phosphorus could be substituted for the other at but slight additional expense. Why then the delay?

Were the American people lacking in parental instincts? Were they indifferent to the useless suffering and agony of others? Were they too absorbed in their own pursuits to offer aid to the helpless in distress? None of these inquiries seem to touch the vital spot. Our people had not been trained to see the social significance of government. They had not been trained to feel a deep personal responsibility for its failure or success. They were not accustomed to connect up in their minds the tragedies of industrial disease with inefficiency in government. They had never felt any responsibility for human suffering unless chance threw it before their very eyes. With ostrich-like naivete they went on the happy principle that what they did not see, for them did not exist. In short, the afferent inlets to their instinctive natures were adjusted so as to arouse their emotional activity only when the human suffering was presented to their actual gaze. Herein lies the explanation of the apparently unchivalrous and brutal attitude of the public.

It was only when public propaganda had painted the picture of the horror and suffering with life-like reality, only when by constant repetition and graphic description the situation was made vivid and specific, only when the real responsibility of the citizen as the only means of stopping the inhuman practise was brought home with resistless logic and dramatic appeal, that there were established new afferent inlets, through which this appeal of human suffering could

gain access to their tender emotions. They then felt the instinct to action, to protest, to aid the objects of their emotion. When they encountered the obstacles of legislative indifference, then their fighting instinct was aroused. Public indignation blazed forth, and the fight was won.

This is a typical example of the history of a piece of ameliorative legislation that could be duplicated many times in the various legislative bodies throughout our nation. Had our people been taught in their youth the true significance of government, had they learned to look upon it as an instrument of happiness or weal, had they become accustomed to identifying in their minds the functions of governments with the deepest interests of humanity, had they learned the true significance of the story of the Good Samaritan as applied to the realities of modern life, their response would have been quicker and more effective.

Nor must it be supposed that where there is an ultimate failure to gain a response from a given individual or group, that the necessary explanation is that the person or group is lacking in the parental instinct. For it is a matter of common observation that many men who are devoted fathers and husbands and genial and sympathetic neighbors, are wholly lacking in broad, altruistic or humanitarian impulses. These cases are doubtless due to a variety of causes, but among them generally lies the lack of early effective training, which might have given them the social view-point, and opened up new and various inlets in their instinctive natures, that would have made them both good citizens and better neighbors.

There is scarcely an important topic in civics, in domestic history, or in community life, when accurately analyzed, that does not contain the possibility of an effective appeal to the parental instinct. These subjects thus have a special value as the medium through which the spirit of constructive

patriotism may be developed, if taught in an effective manner. Moreover, it is where one gives them a dramatic setting and clothes them with the realities of life, that they become interesting to the student. It is significant that the subject of civics in the hands of one teacher is deadly uninteresting, while in the hands of another, it is fascinating in the extreme. The difference very frequently is that the latter uses civics as the means of establishing in the consciousness of the pupil new and absorbing contacts with life, thus enriching the sum total of his instinctive and emotional experiences.

For example, one teacher will find in the study of the state legislature, its organizations and functions, only the dry skeleton bones of a legal institution, with certain definitions to remember, certain processes to master and certain details to organize. But there are no vivid contacts with life. The legislature is never filled with men of flesh and blood, men intensely human, like most men whom the pupil knows, men with pettiness and patriotism, and with selfishness and altruism, trying to deal with the real human problems that exist in every group. Many of these problems have roots that run deep down into the noblest and the worst passions of human nature. These conflicting passions present a fascinating and unending struggle that is typical of life. Decisions are made that touch life at a thousand different points. A teacher who does not see in such a situation the opportunity of bringing home to the boy or girl an increasing sense of the social significance of government and politics, who does not find a way of awakening the nobler instincts and emotions to effective action, and who does not establish new points of contact between society and the instinctive nature of the individual, is indeed asleep to his possibilities as a leader, and blind to his opportunities as a teacher.

It was my lot to study civics under a teacher who failed to see. She was a woman of marvelous character and personality to whom I am indebted for much in other ways, but who lacked the training, the imagination and the background to make the subject a vital human one. I committed important provisions of the Constitution; I learned the qualifications of various officers; and I mastered the dictionary meaning of legislature, executive and judiciary. But I never dreamed that any or all of them had anything to do with life. I never imagined that some of the most dramatic and significant conflicts of history had been won and lost in legislative halls. I never conceived that right in my native community we had conflicts of interests, absorbing human problems, that the community solved through these instrumentalities of government. As I write, I can not recall a single emotional thrill that I ever experienced in my high-school course in civics. In my boyish mind there was no conceivable connection between patriotism and politics. Could a training for citizenship have been more barren, impotent or sterile?

Let us now consider the instinct of pugnacity with its emotion of anger as one of the instincts to be utilized in the development of citizenship that is socially responsive. The instinct of pugnacity is in a way dependent upon the other instincts. It is most readily excited by meeting opposition to impulsive actions impelled by other instincts. One's tender emotions are aroused by the appearance of a suffering child, and there is the immediate impulse to give comfort or relief. Should one encounter opposition in ministering to the child there is at once excited the instinct of pugnacity, and the emotion of anger. This instinct is of great social importance in supplementing the parental instinct and providing for it the great moral forces created by righteous indignation. As McDougall has well observed, both "in the

nursery and in the school righteous anger will always have a great and proper part to play in the training of the individual for his life in society."

It is obvious that the parental instinct alone would be a weak force upon which to lean for the aggressive, constructive patriotism demanded by the exigencies of modern life. It is the anger arising from the opposition to the tender impulses that produces the power we need. Righteous indignation, when intelligently controlled and directed, is an indispensable force for social betterment, and its cultivation and direction become, therefore, an object of our deepest concern.

The wave of popular indignation culminating in the national prohibition amendment is an excellent case in point. It is doubtful if the appeals to the other instincts alone would have accomplished the same result. The public had a general desire to remove the worst evils of the liquor traffic, and many efforts of one kind or the other were being made. It was when these efforts met with stubborn and hostile opposition that the public began to be aroused. When the liquor dealers lost all sense of discretion and decency, openly flaunted the authority of the government, ruthlessly and corruptly sought the control of political parties, and defied the public will—then it was that they met their Waterloo.

It was the same in the campaign against poisonous phosphorus in the manufacture of matches. With the realization of the useless suffering involved, the public began to become concerned. They expressed their desires in resolutions to Congress, and a few wrote personal letters urging the justice of the cause. The movement might have proved abortive at this very point but for the suggestion that the impulse of the public to grant relief was meeting with opposition from indifferent congressmen and from certain special interests that were obviously concerned. A mild

interest quickly gave way to righteous anger. Men who were only casually interested arose in wrath and the law was passed.

The opportunities for the employment of this splendid social force and its intelligent direction are too numerous to mention, and yet they are too frequently ignored. They have not only a great social value but an equally great pedagogical value. Normal individuals exult over an opportunity to experience righteous anger. Significant movements in history, the solution of community problems, the development of political issues, if clearly analyzed, disclose continuous opposition to all the movements that have been prompted by the better impulses of men. This opposition may have been due to ignorance, bigotry or greed, and it affords a splendid opportunity to organize the instinctive and virile emotions of youth against the forces of reaction. It would be difficult to imagine a greater service to society than to equip its youth with a righteous scorn against these fundamental ills.

When taught in this manner the subjects of social science, found in the public-school curriculum, take on a vital aspect. They develop the gripping interest of the drama. The local history of a city or a rural community becomes a deadening monotony, if it amounts merely to the marshaling of chronological events, but if it is the story of conflicting forces, an accurate account of the ceaseless battle between progress and reaction, as it found expression in the terms of local issues, it becomes an absorbing tale. It enables the student to begin the formulation of his personal philosophy amidst the stimulating and wholesome influences of the realities of life. He instinctively begins to estimate public questions in terms of social values, and his whole instinctive nature becomes adjusted to functioning upon the problems of his every-day environment.

We now come to the consideration of sympathy as a valuable innate tendency to be utilized in the development of constructive patriotism. Sympathy is not an instinct, perhaps, within the meaning of our definition, but it is an element in human nature of great social significance. It is probably a product of the parental instinct, the gregarious instinct, and certain egoistic tendencies. Whatever its accurate psychological analysis may be, its meaning for our purposes is obvious enough.

The functioning of the sympathetic tendency seems to be twofold, the experiencing of fundamental emotions whenever the same emotions are witnessed in others, and the desire, on the part of one, to share his emotions with others. Every one has experienced a sense of distress upon viewing the grief of others, or has felt the distinct influence of infectious laughter on the part of his associates. So likewise most of us desire to share great emotional excitement with others. Music, the drama, inspiring scenery, good news and all such things that arouse strong emotional response, we like best when we share them with friends, and there is generally present on all such occasions a decided tendency so to do.

The social utility of sympathy consists in the fact that through the tendency, emotional states spread very rapidly through society and thus affect public opinion much more quickly than would otherwise be possible. Thus in the campaign against poisonous phosphorus, when the leaders of each community began to evidence certain emotional hostility, it began to spread to the crowd much more rapidly than it would be possible to reach them by a campaign of education. This is also accentuated by the natural desire of those who felt the heat of burning indignation to impart their feeling to others. The missionary attitude and the al-

truistic spirit of the pioneers in humanitarian enterprises are largely the product of sympathetic natures.

Moreover, the capacity of a community or a group to cooperate successfully in public undertakings, a capacity that is essential to democratic success of any kind, is conditioned very largely upon the existence of broad and effective sympathies, while one can not hope to become an effective leader of the public unless possessed of sympathetic tendencies that are virile and profound.

The nourishing and developing of this tendency thus plays a vital part in the preparation for citizenship. We have already seen something of the opportunities for appeals to the social instincts that the social sciences afford, and the development of those instincts is the foundation of strong sympathetic tendencies. Perhaps one other concrete example will suffice.

A very splendid teacher of high-school civics always takes her class to visit the orphans' home, among the other public institutions of the community. This particular visit was utilized to bring home to the pupil a keener realization of the human significance of local government. Nothing appeals to the sympathies more than the conception of homeless orphans. Nothing, perhaps, could bring home more vividly to youthful understanding the tragic significance of inefficiency in the local government, for it then becomes to them a very real and a very human institution. No longer was it a mere matter of formal rules and legal technicalities, but the parent and guardian of helpless orphans. Here an efficient government meant a happy home, kind treatment, effective training, good food, and a wholesome childhood, while inefficient government meant sorrow, tragedy and impotence. Just a few of these every-day illustrations, available in every community, in the hands of a skilful,

sympathetic teacher, will bring to every boy and girl a new understanding of the significance of civic duty. There will follow inevitably an increased interest and a growing sense of personal accountability that good government so imperatively demands.

The self-regarding sentiment ought now to be briefly considered, since it plays an important rôle in the social life of the individual. It is not an instinct or an innate tendency, but is rather the product of some of them as their perceptual and motor aspects have been modified by experience. The self-regarding sentiment is the organization of the emotional disposition and experiences centered around the subject of one's self. The two dominant factors in the creation of this sentiment are the influence of society in establishing a system of rewards and punishments and sympathy with its influence toward a harmony of feeling and emotion between individuals.

It is this sentiment that gives us such a high regard for the praise and blame of our fellow men and for moral approval and disapproval in general. This may be developed into regard for an ideal which may dominate life, even to the extent of violating the opinion of the community. The development, training and direction of instinctive and emotional life, and its innate tendencies, and their organization into the most altruistic and ennobling sentiments, is the very essence of patriotic education.

This sentiment is capable of being extended, and generally is, to all the groups with which the individual has any intimate association and special interest. Thus it is by the extension of this sentiment to one's family, church, college, community, or nation that one finds his actions profoundly influenced by the interests of these groups and their claim to his fidelity. The opportunities for the direction of this sentiment in its extension to the community and to the na-

tion are almost without limit. The ties of human interest between the individual and the modern community are so many and so vital that one finds on every hand the materials for civic training. Our failures have not been for want of opportunity or of material, but a failure to see the vision and to analyze the task. A pedantic or scholastic point of view and an interest in the subject-matter has too frequently obscured the fact that our main objective must be the training of the boy or girl for the gigantic tasks of every-day democracy. The teaching and materials that do not contribute directly to this task, do not meet the demands of modern life.

We have seen that a sentiment is, in the words of McDougall, "an organized system of emotional disposition centered about the idea of some object" and that "the organization of the sentiments in the developing mind is determined by the course of experience." We have seen how the materials of the curriculum, particularly the social sciences, afford unequaled opportunities for appeals to the more social of the instincts and their accompanying emotions. We have seen how these can be trained to function in connection with the study of the communities in which we live. We have seen the sentiment of patriotism dominate our land and exact immeasurable toll of human sacrifice. We have gloried in the splendor of our patriotic fervor. Animated by its generous impulse our men have risen to heights of valor and achievement that the world will not forget. The gallantry and courage of our troops have left nothing to be desired. This magnificent example should serve us as a guide.

The splendid patriotism thus evidenced has been a sentiment of war. It has been developed by the study of the heroism, the glory and the tragedy of the battle-field. Love of country has been identified almost exclusively with

national strife. Our task is to develop a sentiment of constructive patriotism, not only concerned with the noble duty of its defense, but primarily with the opportunities of its perfection. It must be developed by the study of the heroism, the glory and the tragedy of the conflicts of peace. Love of country must be identified in the public mind with the unending struggle against ignorance, bigotry and greed. Patriotism must become a passion that marshals its host against unemployment, poverty and disease. It must organize its forces against domestic injustice with the same terrible energy that it directs them against our foreign foes.

Such an undertaking is indeed difficult but its importance is monumental. If it is possible to say that the murder of innocent persons in the race riots of Chicago is as great a blemish on our national honor as the killing of our citizens by the bandit gangs of Mexico; if it is fair to argue that the useless destruction of life and limb by preventable industrial accidents in America is as great a crime against civilization as was Spain's cruel and inhuman treatment of the Cubans; if we may justly reason that some of our ghastly excesses of mob law are no greater crimes against humanity than were the atrocities of the Boxer revolt in China, then why may we not develop a patriotic sentiment that will function as resistlessly against these domestic evils as it does against our foreign foes?

The creation of this sentiment of virile constructive patriotism, which is the essence of dynamic Americanism, must be the mission of the teacher.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. If most American citizens have normal instincts, why did it take so many years to get the nation aroused to the evils of child labor? Was it indifference to child welfare?

2. Recently a state legislature appropriated forty thousand dollars to fight hog cholera but neglected to make any appropriation

for fighting tuberculosis. The public did not seem disturbed. What is the explanation? Did the people think more of their hogs than they did of their afflicted fellows?

3. Have the "muck rakers," with their dramatic and frequently exaggerated criticisms of the government, been efficient in developing a constructive patriotism? Why or how?

4. What public issues in your community afford an appeal to the parental instinct and the tender emotion?

5. Explain concretely just how this appeal should be made to be effective.

6. Some teachers have made some progress in training the afferent part of the instinctive process, but have ignored the efferent. Explain how such training is impotent for practical purposes.

7. Explain the psychological basis of what we call "school spirit" or "college spirit." How may this be utilized in developing a constructive patriotism?

8. What detailed steps would you take to interest deeply your students in a study of your legislature?

9. When a citizen confronts an issue like the prohibition of poisonous phosphorus, he may react in one of two ways: seek comfort in ignoring and forgetting it, or in fighting for it. State explicitly what incentives you would utilize and how you would proceed to develop habitual reactions of the latter type.

10. What specific steps would you take to arouse a deep interest in your city government?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ross, E. A., *Social Psychology* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1911).

James, William, *Psychology* (Henry Holt & Co., 1910).
Chapter XXV, "Instinct."

Wallas, Graham, *Human Nature in Politics* (Houghton, Mifflin Company, Boston, 1919).
Part I, "The Conditions of the Problem."

McDougall, *Social Psychology* (John W. Luce & Co., Boston, 1919).

Cooley, *Social Organization* (Scribner's, New York, 1912).

Hall, Arnold Bennett, *Practical Problems of Politics* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1920).
Chapter I, "Public Opinion and Popular Government."
Chapter II, "How May Public Opinion be Improved."

CHAPTER III

THE INTELLECTUAL BASIS FOR CONSTRUCTIVE PATRIOTISM

"THE remedy for the evils of democracy is more democracy." I sat in a great theater and heard an eloquent statesman utter these words in clarion tones. I heard the audience reply with deafening applause. I saw them follow with slavish credulity the deductions he drew from this ringing declaration. Without thought or hesitation they had accepted the fundamental premise. To have questioned it would have shown a lack of confidence in democracy, a lack of faith in the American ideal. The words had an appeal to the imagination and emotional life of the hearers and they responded with unquestioning conviction.

As I pondered over the incident and the marvelous effect of the apparently self-evident assertion, my mind reverted to the days of carpetbag rule in the South. I remembered that the negroes had just been freed from slavery, and that in the very dawn of the new liberty, without education, training or experience, and burdened as they were with ignorance, superstition and poverty, the ballot was placed in their hands. They were thus given the balance of power in the politics of the southern states. The abuses of this power, the corruption of the government, the unparalleled extravagance and dishonesty that followed, are without precedent in the history of free governments.

The reign of terror and incompetence was only ended when the intelligent people of these states, taking the law into their own hands, wrongly or rightly, denied to the ignorant negro the rights that he had been given. It was only

when statutory and constitutional provisions had been defied, and fraud and intimidation employed, that the new civilization of the South could be erected upon the ruins of the old. As these incidents were passing through my mind, I wondered if the remedy for these particular evils of democracy was really more democracy. I wondered if the direct primary, the referendum, the initiative, or the recall would have solved the problem. I wondered if all that was needed was merely the extension of more political power to the unfortunate race that became the victim of its own ignorance and inexperience.

I could not escape the conclusion that in this case at least the remedy for the evils of democracy was a more intelligent, experienced and better trained electorate. For when the average was improved by the forceful elimination of the unfit, the evils disappeared.

Then again my mind wandered to Mexico, and I thought of the distress, anarchy and chaos that seemed to rule the destinies of our southern neighbor. I remembered that her constitution was as democratic as our own, and that her people were living under the form of popular government. I recalled the hopeless ignorance of the populace and their careless, care-free life, and I asked myself again, if in this case, the remedy for the evils of democracy was more democracy. Would all the instrumentalities of popular control, if placed in the hands of the ignorant and inexperienced people of Mexico, usher in a new régime of order, justice and peace. Or could there be a real and effective democratic government, competent to deal with the gigantic problems of modern life, without a regenerated citizenship, clear-eyed, intelligent, sincere.

Then my thinking brought me nearer home and I recalled watching an election in the first ward of Chicago. I saw the denizens of the cheap boarding-houses, who had been

collected and boarded without expense to themselves in order that they might be voted on election day, pass in to exercise their right of franchise. I saw the citizens of the ward reelect their feudal and beneficent overlord and political boss, a man who befriended the voters personally, but who protected the system of vice that corrupted their morals, menaced their homes and debauched their children. And then again I wondered if the remedy for this evil was more democracy and greater popular control. Or was the remedy to be found in cleaning up the district, educating the children, eliminating the inherently unfit, and establishing a more healthy environment for the young citizens of the future?

And yet a vast intelligent audience had accepted this doctrine as a panacea for the social and economic ills of our democracy. Their attention was thus diverted from the great eternal problem of civic training and popular education, while such fundamental tasks as seeking the remedy for unemployment and perfecting a just and righteous system for the distribution of wealth, were brushed aside in the naive confidence that these problems would be solved when the new devices of popular government had been installed.

And yet a moment's critical observation would have shown the inadequacy of such a doctrine as a modern panacea. Abundant evidence to the contrary was available to all if they had only used it. The audience responded with fine enthusiasm and emotion but failed to display habits of critical analysis or thought.

Unfortunately this failure to think seems particularly true of politics. Some one has said that the average man refuses to think critically about the two things in life that affect him most, politics and religion. I have seen men who think critically and carefully about their business, about their games, about their avocations, but who are "thought

tight" when it comes to politics. They accept the traditional dogmas of their party or their party heroes. They accept plausible theories without question, if they emanate from sources that are orthodox. All the complex political judgments of their lives are made by their reference to a few trite "rule of thumb" political platitudes or plausible, euphonious sophistries.

It follows that the organization of instinctive and emotional life into fine sentiments of constructive patriotism can not take place without certain intellectual capacities and qualifications. What does it avail society if the public conscience is aroused to an emotional pitch against certain inequities of our economic life, if we seek only to establish some new instruments of popular control and leave the problem still unsolved? The development of an effective sentiment of constructive patriotism implies habits of critical observation and analysis, an evolutionary point of view, and a passionate love of truth. Unless these mental traits can be developed, our emotional life, instead of being a great constructive force, will play slavish tribute to the power of demagogues. The demagogue can seek no greater boon than a strong emotional response when not directed with intelligence and understanding.

The reign of the demagogue is based upon appeals to those whose emotions are normal but whose credulity is greater than their powers of critical analysis. Nor is demagoguery always the product of dishonest intent, for it is only too frequently that a man makes the appeal in the best of faith, not realizing its inherent impotence.

It is not unusual for an honest man, in the exigencies of a political campaign, to make the contest turn upon such issues as "Shall the People Rule," although in truth and in fact such question can not honestly be involved, and the issues concerned are side-tracked and forgotten. Many an

honest man has thus innocently played into the hands of designing politicians or special interests, whose success depended upon diverting public opinion from the real issues that were at stake.

In a recent political campaign there was circulated a piece of literature appealing to farmers and workmen. The party claimed credit for the high prices the farmer received for cattle, hogs and grain, and impliedly promised a continuation of the same, while a little later on, the worker was assured immediate relief from the increasing cost of living. How prices were to be maintained and the cost of living lowered at the same time did not vex the committee or apparently scatter doubt among the electorate.

Again the ease with which political parties have assigned the blame for hard times, bad crops and industrial depression, or claimed the credit for good crops and industrial prosperity, demonstrate the blind credulity with which many of us accept the statements of our favorites.

So long as these things can be done demagogues will prosper, the real vital issues will be avoided, and the most sinister influences in our political life will frequently escape political responsibility through campaign alibis. As long as the public mainly accepts any issue indicated by the demagogue that appeals to popular imagination, these alibis will be open to those whose real interests would spell defeat, were they known to the electorate.

Another evil resulting from the failure to acquire critical habits of observation is the tendency to surround historic incidents and characters with the sentimental glamour of unreality. A humorist has referred to this as the Lavender and Old Lace method of history. Such impressions as that Washington never told a lie, that the early days of the republic were more glorious and unsullied by selfish and corrupting influences than now, and that the public men

then were purer, nobler and more admirable than to-day, are typical examples.

The evil of such a course is that it robs history of the fascination of reality; it destroys the perspective of the child; it must in time dull his love of truth, and finally lays the basis of a later cynicism. A boy or girl who goes out into the world to-day, equipped with such conceptions of life, comes very promptly to his disillusionment which is both painful and costly. When he finds that in government to-day and even in our popular heroes there is sometimes selfishness, bigotry, pettiness and occasional dishonesty he is unprepared for the sudden shock. He may lose all confidence in the government and society. Wholly lacking in historical perspective he does not see things in their true light. He has no reasonable standard of values, and it is but a short step to hopeless cynicism. There are several men among my acquaintance who have this attitude, who say openly that they never vote, for it is useless. Ignorance, dishonesty and greed are bound to triumph. Such a position is only possible among thinking men when they have no historic perspective in which they can see the slow but steady advances that have characterized our national life.

This does not mean that children should not be taught to honor and admire our national heroes, but rather that the admiration should be wholesome, just and honest. For example, the teacher who can not see adequate ground for the warmest kind of admiration and pride in the actual achievements of the framers of the Constitution is woefully lacking in imagination, historical perspective and accurate understanding of that significant achievement. It is not necessary to paint those pioneers as men inspired from heaven, able to achieve perfection. It is not necessary to attribute to them qualities of heart and mind that they did not possess. The magnitude of the problem, the hard-

headed practical way in which they approached its solution, the courage and self-confidence with which they ventured upon untried paths,—these are sufficient grounds for all the glory that they so richly deserve. Moreover, these are the same qualities of heart and mind that the citizenship of to-day requires.

The remedy for these two evils of demagoguery and cynicism is to be found in forming habits of critical observation and analysis. Here the instinct of curiosity must be employed, and its possibilities are without limit. The amount of time and energy that children will devote to puzzles is significant, and yet civics, if properly presented, becomes an interesting series of puzzles or problems to be solved by critical observation and analysis. The fact that these problems are human ones, with dramatic settings, greatly increases the possibilities of attention.

The political philosophy or the democratic theories of the fathers affords an excellent example. If one is merely told that those theories will be found in the Declaration of Independence and the public addresses of the day, and they are to be taken at their face value, no problems are presented, no critical attitude is developed, no instincts aroused. But let the student approach the problem in its real setting. Let him become interested in finding out and formulating the philosophy of the fathers. If he begins to rely too much upon the obvious meaning of the Declaration of Independence, ask him if that document was a product of deliberation and counsel. Was it adopted as an accurate statement of their beliefs? Or was it adopted to accomplish a definite mission, *viz.*, to provide a platform around which they might successfully rally the forces of the revolution? When men draw up such statements, in times of stress and strain, do they generally strive to say just what they think or do they seek to say what will catch the popular imagination?

What about the declaration that all men are created equal, and the subsequent recognition of slavery in the constitutional convention? In arriving at a man's philosophy, do we accept his own words as conclusive, or do we examine them in the light of his activity and conduct? What, then, did the fathers think about equality and democracy and political philosophy?

By these and similar suggestive questions the pupil's instinct of curiosity may be aroused and habits of critical observation and analysis become established. With this same method applied throughout, the student will be prepared to form intelligent judgments when required to do so in the performance of civic duty. When he is trying to determine for which political party he will vote, he will not accept at face value the high-sounding phrases of party platforms. He will not take campaign promises as the sole criterion for decision. He will not accept the candidate's version of the issues that are involved. He will compare party promise with party performance. He will subject the high-sounding promises and platforms to critical analysis in the light of all the facts that are reasonably available. In short, he will be able to vote intelligently. Surely this is a necessary step in the intellectual preparation for citizenship.

The pupil who studies civics or history by this method soon becomes enamored with his task. When he discovers that he is dealing with the real forces of politics, that he is trying to unravel the tangled fabric of our political life, the subject will cease to appear to him as pedantic and artificial but as fascinatingly realistic. It takes on a new dignity and importance that wins his respect, challenges his manhood, and absorbs his interest.

One word of caution should be given. In emphasizing the importance of a critical attitude and the evils of credulity,

care should be taken not to resort to the cheap methods of the muck raker, in which everything is questioned and everybody's motives but his own are impugned. To be honestly critical and to withhold one's judgment until the matter has received careful thought and analysis with an open mind, is one thing. To develop a morbid spirit of cynical distrust is a wholly different thing.

This morbid desire for scandal perverts one's judgment and defeats one's own effort to know the truth. There are any number of individuals who have this peculiar mental twist, whose bias has poisoned the minds of many, and, unfortunately, some of them are prominent reformers. A few years since the writer attended a public lecture given by Carrie Nation. She was heaping indiscriminate condemnation upon all those in power. It was during President Roosevelt's second term. A member of the audience spoke out in protest, calling attention to Mr. Roosevelt's sterling qualities as a man and as a citizen. He then called attention, by way of clinching his argument, to the position taken by Mr. Roosevelt on the subject of large families and race suicide. Carrie Nation promptly retorted, in that stage whisper that betokened the giving of secret but authoritative information, that Mr. Roosevelt's attitude on race suicide was due to a secret contract with the brewers, by which he had agreed to get the mothers of the country to raise more sons in order that the brewers might have a larger market for their beer. She undoubtedly was sincere, but a type of mind that would conceive, believe and propagate such a notion is neither wholesome, scientific nor intellectually honest. It becomes a positive menace. The way to avoid this is to emphasize the importance of evidence, to keep open-minded, to be reasonable in judgment, and to develop a saving sense of humor.

We come now to consider the evolutionary point of view.

This means that our ideas of truth and life are relative and that they change and enlarge with our expanding wisdom and increasing experience. This view regards society and government as a constant process of development or evolution in which is found the ceaseless operation of the law of cause and effect. In such a conception, government is not an end of human endeavor, but a mere means to the realization of mankind's higher destiny.

The necessity for the development of the evolutionary point of view as a part of civic training and the development of patriotic sentiment, is to be found in the evils of the static mind. This type of mind is possessed by the standpatter. It does not recognize growth, development or evolution as essential. Its ideas are fixed, static, bigoted. It considers existing ideas and conceptions as entirely adequate and correct, and rejects the evidence of new experience and more developed vision as dangerous and necessarily incorrect.

The development of the juvenile court movement in this country affords a tragic example of the operation of a static mind. Our criminal jurisprudence was developed very largely out of a retributive or vengeance theory of punishment. It assumed all criminal acts to be intentional, wilful violations of the moral or criminal law, for which no one was responsible save the wrongdoer, and upon whom society should wreak vengeance, in order to satisfy and keep alive the retributive impulse or tendency, and incidentally, to restrain crime by making evil-doing a poor bargain to the doer.

With the industrial revolution, the growth of great cities, the disappearance of apprenticeships, and the coming of the city slums, this extremely individualistic theory seemed to operate with unnecessary harshness and injustice in certain cases, especially when juvenile offenses were concerned. In the case of children, reared in hopeless city tene-

ments, surrounded by vice and immorality, where their only heroes were likely to be the successful sneak thief or the painted woman of the streets, it seemed that their criminal tendencies were frequently the inevitable product of early training and environment, for which they were not morally to blame, but for which the community itself should answer. To take these young offenders, because they had copied the only life they knew and learned to violate the law, and lock them up for long sentences with hardened criminals, seemed not only unjust but unwise. It seemed unjust, for in many cases they could not be subject to moral blame. It seemed unwise, because the experience, during the plastic years of youth, of being imprisoned with adult criminals, seemed almost sure to condemn them to a life of crime, while to treat them as pathological cases for investigation and correction, seemed to afford better security against their depredations in the future.

The concrete operation of the theory was well illustrated in a western state where a juvenile court law had been established. The facts are given below as reported by the judge who tried the case. A young lad with nameless parentage was a "hanger-on" in a saloon. A bright gamin of the street, he won the affectionate regard of those who knew him. The saloon was his home where he rendered such services a young lad might, and received in turn the alms of its patrons. He frequently delivered drinks to private residences. Having done so on one occasion, and having been given a generous drink by the woman to whom delivery had been made, he became intoxicated and threw a rock through a window in the home. The woman had him arrested. Under the old law this lad might have been imprisoned for a considerable period, with hardened criminals, for malicious trespass.

But under the juvenile court act the procedure was

different. He was brought before the juvenile court. The judge had a probation officer investigate the circumstances of the youth's life, as well as the facts in the case. The whole investigation resulted in the trial, conviction and punishment of the woman and the bartender for contributing to the delinquency of a youth, and the location of the boy in a good home, where he rapidly responded to the influences of the new environment and subsequently became a successful probation officer of the court.

It would be difficult to find a cause that would seem easier to plead at the bar of public opinion. Here certainly was a vital institutional change that afforded a splendid appeal to the parental and pugnacious instincts. But despite that fact progress was slow and success frequently uncertain. The difficulty lay in the fact that the proposed change encountered the static mind. The change ran counter to two "rule of thumb" precepts that most people regarded as fixed and eternal. These two precepts were "spare the rod and spoil the child" and "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." The static mind loves its precepts more than it loves truth and humanity. Consequently the public hardened their hearts to the appeal when they saw a conflict with established precept. They thought more of their theories than they did of their children. The change could not take place until by a long and patient process these precepts were limited or undermined, and the public thus freed from the tyranny of phrases. It is thus evident that the development of instincts and emotions, if it be effective, implies the training of the intellect into proper habits of thought and action. No more formidable obstacle can be imposed to impede the progress of society, than the habitual bigotry of the static mind.

Another example is found in the campaign in Chicago prior to 1904 for the abolition of the justice of the peace

courts in that city, commonly known as "justice shops." Because of the peculiar legal and constitutional provision of Illinois, some of the "justice shops" of Chicago were notorious for corruption and tyranny. There grew up the brazen and corrupt practise by which certain alleged collection agencies would enter into a corrupt bargain with some of the justices of the peace. The justices would make out copies of blank judgments and executions, signed and stamped by the courts, and sell them by the hundreds to these agencies. They would fill in the names of the poor and ignorant in these false papers, fill in the amount of the fake judgment, and give them to a corrupt constable who would serve the papers and collect the money specified therein. If the poor ignorant victim did not pay, his goods were seized and sold, and the robbery was made complete under the forms of law. This was done, though the poor victim had never been in court and never owed a cent.

If the victim were intelligent enough he realized that he had redress in the county or circuit court in a suit at law. But such a suit took time and money, and frequently cost the plaintiff more than he had lost. Also the offending constable was frequently a worthless individual, with no property, and against whom a judgment would be impotent. In 1904 there was one constable against whom over fifty indictments were pending, and against whom suits totaling over two hundred and fifty thousand dollars had been filed.

As a result of this pernicious system, justice was bought and sold at the expense of the poor and ignorant. Their homes were invaded, their scant savings dissipated, their property was stolen. This had gone on for years. The newspapers and magazines joined in occasional crusades against these inhuman practises. Voluntary and civic bodies made elaborate investigations, published the results, and demanded immediate and adequate reforms. The files of the Chicago

papers prior to 1904 contain repeated stories of these terrible abuses. The Cook County Grand Jury time and time again called attention to the situation and demanded appropriate action.

In the meanwhile the evils were continuing in the face of an informed but an apparently indifferent public. The poor people of Chicago, whose conceptions of our courts of justice were mainly confined to their experiences in these "justice shops," were being trained in a school of bitter experience that would produce only contempt for law and justice.

Here was a case where the whole controversy necessarily depended upon an effective appeal to the generous emotions. No selfish appeal would be effective, since the intelligent members of the community, who wielded political power, escaped the evils of the system. The fraudulent collection agencies were too shrewd to attack any save the hopelessly ignorant. Should one desire to use a justice court on legitimate business, there were many justices of the peace who were efficient and trustworthy, and one could take his choice. Only an appeal to the social instincts, therefore, could produce the required results.

The circumstances certainly afforded ample basis for the appeal. But it encountered the static mind, and the tyranny of an established phrase. The justice court had been known for time immemorial as the "poor man's court" because of the pettiness of its jurisdiction and the simplicity of its procedure. When its abolition in Chicago was advocated and the establishment of the municipal court was proposed, it encountered a tremendous obstacle. To abolish the "poor man's court" seemed to the unthinking and the uninformed a deliberate thrust at the rights and prerogatives of the unfortunate poor. It was true that the municipal court was to have, among other things, the simplicity of procedure and

the petty jurisdiction that had given the justice court its peculiar name. It was also true that the prime purpose in supplanting the "justice shop" with the municipal court was to protect the poor and ignorant against intolerable abuse and tyranny. The remarkable and conspicuous success achieved by the new judiciary bears enduring evidence to the keen foresight and statesmanship of those who founded it.

Despite these facts, public opinion was successfully rallied to the defense of the "poor man's court." Intelligent men refused to think but accepted blindly the influence of an established phrase. The very men who were being exploited rallied to the defense of the instrument of their oppression. For a considerable time the most popular and potent argument against the change was the influence of this single phrase. Thus they sacrified substance for form, justice for a tradition, and reality for a name. Thus the static mind barred the possible inlet into the instinctive life that alone could yield results. Finally it was broken down and the reform splendidly and constructively achieved, but had the leadership been less intelligent, industrious and determined, it would have failed.

It must not be supposed that the evils of the static mind are restricted to the conservative. It is frequently found in its most pernicious forms among the radicals. The slavish worship of trite phrases and the substitution of panaceas for critical and constructive thought, is a common error among the ranks of radicals. The naive dependence upon the maxim that "the remedy for the evils of democracy is more democracy" is an excellent case in point. Innumerable instances may be cited where men have staked all their hope of social progress upon some particular reform such as proportional representation, the single tax or a particular brand of socialism. Not only that, but instances

may be cited where socialistic legislators have actually opposed remedial legislation, though admitting its efficiency, because it was not consistent with a theory, or might weaken their party's power. In such a case theories are given a greater value than life, and party strength is preferred to social progress.

Perhaps a warning should be given here against the idea that the alternative to a static mind is the creation of a desire for change. Nothing could be further from the truth, though it is an easy mistake to make. The remedy is not a mind predisposed to change, but predisposed to observe critically, to analyze accurately and to think sanely.

Another common manifestation of the evils of a static mind is found in the failure of many to regard government as a means to an end. They think of it only as an end within itself. To such a person the primary purpose of government is to preserve itself in its existing particulars. Any change is to be vigorously opposed, therefore, regardless of its merits. The true purpose of government, however, is generally conceived to be to serve the highest interests of its people and of humanity, and the test of any proposed change is its effectiveness in the accomplishment of this great end. Its purpose is not to vindicate any set principles of government but to serve mankind.

In a small city in the Middle West a group of intelligent leaders became interested in the project of establishing supervised playgrounds and recreational opportunities for all the children in the city. It was a backward community and there was much to be accomplished. The general moral and social conditions among the children were discouraging. Young boys frequented questionable places of amusement, and the evidences of general moral delinquency were startling. A comprehensive program was planned which would make it possible to reach every child in the public

school, and continuous service was arranged during the summer when the loitering children most needed such attention.

In the course of time the plan became involved in the fortunes of local politics, and it became an issue in a public election. There were arrayed against it such special interests as the saloons and the pool-rooms, but the measure seemed assured of popular support, until an opponent discovered one day that the plan was "socialistic." That was the argument that defeated it. It is improbable that many of the persons in the city had any definite idea as to what it meant to be "socialistic," or as to whether the proposed program could be honestly so described. That was not essential. In the minds of many it was the prime function of the community to kill anything called "socialistic" and to that end the community quite cheerfully sacrificed the moral and physical well-being of the children. They misapprehended the real and only purpose of government. They determined their action by a false and inadequate standard of values. The only legitimate question before them was whether or not the proposed program was a sane and effective means of helping their boys and girls, and of serving the highest interests of their community. Until they are able to analyze this fundamental issue and to apply a standard of real values, they are not prepared for the intelligent performance of civic duty.

How may this evolutionary point of view be developed? The illustrations of the operation of the static mind should afford some suggestions, for the student having the problem vividly presented to him will at once be interested in its solution. The instinct of curiosity should be continuously employed by the use of suggestive questions and the setting of problems. Nothing should ever be studied, no institution

considered, without inquiring as to the facts and conditions that gave it birth.

In the early part of this chapter the question of the theory of democracy held by the fathers was suggested as an excellent problem for training the student in critical observation. Having come to his conclusions, then ask him from whence those theories come. What experiences and conceptions produced them? What are the present theories of democracy? What are the changes? What tendencies or forces caused the changes?

In like manner let him trace through the conception of liberty, as used in the revolutionary days, and compare it with liberty as used to-day. Take the conception of suffrage, at first granted only to a very small and select class of adult males, and now granted to all normal persons of adult years. Why has it been done? What forces produced it? What tendencies are thus exhibited? The student soon gets the idea that things are relative; that a conception that seemed adequate and true a century ago, no longer holds, and what we honestly believe to-day may be discarded in the light of new experiences and clearer vision on the morrow. A student so trained will have a reasonably sure insurance against bigotry and excessive credulity.

No more fascinating problem can be set the boy or girl than the tracing out of cause and effect in the development of the life of the community, national and local. And yet how rarely is this adopted as the habitual method of instruction? The study of local rural government affords a splendid opportunity. How many children have received the impression that the New England town meeting was adopted by the Puritans of New England as a result of their love of liberty, while the county commissioner system, prevailing in the South, was due to a disdain for

liberty, that might be expected from a people who were a little tardy in their conversion to the gospel of emancipation. Yet this cheap exploitation of sectional prejudice has been by no means uncommon.

How much more instructive and effective it would be to call attention to the different types found in the different sections, and set the problem of explaining how the two different types happened to develop as they did. The student would learn that the Puritans of New England found themselves surrounded by hostile Indians, the land unsuited to agriculture, and commerce and manufacturing the main occupations. The result was that they lived together in the stockades for safety, and had no occasion to scatter out on farms or plantations. Living together under such circumstances it was inevitable that their simple problems of community life should be discussed and settled in local meetings. It was not a matter of conviction to the cause of liberty, but an obvious convenience under the circumstances of the case.

On the other hand, in the South the situation was just the opposite. The land was well suited to agriculture, the natural system of waterways enabled the settlers to scatter far throughout the land, and the friendly character of the Indians made possible the isolated life upon the plantation. Under these conditions community business could only be conveniently transacted by the representatives of the people, meeting at a central place. A town meeting would be highly inconvenient and impractical, if not impossible. This tracing of cause and effect is not only a fascinating problem, it is the only method that makes history and government real and vivid, that presents a true perspective and develops the evolutionary point of view.

The absolute reversal of governmental theory that occurred among the fathers in the short period intervening

between the drafting of the Articles of Confederation and the adoption of the Federal Constitution presents a striking opportunity for the employment of the problem method. Under the Articles of Confederation there was no central government, no executive, no authority. The people, impressed by the British conflict between Parliament and the Crown, were skeptical of executive power. They viewed with suspicion any proposal for a central government lest it impair the right of the colonies and the liberties of the individual. But only a few years later the same people ratified the Federal Constitution, creating one of the strongest executive positions at the head of government to be found anywhere, giving the central government full and plenary power over foreign affairs, military and naval matters, interstate and foreign commerce, and many other matters of general concern. Moreover they conferred upon the central government adequate authority to enforce whatever powers the Constitution had conferred upon it.

This direct and sudden reversal of policy presents an interesting problem that can not help but arouse the interest and enthusiasm of the class. Its solution will be found in the experience of the colonies under the Articles of Confederation. There is a fascinating story of the hostile competition between the thirteen original and discordant colonies. Naturally suspicious, they vied with one another, with competitive zeal, in the shirking and evasion of the taxes, and other duties levied upon them by the Continental Congress, and violated any treaty that might be made when it seemed to their advantage so to do. Each state, trying to gain wealth at the expense of its neighbor, levied excessive duties and erected discriminating barriers. Moreover, there were controversies over boundary lines and land claims that threatened serious bloodshed.

The result was that the public peace was threatened, com-

merce was impeded, treaties were flouted, national debts were unpaid, and national dishonor threatened. Intrigue, selfishness and disorder seemed the order of the day. The evils had to be corrected. Order had to follow chaos. The national honor had to be preserved and public obligations paid. Commerce between the states had to be free and unrestrained. Its regulations had to be uniform and impartial between the states. The military and naval forces had to be placed under centralized authority, and dependent upon the power of government, rather than upon voluntary offerings, in order to be efficient.

However much the fathers may have been devoted to theory, above all things they were practical. The reversal of governmental theory was the inevitable result of the teachings of practical experience. When their theories did not work, they were wise enough to abandon them. In spite of the obvious opportunity afforded by this incident in our constitutional history, in a group of some fifty teachers of civics recently, not a single teacher had ever thought of utilizing it. Is it any wonder that we develop static minds, that civics is uninteresting, or that civic training is inadequate?

The writer has visited the classes in civics of a teacher who approaches all the important topics of civics, both contemporary and historical, with the problem method and from this point of view. This teacher has never had difficulty with the problem of interest or attention. In working out the solutions to these problems, the students have learned to use all the information at their command, as well as their own observation and experience. The recitation room is a laboratory to which every student brings the materials of his information and thought to be carefully worked over by the teacher and the group. The writer has never seen such instincts of curiosity as this class disclosed.

Superficial explanations did not suffice. They handled their materials with a self-confidence and an interest that seemed nothing short of remarkable. They were a group of thinkers, and were receiving the exact training that every citizen ought to have. What can be done with this class can be done with other classes, whenever we can get teachers with background, with imagination, and with a deep sense of responsibility, to do the work.

The development of critical habits of thought and the evolutionary point of view bring with them a valuable by-product that is most important—a love for the thing that we call truth. No student can be directed along these habits of thought, in the daily effort to discover the realities of life, in which their discovery is made the immediate object of their effort and the measure of their success, without developing a genuine appreciation and attachment for truth. Habits of intellectual honesty become established, which will have a deep personal as well as social significance.

The development of these intellectual traits, as a necessary part of civic training, should now seem obvious in the light of the illustrations afforded by our political history. One might have the most marvelous instinctive development, the finest and most generous emotions, the keenest native intellect, but, unless one also has the capacity to see life as it is, to interpret and understand its unfolding truths, to analyze the confusing evidence and to keep his head clear amid the glamour and confusion of party strife, he might still fall an unwilling prey to the demagogue's persuasive pleas.

The political contests into which our young citizens are emerging promise now to be the most bitter that America has ever seen. The stakes will be larger. The leaders will be more determined. Issues will be presented in the confused and delusive light of class and economic bias. In the

tempestuous storm that we see approaching, the pressure will be tremendous. Short-cut solutions to fundamental problems will be urged. New conceptions and values will be pressed for consideration and adoption. In the midst of these perplexing problems, the citizen of the future must be prepared to find his way. With keen and accurate analysis he must penetrate the confusing issues, he must discover the real and fundamental difficulty, and with a clear head and an open mind, he must struggle with the gigantic problem of their just and equitable solution.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. In a presidential campaign one of the candidates continually declared that the fundamental issue was "shall the people rule." Criticize in detail the statement. What harm might such an issue do?

2. Illustrate how a vigorous emotional life may become a menace to a democracy unless accompanied by the proper intellectual equipment.

3. Trace the organic relation between habits of critical observation and the utilization of the social instincts as an important factor in democracy.

4. Give your own analysis of the prolonged failure of public opinion to respond to the movement for the juvenile court. What suggestions can you offer in connection with our present training in the public school that will make the future citizen grapple with similar problems in a more effective manner?

5. In the teaching of history, civics, literature and similar subjects, how may we imbue the student with a profound faith in truth, and in humanity, without at the same time developing credulity.

6. If you wanted to teach the Civil War by the problem method, what specific problems would you suggest? What benefits would you expect to gain from this method?

7. How important is the instinct of curiosity in teaching? How may it best be utilized? How do you go about, consciously, to utilize it in your teaching?

8. What evils of the static mind have you encountered the most in the school-room? How do you seek to correct the fundamental difficulty?

9. What examples of the bigotry of the static mind have come to your attention in public life? How harmful have they been?

10. Why can not the best results in teaching social science always be secured by the problem method? What are the difficulties?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gettell, Raymond G., *Problems in Political Evolution* (Ginn & Co., 1914).

Chapter I, "The Evolution of the State."

Chapter II, "Influence Affecting Political Evolution."

Lowell, A. Lawrence, *Public Opinion and Popular Government* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1913).

Part I, "The Nature of Public Opinion."

Coman, Katherine, *Industrial History of the United States* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1913).

Bryce, James, *The American Commonwealth* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1907).

Volume II, Part IV, "Public Opinion."

Smith, Reginald H., *Justice and the Poor* (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1919).

Wallas, Graham, *Human Nature in Politics* (Houghton, Mifflin Company, Boston, 1919).

Part II, "Possibilities of Progress."

Eliot, Thomas D., *The Juvenile Court and the Community* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1914).

Aronovici, Carol, *The Social Survey* (Harper Press, Philadelphia, 1916).

Note: The value of most of the references cited above is that they will furnish additional illustrative material.

CHAPTER IV

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF GOVERNMENT

IN THE stress and strain of reconstruction, with its ominous spirit of unrest, its radical and revolutionary tendencies, and its spirit of challenge to the very foundations of society, the evolutionary point of view is increasingly to be desired. A long time view of government, as a process of social evolution, is the only adequate safeguard against the myopic attitude induced by the intensity of immediate problems. Moreover, the evolutionary view-point affords the only intelligent basis for the accurate formulation of a political theory and the solution of social problems.

This view-point, however, can not be imparted at the teacher's will. It can not be convincingly established as a problem in formal logic or a demonstration in mathematics. To be effective it must become a habit of thought, a point of view whose foundations are deeply imbedded in habits and experiences. Like the technique of a musician, it must become an automatic practise—the established, unquestioned method of procedure. Unlike the musician's technique, however, it generally can not be formally presented nor consciously acquired. This difficulty should be frankly recognized, and the hope of the immediate conversion of the pupil to this point of view should be abandoned. It may be accurately explained to the pupil. The concept may be accepted as proper, and may merit his approval even, but it does not become effective until he has acquired the habit of thinking in those terms, and has accumulated experiences, garnered through that method of approach.

This evolutionary point of view must, then, become a habit, fastened upon the pupil's intellectual life by its continuous and persistent repetition. I have seen teachers who rendered lip service to the idea, and who sincerely believed that they practised it effectively. At the beginning of the course in civics, they would carefully explain it, and follow it up by a few orthodox illustrations, and then proceed with the remainder of the work in its flagrant, though unconscious, violation. I once heard a teacher make a convincing exposition of the evolutionary point of view in the beginning of the course, and then proceed directly from that splendid beginning, to an uncritical discussion of the Federal Constitution, using the famous phrase of Gladstone in describing it as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." She accepted these words at their face value, and construed them to imply that our organic law was not the product of experience, but a production, *de novo,* from the inspired genius of its framers.

To this teacher the evolutionary conception, or point of view, was only an isolated bit of academic theory, to be memorized but not applied. The result was a fundamental misconception of the nature of human progress, the loss of opportunity to make the topic a group of problems of unceasing interest and fascination, and the development in the child of a static attitude toward life and truth.

The topic of this chapter may not seem to have any special value or utility to those engaged in secondary education. Many will doubtless think it more appropriate for work of a collegiate or university character. From the view-point of content alone, this may perhaps be true. But in training citizenship, subject-matter and information are relatively unimportant. The thing we are interested in is the boy or girl. Their mental and moral development is the great

object of civic education. Civics, history, community study and the other parts of the curriculum, are but means to this definite end. That being the case, we should choose those subjects and topics which are best suited to the task at hand.

For that reason, any discussion of government, politics, or society, might very profitably be introduced with the consideration of the present topic. The "taking for granted" attitude regarding organized society is extremely unfortunate. It permits and encourages the static conceptions of social origins. With this method, the student inevitably comes to his study of society with the idea that it is a machine, rather than a process; that it has been created rather than evolved. It naturally follows that the machinery of society is the center of attention. If there are social and economic ills, merely mend or repair the machine, and presto! the ills are gone. Panaceas are seized with great avidity, because they seem to bring perfection to the social organism. Reckless and impossible promises of demagogues are credulously accepted, because changes in governmental forms may be so easily perfected.

Because of these factors, the hope and altruistic enthusiasm of each generation tends to be squandered upon impossible desires and Utopian programs. The agitation for the Australian ballot affords an excellent example. Its advocates contended that with its adoption the problem of democracy was solved. It was a tremendously important step, amply justified by subsequent experience, but it never began to accomplish the wonders so buoyantly prophesied. By concentrating their hopes and intentions so completely on this one reform, other matters of equally great importance were ignored, while the fundamental problem of civic training, as the only enduring basis of efficient democracy, was practically forgotten.

These conditions are inevitable, as long as our people are allowed to hold the static, mechanistic conception of government and society. If everybody were brought to see the truth, at the beginning, a different attitude would inevitably result. If the student realized that organized society was a slow and patient process of social evolution, operating throughout the ages; that the ideal and spirit of democracy have slowly and painfully evolved through centuries of human struggle; and that our own institutions of society are the products of generations of trial and error, in which our mightiest intellects and most courageous leaders have shown the way, they would sooner realize the impotence of panaceas, would waste less energy in the pursuits of political "cure-alls," and would recognize the profound and fundamental character of the problems of democracy.

Nor would they necessarily become discouraged by the magnitude of the problem nor the slowness of its solution, for with the evolutionary approach, with the careful study of the forces of human development, there comes a profound faith in the ultimate progress of humanity. Such progress may be slow, but it is inevitable, and it affords an alluring appeal to those who will, to devote their zeal to the upward struggle.

The effect of the artificial or mechanistic conception of the state is reflected in many of the suggested explanations of its origin, such as the theory of the social compact. This theory is that the state originated in formal agreement. People lived in anarchy or chaos until they entered into an agreement to create a state or government. This theory has been widely accepted, although a moment's critical consideration demonstrates its fallacy. In the first place, historic evidence of the theory is absolutely lacking. Secondly, the theory assumes the conscious idea of political organization

instead of explaining its source. As explaining the origin of organized society, it is, therefore, necessarily wholly inadequate. Finally, history affords no evidence of the relationship between the state and the individual being contractual, which would indicate very strongly that the state did not originate with agreement.

In spite of these facts the theory has at times been widely held. It rendered valuable service at the time of the American Revolution, when much of the ethical justification of revolution was drawn from the premises afforded by the compact theory. It has indirectly served a useful purpose, also, in that it tended to emphasize the fact that government should exist for the benefit of the governed, which is sound American doctrine to-day.

On the other hand it has worked no little harm. It has given us a conception of individual rights that tends to be too static and absolute. Such conceptions have blocked progress and impeded development. The temperance program, the prohibition of child labor, the effective regulation of monopoly, have all been greatly retarded because of the popular conceptions of private rights as dogmatic and absolute concepts, with which nothing should be permitted to interfere. Individual liberty and private right are the most precious possessions of our people. But their content is relative, not absolute. Their very preservation depends upon our ability to adjust them to the evolving needs and conditions of our national life.

A conception of liberty which insisted upon the inalienable right of the child of tender years to sacrifice education, youth, health and character for a weekly wage, is a mockery of justice, while a conception that sought to preserve liberty of conscience, freedom of speech, and adequate safeguards against arbitrary and despotic power, is indispensable to democratic institutions.

Another false account of the origin of organized society, springing from the mechanistic conception of the state, is the doctrine of divine right, that governments were established by rulers who received their authority and power from God. While this doctrine has recently received startling support from the German emperor, it has long since been repudiated by democratic peoples.

These and other impossible explanations of the origin of the organized state, are the products of a false attitude toward society. There is always the tendency to make it too conventional and too simple. The truth is that the origin of society can not be traced to any single cause or force. It is a complex of many forces, natural and spiritual, that have operated throughout the centuries, each force and century contributing its increment to the dawning consciousness of political life.

The historical or evolutionary theory of the state is the one now generally accepted. It regards the state as the inevitable product of the reactions of the human instincts to the environment of nature. The instincts were the motivating forces, and the environment provided the conditions under which the struggles for the satisfaction of instinctive wants were fought. Conditions were such, that in time these wants could only be adequately supplied by some rude form of cooperative effort, and thus unwittingly the basis of political life was being laid. Professor Burgess has given an excellent statement of the theory. "It means," he writes, "to go a little deeper into the psychology of the subject, that it is the gradual realization, in legal institutions, of the universal principles of human nature, and the gradual subordination of the individual side of that nature to the universal side." In other words, individual interests gradually were subordinated to the necessities of the cooperative effort demanded in the struggle for existence.

This process becomes more significant and obvious as we trace in rude outline the various stages in the development of political organization. Professor Dealey has for the sake of convenience, treated this development as comprised of four stages, the formative period, the period of settled social institutions, the period of urban civilization, and the period of industrial civilization.* Since this development has been largely conditioned upon the economic factors in the environment, economic periods were adopted as the basis. This classification will be followed here in our discussion.

In the early part of this period man was doubtless little removed from the other animals in his manner of life. There could have been no political consciousness, no cooperative effort, no exercise of forethought. Complete dependence must have been placed upon the bounty of nature for food and nourishment. Property and law in their most elementary forms had not yet appeared. Whatever family life there was, was of the natural matriarchal type.

From these rude conditions, man's capacity to learn, to generalize from observation, and to profit by experience, enabled him to develop the beginnings of social and political life. Desire to satisfy instinctive want, in which hunger may have played a dominant rôle, provided the dynamic power. The pangs of hunger stimulated dormant intellect, and hunting was evolved as an additional method of securing food. With the development of primitive arms and tools, there began to dawn the idea of private property, though property in land was yet unknown. As hunting developed, there ensued competition for the better hunting-grounds, and thus there arose another need of forming into groups, in this case for the protection of the better

*Dealey, J. Q., *The Development of the State,* Chap. II.

hunting lands, against the aggressions of competing foes. When there were more interests to be protected, the advantages of cooperative effort for defense were obvious, even to the most primitive of intellects.

Thus men united in loosely organized groups, frequently called hordes, brought together primarily for the purpose of obtaining food, and providing for mutual offense and defense. These forces were supplemented by the more primitive of the social instincts. In such groups leadership, authority, custom and similar notions, in their most elementary form, were necessarily developed. But a civilization, resting upon an economic basis so insecure, could not develop great strength, endurance or permanency. Consequently their conceptions of property, custom and political organization were necessarily vague, uncertain and indefinite.

In reaching the second period, characterized by the development of settled social and political institutions, the same fundamental principles seemed to have prevailed. It was the same old process of subordinating individual caprice to the necessities of cooperative effort. Customs, laws, authority and institutions did not develop except by degrees, and to the extent that the contending masses of humanity found them useful aids in their struggle for existence.

One very important step, doubtless, was the discovery that animals might be domesticated. Thus, by the exercise of forethought and self-denial, men found they could protect themselves against the days of scarcity. The effect of such discovery upon the methods of life and organization was fundamental. The flocks of domesticated animals became tribal property, which brought individuals into much closer relations, by increasing the immediate interest and stake that the individual enjoyed in the strength and wealth of the group. Transient hordes thus became permanently

and closely united by the joint possession of a common food supply.

In addition, the possession of such wealth aroused the envy and anger of hungry neighbors. The struggles for defense became proportionately more bitter. This required greater group efficiency for defense, and this necessitated stronger leadership, more definite authority, and greater individual subordination. Group boundaries became more definite, and the sense of group interests more firmly established. Custom and laws, tending to increase the strength and efficiency of the group, became established as the community of interest became more obvious, through the existence of common property, common needs and common foes.

In such a civilization, with an accumulated food supply, there came moments of leisure, when the social and spiritual instincts of the race could find opportunity for primitive expression. Art, religion and similar interests began to be expressed, and moral conceptions to develop.

An interesting observation has been reported, which brings home with unusual vividness the degree to which individual rights were subjected to group interests. It is said that in some of the primitive communities, it became the fixed custom for mothers to murder their female babies. In the savage warfare developed between the various groups, women were not useful. If a community had too many women, it would be captured and eaten, or subjected to slavery by competing groups whose membership contained a higher percentage of warriors. To meet this condition, the rule of female infanticide was adopted. Doubtless the mother's love for her offspring was as strong then as it is to-day, but it had to give way to the larger interests of the community. The identification of the individual's welfare with that of the community under the simple but strenuous life

that then prevailed, was so obvious and the necessity for the rule so clear, that obedience was secured.

Herein lies, in part, the secret of respect for law, tradition and authority, that has prevailed from time to time among uncivilized societies. Conditions were so simple that the necessity for laws and their obedience, as a measure of self-protection, were apparent. In the complicated society of to-day, the relations between self-interests and community welfare are no longer so direct and obvious, though clearly equal in importance. Genuine respect for law and order did not originate in moral preachments upon the subject, but out of a keen realization of its imperative necessity to individual and community well-being. It does not seem unreasonable to suppose, therefore, that the same thing holds true to-day. Reverence for law and order will come now, only as it did originally, when we have made its importance clear to every mind. In the complicated conditions of to-day, it presents a more difficult problem and can be solved only by educational efforts. Train the child to see the human significance of government, what its failure or success may mean to him and to his loved ones, and let him be brought to the vivid realization that law, authority and government are but the instruments through which society cooperates for human betterment and progress. Obedience to law and order then becomes a mere matter of effective cooperation, and not a blind submission to authority. Out of this process and understanding may come a profound respect for established order as a conscious instrument of progress.

Returning now to the question of the development of primitive society, perhaps the most important single factor after the domestication of animals, in rounding out the development of the period of settled social institutions, was

the advent of agriculture. This gave a great impetus to the growth of civilization. It may be supposed that the pressure of increasing population, the difficulty of finding adequate grazing lands for the expanding flocks, and the desire to vary the diet composed so largely of flesh, all combined to bring about the development of agriculture, as a necessary means of economic support.

The social and political consequences of this development were enormous. People were not willing to sow unless they had some assurance that they might also reap. This meant the definite group ownership of definite lands with fixed and definite boundaries. It meant still greater interest in the methods of defense and offense. It meant more highly organized effort, and the beginning of the division of labor. The increased productive capacity of agriculture resulted in an increased density of population. Competition for the possession of the best agricultural lands also increased the necessity for more effective military efforts.

The inevitable result of all of these centralizing and stabilizing forces was the slow evolution of the horde into the more complex and highly organized group commonly called the tribe. This change may have taken countless centuries, for the primitive peoples learned slowly, and there are some backward peoples on the earth to-day who have not even yet reached the period we are here trying to describe.

These conditions, and the continuous wars that accompanied them, still further defined the notions of authority, law, order and obedience. Warfare required leaders with authority who might compel obedience. The increasing density of population brought on new possibilities of friction between individuals, which required the development of laws, customs and tradition, and the recognition of established authority within the tribe.

The development of morals, supported by the public opin-

ion of the group, followed the obvious need of tribal warfare. Cannibalism was abolished in favor of slavery. With the agricultural period, came the need for increased labor, which was neither exciting nor attractive. It did not require a vast deal of intelligence to discover that an enemy captured in war would provide more food as a slave than as a meal, and consequently cannibalism became immoral, as contrary to the best interests of the tribe. This throws a significant light upon the origin of primitive morals, and affords a splendid introduction to the modern conception of social ethics. Slavery, which to-day is considered as a curse, was at one time a distinctly moral conception, and marked a great step in moral development. The question of ethics thus becomes an evolutionary conception, rather than a dogmatic rule. Through this study, the child is thus being unconsciously prepared for an intelligent, practical and enlarging conception of the great problems of our social and political life.

With these developments came many changes in political institutions. The tribe tended to break into smaller units, frequently called clans, which settled into small, more compact, and more highly organized communities, adopting the patriarchal form of organization. Describing the organization of these communities, Professor Dealey writes, "The headship of the clan was vested in the oldest male of the leading family, but tended to pass from father to son. Religion secured a powerful hold on the mind by emphasis on ancestral worship. The family became permanent and definite, but included a wider range of kin than the modern family. The entire clan was virtually one great family looking to the head as the Patriarch or ruling father who guided and protected his children. They bore a common name, had a common system of worship and cultivated their lands and pastured their herds in common. Their disputes were

settled and their affairs regulated by the heads of households in joint session under the leadership of their chief. In this system each village community was itself a petty state voicing its sovereignty through the chief of the clan, who was assisted in his deliberations by the older and more influential men under his authority. Such a community by inter-marriage became closely kindred in blood and in social customs, and thus developed a homogeneous, autonomous, self-centered life, that gave wonderful permanence to that form of organization."

These clans developed relations among themselves which finally culminated in various types of loose confederations, either through permanent alliances, or through one powerful community making itself superior over its lesser neighbors. Some form of inter-clan organization seemed inevitable, since intercourse between them was necessary, and such relations generally led either to hostile competition or useful cooperation, and the latter implied organization. Marriage alliances, commercial intercourse, common worship, and joint action for offense and defense in times of war, were the forces through which inter-clan organizations tended to develop. With the absorption of competing clans into the larger confederations, wars became less frequent by the lessening of the number of potential enemies, and the new organizations became more powerful against the enemies that remained.

From such conditions tribal monarchies could easily develop. Permanence and stability were obtained. Public opinion became more articulate. Law, authority and government became still more clearly delineated. A sense of political consciousness had begun to dawn, and the elements of the modern state were thus slowly and rudely formed. In these communities, however, there was no distinction between state, family and church, for all were one. At the

end of this period, however, this distinction began to become apparent, and the state stood out as a separate institution, representing the organized political life of the community.

The third stage of political life, known as the period of urban civilization, was largely the product of commercial forces. The advent of agriculture had greatly facilitated the creation of wealth. Men now produced a surplus above the bare necessities of physical existence, and this gave immediate stimulus to the process of barter and sale, which developed in magnitude and efficiency, under the new demands. New wants were created, and there developed commercial relations between communities producing and those desiring the products of the day. Improved forms of communication were established, mediums of exchange devised, and the special business of the merchant became established.

In the wake of these developments came the city. Merchants established themselves in the midst of the fertile lands, in proximity to mining districts, or along the ways of travel. The termini of trade routes became centers of business, and here were gathered together the wealth and business interests of the community. Stopping places along the main channels of trade were established for the convenience of travelers, and these also became centers of urban population.

By the cosmopolitan influences thus exerted through the forces of commerce, travel became common, while competition between groups stimulated mentality and inventive genius, created new wants, and accelerated interest in all phases of human development.

Here were new interests to be served, new problems to be solved, new functions to be performed, for which the old established political and legal conceptions were inadequate. New laws dealing with barter and sale, medium of

exchange, private ownership of property, merchandising of goods, and innumerable other subjects were required. Commerce between clans and loose confederations became so profitable and common that rules and customs regulating such relations developed, and the basis of diplomacy and international law began slowly to develop. New problems arose with such rapidity and complexity that the slow developing customs and traditions, enforced largely by public opinion, could not keep pace. The process of consciously framing and promulgating rules and regulations for the solution of problems, developed while the old traditions and customs were frequently codified by public authority.

The administration of public affairs increased so tremendously in importance and amount under these circumstances that public administration became a separate business, and a class of public officials followed. While, heretofore, the development of the state had been more instinctive than conscious, as humanity, struggling with the problems of nature, had instinctively gathered into such groups and developed such traditions as their daily experience demonstrated was essential to their existence, here they began to use their conceptions of the state, government and laws as valuable instruments with which to struggle with their common problems. This was a great step in the advancement of civilization, and enabled humanity to grapple more effectively with the questions that a rapidly changing social and economic life presented.

As Professor Dealey observes, such development "demanded changes in political organization. The members of a conservative village community living in practically the same way as their fathers, might well continue the customs and habits of their ancestors. But when the population and wealth of the community increased by leaps and bounds, when strangers of wealth and brain capacity settled

in ever larger numbers within their borders, modifications had to be made. The village lord became a king, his little council became a great body of advisers and administrators, the petty business of the village became a mass of duties requiring the services of many hundreds. Then followed centralization of authority, codification of customs and introduction of business methods in administration, through the organization of great departments of state. Increasingly larger numbers of influential residents, whether native or foreign by descent, shared in the responsibility of government. Such modifications brought about the development of the city state, best known through the classic examples of Greece and Rome, but found in all early civilizations characterized by a developed commercial life."

It was from the city states so developed that there arose the Roman empire, extending its control in all directions, and developing a monarchy much stronger and more unified than had been found before. The tendency toward centralization and expansion reached its crest in the rise of the Holy Roman empire, and the ambition of the papacy for temporal power. The failure of these schemes, together with the awakening spirit of nationality that occurred in the centuries that followed, resulted in the growth of civilization being directed again along the lines of national development.

The fourth stage in the political development of the world, known as the period of industrial civilization, followed about the middle of the eighteenth century, with the application of machinery to the manufacture and transportation of goods. The advancement of civilization has always been dependent upon the supply of food and other material wants. Population easily increases under favorable conditions, but food and other material things come only by physical work and mental toil. All the great eras in human ad-

vancement have been preceded by permanent additions to the food supplies. With such increases in the necessities of life, there are released great quantities of energy, before absorbed in the object of food getting, for new types of productive enterprise and mental effort.

Thus with the tremendously increased production, made possible by the industrial revolution, marvelous social and economic changes were inevitable, and political life had to be adjusted accordingly. "As a further result of the development," again quoting Professor Dealey, "commerce has multiplied past all precedent, every corner of the habitable earth has become known and explored, hermit nations are forced out for better or for worse into western civilization, and governmental activity has expanded so as to meet new conditions. Larger interests, greater wealth and increased population give greater fighting power, and to the leading nations the old struggle for empire once more comes to the front. They strain every nerve to develop material and mental capacity, so as to attain supremacy in international competition; they seek to expand by extending their sway over nations inferior in attainment, and they readjust their political organizations so as to manage more wisely their great interests. In such an age as this political change is inevitable. World politics finds no place for the petty state, the backward nation, the ultraconservative people. Broad and high intelligence, moral energy, capacity for hard work and bold initiative and invention are the virtues of the age. Intelligence in the state involves democracy in the system; immense resources demand executive and administrative capacity; the necessity of accomplishing a desired end by concentrating every possible ounce of energy at the proper place, insures concentration of governmental power. Such capacities and virtues, in a struggle for national existence or world supremacy, are not matters of indifference

but necessities for survival, and hence the present age tends to develop a political life suited to the attainment by states of whatever will contribute to the highest development of their peoples."

Another inevitable result of the conditions is found in the foreign policies of all foreign nations, including the United States. To-day all of their policies are based fundamentally upon considerations of economic imperialism. This is not necessarily so because they desire it, but because it is a necessary result of the condition of the world. It is essential to the maintenance of national strength and vigor. For instance, America is now an industrial, rather than an agricultural, nation. For some time we have been producing more manufactured goods than we have been consuming. That means that we must find a foreign market for our surplus, or our industries will decline, while the nation that sells to the markets of the world prospers in strength and wealth. Under the circumstances there is no other alternative, if America would retain her strength and power, than to enter into the world-wide competition for foreign trade.

But this is a hazardous undertaking. It has been recently reported that seventy per cent. of the people of England live upon the profit of overseas commerce. That means that unless England can keep her share of the world's trade, a corresponding number of her people must either starve or live on the bounty of others. That in turn would be the end of British power. With England, it is a matter of life or death. What is true of England, is true to some extent of France, Belgium, Germany and Japan. For America to enter into competition with these great powers, for the very life-blood of national existence, is bound to lead to friction and toward another period of world conflict.

These nations must have an assured access to the markets of the world. They must have increasing supplies of raw

materials to keep their factories employed. As they amass their surplus wealth, they must have opportunities for its profitable employment in the more backward countries. The amount of world trade at any one time is limited. The known sources of raw material are not inexhaustible. The opportunities for the profitable investment in backward countries are capable of being monopolized. No nation, including America, can afford to lag behind in this contest for survival. Consequently there has ensued the contest for colonies, for spheres of influence, for protectorates, and for special concessions among backward peoples.

Under the circumstances, the position of the weaker nations, with valuable sources of raw material to be exploited, and affording potential markets for the future, is most hazardous and insecure. The scramble for trade and for empire makes another world conflict inevitable, unless the nations, appalled at the tremendous sacrifice that it exacts, conscious that any settlement so secured can be but temporary, can create an international organization, wherein the united forces of all can safeguard the security of each. If all the backward countries toward whom the great nations now look with envious eyes would have their independence thus assured, and no nation would have ground to fear that it would be monopolized by its competitor, a great source of danger would be removed, and a measure of equal opportunity in foreign trade might be assured to all the powers.

Out of these conditions has come a movement for a league of nations, in which the nations prepare to unite to serve jointly their nationalistic purposes which they can not protect separately. For under the present régime, national life and vigor rest upon no more certain foundation than the fickle channels of trade and the accidents of modern wars, where alliances and ententes only add to the bewildering

uncertainties of military victories. The movement for a sane world organization thus rests, not upon any sentimental basis of internationalism, but upon the most far-sighted and practical nationalism.

International organization, like all other forms of political institutions in human development, will succeed only in so far as it is an effectual instrument for serving human needs. This is one lesson that the story of the development of the state must not fail to teach. If the league of nations is to endure, therefore, it will be because it is an effective means of providing adequate safeguards to the peaceful and lawful development of the several nations. If it does not provide this, it can not endure.

To those with the evolutionary point of view, who have followed the course of economic and social development, the need of some form of international organization, to save civilization from the wreck of future wars and the bolshevism that tends to follow in their wake, becomes self-evident. The political and organizing genius of the race, that has evolved the political ideas for the horde, the tribe, the clan, the city state, the nation and the world empires of to-day, must now create a political organization that will meet the immediate international needs of the great powers of the world. This is the next step in the great process of human evolution. If it does not come this generation, it will come the next. The opposition to the fundamental principles of such movements comes from those with static minds, who lack the evolutionary point of view. They regard change as unnatural. They rally around the battle cry that one can't change human nature. But the facts are that the basic elements of human nature make change and development inevitable. In this fact lies the hope of humanity. In these great world movements, in which men are struggling to secure new safeguards for civilization, and

new guarantees against the enemies of mankind, such movements as those looking to a practical world organization represent not the defiance of human nature, but the unfolding development of its divine splendor.

The successive stages by which men have supplanted conflict with cooperation, license with liberty, and chaos with law, have evidenced with unmistakable clearness that the pathway of human nature is the pathway of progress, development and evolution. Those who, through selfish interest or hopeless ignorance, seek to oppose the progress of society, are the real enemies to the forces of human nature. They may impede but they can not stop its onward march. On the other hand, those who comprehend the nature of social progress—who have the evolutionary point of view—they are the ones upon whom society must depend for the vision, the energy and the leadership that will direct the contending forces and facilitate humanity's upward struggle.

Not only is the knowledge of the nature and necessities of the modern industrial state essential to the understanding of the modern tendencies in diplomacy and world politics, but it is also indispensable to an understanding of the internal development of modern governments. The relative simplicity of our governmental machinery of a century and a half ago, as compared with that of to-day, is appalling. Has there developed a needless complexity in the mazes of which democracy is about to lose itself? Does it mean that we have lost our political moorings, and are wandering dangerously and needlessly along the pathway of paternalistic government and state socialism? These are questions that thinking people can not evade, and their answers can only be ascertained by inquiring into the underlying causes of this complex development. If we have only added new machinery of government to meet the problems that a rapidly

evolving civilization has presented, and we still adhere to the ideal of equal opportunity for all, there may be little cause for fear.

One has but to contemplate the vast and revolutionary changes that have followed in the wake of the industrial revolution, to realize that the simple political conceptions of the fathers, while sound in fundamental principles, were wholly inadequate in detail for the modern problems. Before the industrial revolution, only about three per cent. of our people lived in cities, while to-day over forty per cent. live in cities of over eight thousand inhabitants. These cities, largely the result of the factory system, have been conditioned, both in their development, location and tendencies, upon considerations of economic expediency. It made no difference how unwholesome a place might be, how unsightly the surroundings, or how overcrowded it already was, if a great factory could be profitably established, because of its proximity to raw material, to distributing centers, or to unusual transportation facilities, there the factory was located, and there the men and women who depended upon factory labor for their living were compelled to live, whether or no.

With such conditions arose new problems of public health, sanitation and tenements. Adequate safeguards against the spread of contagious disease to a degree unheard of before, now became essential. With the rapid growth of these industrial centers, came the tenement-house problem with its moral, physical and spiritual implications, which could not be ignored. In the congested areas, it became necessary to provide breathing areas, public parks and playgrounds, and to see that conditions prevailed that were conducive to health and morals.

Public utilities were then established and their inseparable relation to housing, health, morals and the necessities of

life, at once required their regulation by the state. The constitutional rights of stockholders had to be protected, and the investment of private capital in such enterprises encouraged, but at the same time it was necessary to protect the public against inferior service, discrimination and excessive charges. This one problem alone has called for the development of much additional machinery and the end is not yet in sight.

With the growth of the factory system and the division of labor, there came the problems of industrial disease, and industrial accidents. Despite the great progress already achieved, these two causes alone exact an annual toll of nearly one million victims.

More fundamental and intricate than these examples, and the hundreds of others that might be cited, is the problem arising from the conflict between capital and labor. With the growth of the factory system, there came a tremendous increase in productive capacity. By virtue of inventive genius and the application of steam and machinery to the process of production and distribution, labor and capital increased their productivity by gigantic strides. Labor and capital soon became engaged in a controversy as to how the joint profit of their labors should be divided. Labor unions were formed to give to employees the advantages of collective bargaining in their demands for shorter hours, better working conditions and higher pay. So the struggle has gone on until to-day it absorbs the interest of the nation and threatens to paralyze our industrial life. To cope with different phases of this problem, new governmental machinery has been found essential and departments of labor, industrial commissions and other appropriate offices have been created.

In all of this development many false steps doubtless have been made. Many things have been attempted that have

been impotent, if not positively harmful. Nevertheless the new problems were present, and if the government was to grapple with them, additional machinery and institutions were required. Under these new conditions the government could not become an effective instrument of distributive justice, it could not be the successful guardian of the public safety, health and morals, it could not protect the weak against the aggressions of the strong, without developing new and effective machinery, accurately adapted to the particular problems that were involved. This is as true of government to-day as it was of the governments in primitive days. Only those groups survived which succeeded in meeting the problems of their day and age, and no government can hope for permanence to-day, except by meeting the same inexorable law of social efficiency.

From this brief survey of the development of government, there are two principles that should become so clear and obvious that they can never be forgotten. In fact, the main justification of the subject-matter of the chapter, is that it affords a splendid opportunity for the exposition of these principles. The first principle is the great social utility of law and order, or the value of established and orderly methods of procedure, as the surest and quickest route of social and political progress. This lesson is particularly needed at this time when the very atmosphere is redolent with the spirit of radicalism and unrest. As has already been observed, the remedy for this spirit is not in moral preachments, extolling the virtues of established order. It can not be based entirely upon superficial and optimistic appeals to altruistic endeavor. The reverence for law and order that will endure—that will withstand the stress and strain of modern life—must be based upon a profound conviction of its utility to one's self and to his group. This must be brought home time and time again, until it is

part of one's intellectual equipment, deeply embedded in mental habit, and until it has made its dramatic appeal, on the part of the group, to the individual's instinctive life.

The whole history of political development has been an almost continuous process of enlarging the field of cooperative endeavor, and humanity has generally made progress only so fast as this has been actually accomplished. Primitive society could never have formed itself into the horde, or the tribe or clan, except by enlarging the cooperative effort. And this was done only by evolving and observing customs and traditions which later developed into laws. It requires but a moment's reflection to realize that only those groups, tribes or clans survived which followed the pathway of local laws. In the agricultural period a tribe that refused to obey the mandate against cannibalism, could not hope to stand out against the richer and stronger tribes who had profited by the rule. In the pastoral period, a group that refused to grant ready adherence to the rules laid down for the protection of their pastoral interests, could hardly hope to survive in a conflict with neighbors who enjoyed the superior wealth and power that flowed from intelligent obedience to law.

The whole primitive struggle that has characterized the early evolution of government, was a constant contest for survival in which those groups that learned the value of law and order, as the basis of cooperative effort, finally survived.

The other principle to be emphasized here is that political progress is conditioned upon the capacity of the group to change their established order, when necessary, to cope with new and changing problems. At first blush this principle seems contradictory to the idea of reverence for law and order, but the contradiction is only apparent and not real. Unfortunately, however, the two are frequently confused.

The man who is for law and order as a matter of temperament, rather than as a result of intelligent perception, is generally for the same reason against any change in the established régime. But the man with a dynamic mind and an evolutionary point of view, who believes in law and order only as a useful means to a desired end, will accept the second principle as a vital and necessary corollary to the first. And yet the facts are that many times important changes are opposed by the defenders of established order, when it is only through such change that the original purposes can be achieved. The controversy in Chicago over the abolition of the justice courts, discussed in the preceding chapter, affords a dramatic illustration. The justice court had become an outrageous instrument of tyranny and oppression for the poor and ignorant, and yet many who opposed the adoption of the municipal court in its stead, did so because they would not rob the poor of simple and inexpensive justice. Yet the facts are that this very change has given to the poor the simple justice that they desired, and saved them from intolerable abuse.

In the primitive contest for survival, the remarkable operation of this principle is continuously apparent. As primitive society emerged from the embryonic horde to the pastoral stage, demanding new traditions and customs dealing with the care, ownership and defense of the tribal herds, any group that would have ignored these needs, and stubbornly clung to the simpler traditions of the earlier days, could not possibly have survived.

So it was with the transition from the pastoral to agricultural life, with its requirements for a definitely organized group, with fixed boundaries, centralized authority, superior methods of defense, and laws governing the ownership and control of property. The group that declined to make the political changes necessary to meet these new demands,

must inevitably have been defeated and enslaved by those who had. And so it has been through all the vicissitudes of human progress, and so it is to-day. No more fundamental lesson can be taught to the young citizens of democracy than that the power, prestige and permanence of our great republic is conditioned upon our capacity so to adjust the details of our government and policy as to make America, amid the rapidly shifting problems of the coming years, an efficient guardian of liberty and justice.

The teacher who can find a way of building into the dawning consciousness of youth the great fundamental conviction that the way of liberty, justice, and of progress is found in evolution; that though its process requires time, patience and tireless efforts, its rewards are ample; that the destiny of democracy depends upon the valor, the wisdom, the open-mindedness and the fidelity with which each generation grapples with the problems of patriotic duty; and finally that in the investment of one's energy and interest in this eternal struggle for human betterment, one finds life's rarest thrills and richest joys—such a teacher is building a foundation for democracy that will endure.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. If our citizens can become thoroughly imbued with the evolutionary point of view, what concrete results will follow in regard to the progress of social and political reform?

2. What additional examples can you suggest that will be useful in demonstrating the evolutionary point of view?

3. What opportunities are there in literature and language to develop this point of view?

4. What are the inherent difficulties to be encountered in developing this point of view?

5. How would you proceed to develop this point of view in teaching the history of your community? Be concrete and specific in your answer.

6. What specific steps would you take to present this point of view in connection with the teaching of state government?

7. Is there any pedagogical value in using the evolutionary point of view? Explain this in detail.

8. In what way is the idea of a league of nations a product of this point of view? Trace this out in detail.

9. Do we have governments to-day and obey law to-day for the same fundamental reasons that impelled the people to have governments and obey laws in earlier times? What are those fundamental reasons?

10. In what ways may the value of law and order as a means to accomplish a given end be illustrated in terms of the child's experience? May the rules of different games and the functions of the umpire in baseball, etc., be profitably employed? Give other examples.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gettell, Raymond G., *Problems in Political Evolution* (Ginn & Co., Boston, 1914).

Chapter III, "The Nature of the State."

Chapter IV, "The Origin of the State."

Chapter V, "The State and the Fundamental Social Institutions."

Strong, Josiah, *Our World* (Doubleday, Page & Co., New York, 1913).

Ely, Richard T., *Studies in the Evolution of Industrial Society* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1906).

Part I.

Beard, C. A., *American Government and Politics* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1914).

Part I, "Historical Foundations."

Beard, C. A., *Readings in American Government and Politics* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1913).

Part I, "Historical Foundations."

Dealey, J. Q., *The Development of the State* (Silver, Burdett & Co., New York, 1909).

Chapter I, "Social Development."

Chapter II, "Stages in the Development of the State."

Garner, James W., *Introduction to Political Science* (American Book Company, New York, 1910).

Cleveland, Frederick A., *Organized Democracy* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1913).
Part I, "The Foundations of the American Republic."
Munro, William B., *The Government of the United States* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1919).
Chapter I, "English and Colonial Origins."
Chapter II, "Preliminaries of National Government."

CHAPTER V

THE FUNCTIONAL APPROACH

AN INSTRUCTOR once startled a teachers' institute with the dogmatic statement that there was no subject covered in the course of civics that could not be made one of absorbing interest to the student. An irate gentleman of many years' experience in the district school, took violent and voluble exception to the idea, concluding his remarks with the statement that it was his duty to teach, among other things, the government of his county. He was unable to see how that could be made either dramatic, interesting or palatable, and he would be very grateful to be shown. The instructor had just come from an institute in another county where one of the special speakers had been the county health officer. This man had shown that during the incumbency of his office for three years, he had reduced the number of preventable diseases among school children of the county over seventy-five per cent., and had reduced the annual number of deaths from such causes from nine to one.

The instructor cited this as an example of the dramatic significance that attaches to one of the county offices, too frequently regarded as too insignificant for the teacher's notice or the public's interest. So true is this attitude of indifference toward this important office, that it is rarely filled with the best physicians, and not infrequently with the worst. I have been in not a few communities where an inquiry for the most incompetent physician and the local health officer, brought forth the same response. And yet upon his skill, energy and fidelity depend the life, health and

happiness of many. If the conscientious work of an unknown health officer, in a backward county, could save eight lives a year, surely the study of that office and its functions could be made both interesting and dramatic. And, what is fundamentally more important, if this were done, there can be but little doubt that these young citizens, as they emerged into years of political responsibility, would take a different attitude regarding the importance of the office, and the type of men who filled it.

The teacher who found nothing of interest in county government, saw in that institution only a framework of statutory and constitutional provisions. He had missed entirely the graphic story of human need that brought the institution of county government into existence, and the significant and human functions that it performed. Doubtless his pupils would have borne out his testimony that the subject was monotonous and dull.

The problems confronting this teacher would be greatly simplified, if not solved, by using the functional approach to all studies of the social sciences. This is the natural, psychological manner, and yet it is rarely used. It is the way the race learned, and it is probably safe to assume that the way they learned was, at least, the most natural if not the most direct. Primitive man began his first political thinking in the terms of the needs that confronted him. It was in the effort to meet these needs that the idea of political organization slowly developed and matured. This same method of learning should be followed in the school-room, if the best results are to be attained.

There are three reasons why this method always should be employed. The first reason is that the functional approach enables the teacher to interpret and explain government and society in terms of the pupil's own experience. Unless this is done the pupil can not really comprehend. As

a student in school, I learned that the functions of government were divided into three groups or departments: the legislative, the executive and the judicial. I learned to define these in terms satisfactory to the teacher, but which were meaningless to me. The separation of the powers of government into these three groups touched nothing in my experience. It did not connect up with any of the realities of my life. It had no sense of importance for me. Under these circumstances, the teacher's efforts were largely futile.

Suppose, however, she had used the functional approach to government. She would have shown, for instance, that to have schools and colleges in which people could be educated, required the cooperative effort of the community or the state. It was too great an undertaking for any one individual or family. Therefore, they had to join their forces to do jointly what they could not do singly. So the people established school boards, and school districts, and school trustees, and provided for the erection and operation of schools. This cooperative enterprise could only be accomplished by having laws adopted which would provide the basis for their joint efforts. For it is obvious that there could be no successful schools unless there were superintendents and teachers and some one appointed to employ them; unless school should be held at a given time and place, so children would know where and when to go; and unless the pupils would be divided into groups, according to age and school experience, so that each class could study the same subjects.

Obviously, so simple a matter as a village school can not be operated without its school law, and its body of rules and regulations. But whence do these laws come? They are not automatic. They do not create themselves. They are, in fact, promulgated by a body of the representatives of the people, which body is called a legislature. This is a

very important department of the government that the people have created for this and similar purposes.

This is the functional approach. It begins with the needs of government, needs that are so clear and elementary that they mean something in the pupil's experience. Then, proceeding from the known to the unknown, the pupil is taken from a consideration of the needs of which he personally has been made conscious, to the institutions of government that have been adopted to meet these needs. Now it may be reasonably supposed, the legislature has come to have some real significance in the mind of the pupil, and as this process is continually repeated, in dealing with the different functions and institutions of government, the understanding becomes more nearly adequate and complete. By this method, the educational process becomes a gradual unfolding of the pupil's realm of consciousness, and a gradual and natural broadening of the limits of his experience.

But laws do not interpret themselves, and yet they must be interpreted for those who execute and obey them. And in spite of the fact that they may be very carefully drawn, reasonable men very frequently differ as to their meaning. And when men do differ as to their meaning, how shall this difference be decided? Suppose, for instance, that the school law provides that no teachers shall be employed who do not have one year of "professional training." The majority of the school board think that one X, who has had a year's work in a certain college, comes within the meaning of the law, and therefore authorize the superintendent to engage X as a teacher. The treasurer, who is responsible for paying out money from the school fund, in accordance with the law, thinks that X does not come within the meaning of the statute, that her contract is, therefore, illegal, and he refuses to pay her salary. If the different parties can not settle the controversy by mutual agreement, some

one must settle it for them, or the school may go without a teacher.

Innumerable cases of this character are continually arising, and if there were no one who had authority to settle them, there would be interminable and intolerable deadlocks and delays in public business. To meet these needs, which, by well-chosen, simple illustrations, may be made very concrete and obvious, the people have established a system of courts, which constitute the judicial department of government, and it is the business of these courts to interpret and apply the law in all such cases, when properly brought before them. Through this approach, the judiciary has a real meaning to the pupil in terms of his own experience. Almost every boy and girl has had some games spoiled by disagreement over the meaning or application of the rules, and has found that if games which require close decisions, like baseball and basketball, are to be played satisfactorily, an umpire must be chosen to give authoritative decisions. Thus the idea of an officer, chosen to decide controversies and interpret and apply the law, may be made very real and significant to the normal pupil. To such a one, the judiciary does not mean a mere dictionary definition or conception, but a very real and essential part of the machinery which men have created to meet the demands of every-day life.

Likewise, the executive department should be approached in exactly the same way. Even though men agree to the meaning of the law, they do not always do as the law provides. Disobedience to the law may be due to ignorance of it, to carelessness in regard to it, to forgetfulness, and to viciousness. Whatever may be the motive, society and civilization can not exist unless the laws are generally obeyed. How could a school be maintained if scholars came only when and where they wished, if teachers only taught what

and when they liked, and if school boards only paid or refused to pay the bills as the caprice of the moment might dictate? Only confusion and impotence would result. What is true of the school would obviously be true of the whole community.

There is then a very real and apparent need in the community and the state for some one to be selected who will see to it that the laws are executed and obeyed. To meet this need, administrative and executive officers are created, and they compose the executive department of the government. The necessity for obedience to law is illustrated so clearly on every hand, that there would seem to be no difficulty in finding abundant illustrative material to bring this clearly home to the most inexperienced boy or girl.

The second reason in favor of the functional approach in the study of society is that it, better than any other method, demonstrates the true nature of government, institutions and laws, *viz.*, that they are useful means for the obtaining of certain ends. This involves one aspect of the evolutionary point of view that is quite essential. The individual, whose introduction to these subjects is made through an analysis of group needs, and the tracing of these needs through the cooperative effort to meet them, resulting in the formation of the institutions and laws he sees about him, can scarcely fail to grasp this point of view. In fact, that is the only conception that he obtains from this method of approach.

One of the important results of this method is the proper appreciation of the nature and character of law. One of the reasons for the popular disrespect of law that seems to prevail among our people, is doubtless due to the narrow and restrictive meaning it has to the vast majority of minds. In the popular conception, law is identified primarily with the repressive and punitive measures that make up the crim-

inal law. And yet in both bulk and importance, the criminal law is but a very minor part of our system of jurisprudence. The great bulk of the law of the state has to do with laying down the rules that are to govern the rights and duties of the individuals, engaged in the great cooperative undertaking that we call organized society. These rules are not so much restraints upon individual freedom as they are the necessary basis of cooperative effort.

In the course of modern events it becomes necessary to make contracts, create partnerships, erect great corporations, build vast enterprises, govern and equip cities, build and operate great school systems, and so on, and yet every one of these and the thousands of other like undertakings require rules and principles, defining all the rights of the millions of parties who are involved, and laying down legal requirements for their guidance. Law thus becomes a valuable instrument without which the fabric of our civilization could not be builded. Law is as essential to these mighty undertakings as are the rules of cards to a game of whist.

The prevailing ignorance among educated people, regarding the nature and functions of law, is illustrated by a recent personal experience. A prominent professor of English in one of our great universities, having, for the first time in his life, become interested in a law pending in the legislature of his state, appeared before a legislative committee in its behalf. In discussing the bill he became confused by some of the technical language employed. He at once came to the quite common conclusion that such technicalities and refinements of expression were quite useless, in fact, positively vicious, for it was the usage of such language that made lawyers an expensive necessity, and led to useless litigation. He closed his outburst to me with the statement that he would "flunk" a member of his freshman class in composition, who could not draw a plain statute or write

a simple contract in clear language, so that no reasonable and honest court or man could have a doubt as to its meaning.

I submitted to him the following simple agreement for his scrutiny and approval: "A and B agree, on this, the 25th day of September, 1915, that A purchase the spotted cow of B, known as Betsy, for $100, it being agreed that B will deliver the said cow to A on the 30th of this month, and that A pay to B the $100 on the 27th of this month." He thought that honest, reasonable men could have no doubt as to what it meant. But, I suggested, suppose that on September 28th, 1915, after the cow had been paid for on the 27th as specified, the lightning strikes and kills the spotted cow, Betsy, and on the 30th A demands the delivery of the cow, and on the failure of B to deliver it, demands the return of his $100, and damages for failure to comply with his agreement. What are the rights of the parties? Submit this question to any group of reasonable men, who are not lawyers, and you will find an honest difference of opinion, and yet here was as simple a contract as one could wish.

The difficulty in drawing the contract was that the parties had not anticipated a very ordinary and possible event, *viz.*, the unexpected death of the cow. To meet all of these emergencies which are bound to occur in great profusion and complexity, and to provide a basis of solution that is just and fair, and in which the public has confidence, there must be a carefully elaborated system of law. Without it, men would hesitate to enter into business relations. When disputes arose, as would be inevitable from time to time, if there was no law for their solution, men would be strongly tempted to resort to force and all the other evils of violent self-help. The fights in which small boys occasionally engage over disputed facts in a game of baseball, when played without an umpire, afford evidence of this tendency.

On another occasion a very intelligent and well informed man declared to an applauding audience that there was no reason why law should be intricate or complex. It was intentionally made so by the lawyers in order to create legal business. These superficial criticisms of our jurisprudence, all too common among our people, can not form the basis of a very intelligent citizenship, nor the foundation for a genuine respect for law. The child who has come to his study of government through the functional approach, who has seen the needs before he learned the laws and institutions created to provide for them—will recognize the simple and obvious fact that our laws are intricate and complex because the life that we live and the civilization that we enjoy are intricate and complex, and the law must provide the basis for both. Take as a typical example, one of our necessary institutions of to-day, a great railroad company, with millions of capital, building and operating a railroad across the continent. There are stockholders, bondholders, shippers of every class and description, contractors, officers, employees, passengers, freight, rolling stock, real estate—all part of the problem of transportation, and all having interests which must be protected by adequate rules of law. As one contemplates the veritable maze of personal and property rights that is involved in a single day's operation, one can not escape the conclusion that the genius that has devised a legal system for defining, limiting, securing and enforcing them with reasonable efficiency and satisfaction, has earned the gratitude, rather than the contempt, of humanity. There are defects in our laws, the same as in all human creations, that require ceaseless efforts to remedy. But the remedy will not be found in the growing contempt and disrespect for law that emanates from the fallacious and plausible tirades of the demagogue. It will come only when an intelligent electorate comprehends the real signifi-

cance of the problem, and demands of its public servants, constructive accomplishment instead of impossible pronouncements.

The importance of emphasizing again and again the functional side of government, as laying emphasis upon the fact that humanity is concerned primarily with the ends achieved, rather than with the means employed, is evidenced by the general confidence reposed in popular votes and majority rule, as a remedy for public ills, or a solution of pressing problems. While this general problem received some attention in Chapter III, additional material along the same line here seems justified by the importance of the subject.

When America was struggling with the problem of peace or war, one of the most important and momentous questions ever submitted to our government, a question whose intelligent decision had to depend upon a comprehensive understanding of the relative strength of the contending armies, upon the real ambitions and intentions of the German government and its people, and upon what vital relations already existed between America and world politics and what these relations might be in the years ahead, there arose the demand to submit this question of war or peace to a referendum vote. Let us contemplate for a moment the nature of this proposal.

In the first place, a very important element in the solution of this problem was the probable outcome of the struggle if America did not enter. The great war was the outgrowth of world developments and competition, for which America was the least responsible of any of the powers concerned. While we soon recognized that the Allies were fighting on the side of law, international order and good faith, if the Allies could defeat Germany without our aid, would we not be justified in leaving them alone to solve the problem for which they were in large measure responsible?

Should we abandon the advantage of our natural isolation unless it became necessary to secure the defeat of Germany?

But the application of this policy, if adopted, would involve the question of whether or not the Allies would need our aid to win. If we waited until the struggle was over, it would be too late. Indeed, as it was, there is evidence to believe that, had America been but a few months later, she would have been too late. To determine during the conflict which side would win, would require a careful study of the problem of strategy, the financial conditions of the contending countries, their probable food supply, the condition of the morale of both the armies and the peoples, and finally, of the secret information that the Allies would be willing to give to the government, but which could not be given to the public, because it would reach the enemy. To suppose that there could be an intelligent public opinion on such a question, involving so many items entirely outside the domain of the average man's knowledge or experience, surely does violence to one's imagination.

But this is not all. To determine whether the suggested policy of entering the war in case it was necessary to secure the defeat of Germany, was or was not wise, depended upon another question, *viz.*, what would be the effect upon the interests of America and the world, in case Germany should win. Obviously this depended upon the purposes, plans and powers of Germany in case of victory. It depended upon an intimate knowledge of German philosophy and German foreign policy, as well as upon the economic, commercial and diplomatic background of the whole European situation. How many citizens were able at the time the question of war or peace was pending, to give an adequate judgment upon those complicated facts? With our traditional ignorance of foreign affairs, how many citizens could have

hazarded an intelligent guess, or even comprehended the outstanding matters that were involved? How many, in 1917, were prepared to comprehend the idea of Mittel-Europa, or Germany's relation to the Balkans, or the effect of these upon the vital interests of America? How many voters, whose only knowledge of German character and purpose was gained from pleasant and profitable friendship with worthy American citizens of Teutonic blood, would have believed that German policy coldly contemplated such damnable projects of world dominion with such arbitrary, despotic power?

Furthermore, how many citizens were in a position to appreciate intelligently the fundamental significance to America in particular and to democracy in general, of the destruction of international law and of international good faith, and of the substitution of the arbitrary power of the conqueror for the cooperative efforts of liberal nations, in arranging the world's affairs? How would this affect the Monroe Doctrine? What effect would it have upon the safety of the Philippines? What would become of the principle of the Open Door in the Orient? What would be the effect on the growing tendency toward arbitration, to which we have always been devoted? Every one of these questions was vital to the issue of war or peace, and yet in the early part of 1917, how many citizens were ready to reach an intelligent conclusion?

This does not mean that public opinion can not and must not prevail. One thing this war has emphasized throughout the world is that in modern military conflict, the morale of the people is as essential to victory as the fighting spirit of the troops. It simply means that to such a complex question the remedy is not to be found by a mere counting of the hands. Great vital problems, upon which depend the destiny of civilization, can not be so easily and simply

solved. The government must study these many problems, must grapple with all their constituent elements, and must determine what policy under all the circumstances of the case will best fulfill the purpose, the ideals and the aspirations of our people. Upon the ability of the people's chosen leaders faithfully to perform this task, depends the destiny of the nation. Had Congress and the president lacked the courage to face this problem, had they escaped their responsibility by submitting it to a referendum vote, the evidence would plainly indicate that America would have come too late to save the world from the curse of German victory.

Nor is this written in any spirit of disparagement of my fellow citizens. It is no slander on American patriotism that they would vote for peace until the case for war had been clearly made. Nor does it cast any reflection upon my native land to say that the great body of our electorate were not specialists in the problems of world politics, European diplomacy and military strategy that were involved. On the other hand, the wonderful spirit of sacrifice, the resistless enthusiasm, the militant patriotism, and the stern determination and resolution, with which the nation rallied to the defense of the policy adopted by its chosen leaders, is the highest evidence one could seek of our loyalty, our character and our common sense.

The futility of majority votes is capable of indefinite illustration, and yet, because it is democratic in form, it is too willingly accepted as a substitute for hard study, statesmanlike methods and official responsibility. Before the thirteenth amendment, slavery was a state matter, and yet it could hardly be argued that because the people of the southern states would have voted in favor of slavery, that a satisfactory solution would have been attained. In 1893, the people of Switzerland voted in favor of abolishing kosher beef, an act of religious intoleration and bigotry, and

no one would argue that the problem of religious liberty had been satisfactorily adjusted. A few years since the municipal council of an American city enacted an ordinance that virtually deprived citizens of a certain race of their rights of liberty and property. At the time the ordinance met with a great wave of popular approval, but no one would to-day say that it solved any problems of liberty or racial conflicts.

The truth is that popular votes on specific measures may be very valuable in some cases and equally mischievous in others. If the measure is simple in its elements, one upon which an intelligent public opinion is therefore possible, and if it is one that will be difficult to enforce, unless backed by an aggressive public opinion, a referendum vote is both efficacious and desirable. Prohibition is probably such a measure. But when the problem is complicated, outside the range of the information and experience of the average voter, and one requiring special knowledge or technical investigation—and many of our modern problems are of this character—the counting of hands can not afford a rational or scientific solution. This is not saying that the people should not rule. It merely argues that when they rule they should rule intelligently. If they have technical problems to be solved, let them employ technical experts for their solution, instead of trying to become experts for themselves.

This seems simple and obvious and yet it is difficult to work out in practise. To the person who approaches government from the view-point of the needs and problems to be solved, there will be no danger. Seeing the needs first, he will naturally seek the instrument best suited to the case at hand. Such a one will not demand a referendum on technical matters because it does not meet the needs of technical solution. But the average citizen does not have this view-

point or approach. When he is told to support the use of the referendum on a given issue, because it is democratic, his support is bound to come, regardless of the nature of the problem. When the demagogue, declaring that the voice of the people is the voice of God, seeks to "pass the buck" of official responsibility by the referendum vote, he is regarded as a champion of democracy, yet in fact, he may have been a cowardly shirker.

The third and final advantage to be urged for the functional approach, is that it makes clear the dramatic and absorbingly human side of government. There is nothing in the study of the organization of the state administration that affords the basis of an appeal to the generous instincts of human nature, until the administration is seen in its functioning aspects, of safeguarding the public health, making war against the white man's plague, and the innumerable other functions discharged by the executive department. It is the functional side of government that has its story of heart interest for every normal person.

Take for example the position of state fire marshal. If one's study of that department is based mainly on the statutory provisions creating it, the detailed duties placed upon its several members, and the rules and regulations for its procedure, it is difficult to conceive of anything that would be more deadly or monotonous to the student, or more barren of results. But approach it from the other angle—the needs and conditions that led to its adoption—and one gets a vastly different result. The report of the fire marshal for Indiana for one year, for instance, shows that the citizens of Indiana, in that year, lost over six million dollars' worth of property and one hundred and twelve lives. Some of the tragic stories of the useless loss of life, and the wiping out, in a moment, of the savings of a lifetime, present rare op-

portunities to secure the closest attention of the child, and to fix forever in his consciousness the grave public importance of this neglected office.

I sat in a teachers' institute, only a year ago, and heard the fire marshal of Indiana tell the teachers of the work of his department and make a resistless plea for their cooperation. He spoke for a full hour, and every teacher listened with eager attention, as he explained the common causes of fires, how the department was seeking to prevent them, and how they might aid in the campaign of education. The reason for their attention was not to be found in the eloquence of the speaker, nor in any special effort on his part to entertain his audience. The secret of his success lay in the fact that he made it clear, as he went along, that the work in which he was engaged and in which he sought their aid, was the work of saving human beings from a horrible death by fire, and of safeguarding homes against a real and ever-present peril.

There is not a department in our government so insignificant, so far removed from the field of popular interest, or so immersed in technical details, but what, if approached from the point of view of the functions it performs, can produce its stories of absorbing interest. In the chapters that are to follow, this point will be illustrated time and time again, in order that no one can miss the human significance of government.

In the remainder of the chapter I desire to illustrate very briefly how this idea may be carried out in connection with the different topics covered in an ordinary course in civics.

In the first place let us begin the study of organized society with its smallest unit, the one with which every child is familiar, and where we can begin dealing with the subjects and concepts of society in terms of the child's personal experience. We will, therefore, begin with the family.

Here we must begin with the question, "Why?" Why do we have a family? What is its purpose and function? What need was there that brought the family into existence? Let us not make the mistake of giving dogmatic answers to the problems, and destroying the fruits of our method. Rather by artful suggestion and leading question, let us direct the inquiring mind of the child along profitable channels of investigation. In all civilized and uncivilized countries we have the family. There must be some need, common to mankind, that the family has to solve. Set that question as the initial problem. Let the pupil realize that in the most commonplace things about him are deep and interesting puzzles to challenge his instinct of curiosity.

Nor should we pass on until the class has found the answer to the problem, until they have found that the family is not a mere accidental creation, or a mere matter of convenience, but a vital social necessity, involving the most fundamental personal and social obligations. Let them realize in their early years that upon the integrity of the family, and the proper performance of its functions, rest the destiny and happiness of society. They can realize the necessity of the family as a means to protect and train the young and as a source of comfort, happiness and inspiration for its members. From the realization of these vital truths, and from them alone, can spring that respect and devotion to the family which lies at the very basis of our society.

Having discovered that the family is a cooperative arrangement, to perform certain very vital and important functions, it is natural to inquire as to the methods and machinery adopted to this end. In the first place there must be certain rules or regulations, without which everything would be confusion. Why do we have a fixed hour for dinner? Why not let everybody eat dinner whenever he

felt so disposed? Why apportion out the work to the different members of the family? Why not allow each member to perform just such tasks as each might choose? These and similar questions will drive home to youthful consciousness, in terms of their own experience, the inherent necessity of rules and regulations to any cooperative effort. Nor is there much danger that this can be overdone, if done in a skilful and tactful manner. It will impress on youthful consciousness something that many people have failed to acquire in a lifetime, a real understanding of the nature and necessity of law.

But who makes these rules? Who decides how these things shall be done? Why not allow each child to make his own rules and provide his own plans? Thus is introduced the idea of authority which is vested in the parents, and which must be vested in some definite body in every cooperative effort. Thus, in the family, we are able to develop very clearly and in terms of the pupil's experience, the conceptions of law, authority and organization, which lie at the very basis of government and society.

When the possibilities of the family have been exhausted, the time has come to develop the idea that the family can not live unto itself alone. There are many things that we must have that the family can not provide. The children must have kindergartens and schools and yet every family can not have its own educational system. There must be roads by which children can get to school, and people may go to market, and yet everybody can not build his own highways. Unfortunate people become sick or old and can not work, and yet other people can not take them into their homes, or permit them to die for want of shelter or of food. Occasionally parents die, leaving little children that must be educated, fed and clothed, and yet there is no one to care for them.

These are some of the problems that the families of a given district have tried to solve by joining in some form of local government, such as townships and counties. The local governments have laid out highways in order to enable the people of a community to pass to and fro when it was necessary and convenient. They have developed machinery for the care and upkeep of these highways. They have established school districts and school boards, built schoolhouses, employed teachers, and made it possible for all children, rich and poor, to get an education. This has required the expenditure of great sums of money and the development of school regulations and rules. This means that some one must be given the power to get the money from the people, by levying taxes and collecting them. This requires additional machinery, and men to provide for these elaborate and necessary functions.

Then there are poor-farms and orphans' homes that must be built and managed unless we are going to leave their helpless inmates to a cruel and brutal fate. In addition to all these things, there are jails to be erected, courts to be established, criminals to be arrested, fraud, theft and burglary to be prevented, epidemics of disease to be fought and countless other things that must necessarily be performed in any civilized community. It requires little imagination to see that these matters touch questions of human happiness at a myriad different points. It becomes equally obvious that local government is a means to an end, a mere cooperative device by which the people of a community jointly solve their common problems. It follows, with equal clearness, that the laws that they develop, like the customs and rules of the home, are but the essential conditions to effective and harmonious effort.

Thus far we have been considering rural government only. When people gather together into compact and

crowded communities that we call villages and cities, there are still additional problems that the conditions of city life present, which require a solution. Streets must be paved, lighted and cleaned, garbage must be disposed of, fire protection must be assured, building regulations must be adopted that will protect the interests of health and safety, and parks, playgrounds and similar conveniences must be established. Tenement-house regulations must be developed, an efficient system of transportation established, and an adequate and wholesome water supply must be afforded. In addition to these institutional needs, there are demands for many kinds of regulations that would be unnecessary in rural communities.

The danger of fire in congested districts requires elaborate building codes, to insure the erection of buildings that will not increase the risk. The crowded condition of the city streets requires traffic regulations to safeguard life and limb and to prevent the traffic from becoming hopelessly confused. In rural communities, the question of sewerage and garbage disposal is one that may be safely left to the individual family, but in urban communities, where epidemics of diseases are more common, and where people live so close together that the collection of sewerage in one home jeopardizes the health of all the homes in the vicinity, these things must be arranged by law. People must accept these limitations upon individual discretion as a necessary means of preserving health.

Then there comes the fundamental and intricate problem of city planning. If the people are to have an efficient city in which to live, it ought to be built and developed in accordance with a careful plan, by which the most wholesome places for homes may be so utilized, and the manufacturing, distributing and terminal facilities so grouped that the maximum of efficiency will be attained. People can not be al-

lowed to build just where they will, but ought to conform to a general program that will make the city more beautiful, more wholesome and more efficient. And so we might go on indefinitely, pointing out the peculiar problems that arise where people are living under the urban conditions of modern life.

It was to meet these conditions that city governments have been developed. It was to solve these complex problems that there has been developed the vast bulk of municipal ordinances and other laws, dealing with the special problems of city life. Municipal government and functions, like all other laws and institutions, is thus a product of evolution and development, as men have struggled with the conditions that confronted them in the modern city. In this way the study of municipalities should be approached and developed. Beginning with the needs, that can be made very obvious, proceed to the instrumentalities for their solution. Proceed from the cause to the effect and you develop an interesting, a pedagogical, as well as a more intelligent approach.

The development of city government in America has not been an inspiring spectacle. Until recent years it has not received either skilful or scientific handling. Many changes were made, and the framework can be traced through many periods of adventure, but little real progress was achieved until the last two decades. And the reason was to be found chiefly in the method of approach. They did not begin with a careful and accurate analysis of the inherent problems of urban life, as a basis for the creation of municipal institutions carefully designed to solve these very problems. In most cases the methods employed appear to have been much simpler in form. The people knew that there were great city problems without adequate machinery for their solution. They supposed the form of government was

inadequate, and they began to pattern it more or less like the federal government, or perhaps the particular state government that they admired. Then they began to try out certain governmental theories, based upon their general plausibility or inherent reasonableness, rather than upon their particular appropriateness to the task at hand. The result was an admitted failure of city government in America.

With the development of the commission form of city government, there began a new interest in the problem, and a real scientific effort to analyze the conditions and to devise a system of government that would meet existing problems. Out of this has evolved the different plans of the business manager form, and there is now reason to believe that real progress is being made. That progress will be conditioned, however, upon the degree of popular intelligence in regard to civic problems. For another wholesome result of the present scientific spirit is the recognition that structural reforms alone can not suffice. The most skilfully devised government that can be arranged is, after all, only the instrument or machinery through which the people of the community can function. The only enduring foundation, therefore, upon which our municipal democracy can rest, is the character, patriotism and intelligence of the people.

Thus we find that city organization, like the family and the rural government, came into existence in answer to pressing human needs. It represents necessary steps in the development of the great cooperative process that we call society. The institutions created are entrusted with the solving of existing problems whose accurate solution is indispensable to human happiness. The laws that we find on every hand, like the rules of the family in the home, are the indispensable means by which our joint efforts may become effective. Based upon these human needs, government

is necessarily a human institution, and its success or failure even in apparently insignificant details, is a story written in terms of tragedy and pathos, that should find a rich emotional response in every normal child.

We come now to the state government where the same method of approach and the same general principles should be employed. In spite of all the varied functions performed by the family, and by local rural and urban government, there are still many things to be accomplished, many ends to be sought, and many ideals to be realized, where these institutions could not avail. We have noticed that the question of highways is a very important one to all forms of local government, and yet, it is a question of such general importance, that it can not be left to them alone. One county might decide that its main highway should run east and west, an adjoining county might build its trunk line north and south, while yet another might come to still a different conclusion. Under such circumstances, an effective highway system from one county to another, throughout the state, would be impossible. And yet this is a very obvious need, which can be adequately met only by organizing a political unit, comprising many counties, which we call a state. One of the important functions of every state government to-day is the development of an adequate system of state highways.

The necessity of laws governing the ownership of land, regulating sales of personal property, and providing for valid contracts, in order to enable people to carry on the ordinary duties and necessities of life, existed among the more primitive peoples, and is an obvious necessity to-day. The making, interpreting and enforcing of these laws, is another function that the state is organized to perform. It might be argued that such was not necessary, for the local governments might attend to that, but a moment's reflection shows how impossible is such a scheme. Suppose

this was done, and there were as many laws governing the validity of a contract as there were counties in the state, conditions would be intolerable. A man's contracts, valid in one county, might be void in another. Under such circumstances there could be no general trade or commercial relations, for they depend upon certainty and uniformity in their legal foundations, and this could come only from the state.

The regulation of railroads in the interest of the public safety, better service, and reasonable rates—a very necessary function in modern times—is another condition necessitating the existence of the state. For if this were left to counties, there would be hopeless complexity. Suppose, for example, that one county required that passenger coaches be heated with steam, another county demanded that they be heated with hot water, and still another that they use the vapor system. Any one of these regulations would, in itself, be reasonable, but to have to comply with all three, on a trip through adjoining counties, would be an intolerable hardship that would virtually prevent efficient service and do nobody any good.

The question of public health is one of the needs that made local government necessary, and yet it is a problem that also demands the attention of the state. One county may become careless in matters of public health. Epidemics may break out, which through the carelessness of local officials, may spread to adjoining counties. With our modern means of communication, contagious diseases may spread with great rapidity and ease from one community to another. Thus, every community has a very definite interest, not only in its own health, but also an interest in the health and welfare of others. Consequently the state is resorted to for the purpose of supplementing the work of local health

authorities, and initiating measures of its own for the protection of all.

The relation of these functions to the health and happiness of the people is very vital. The number of lives saved by the state health departments in the recent epidemics of influenza would doubtless run into the tens of thousands. Likewise, the lives that might have been spared, had the departments of all the states been up to the maximum of efficiency, would doubtless run into the thousands.

Again, the question of education is generally regarded as a local matter, to be attended to by local government. It is true that much of the work of building and maintaining the public school system devolves upon the local communities, but there are important matters of education, which we have found it expedient to leave to the state department. The reasons for this are not hard to seek. The question of the education of youth of the land is not confined to local groups. It is as broad as the foundations of our democracy. Every citizen of the state, regardless of his place of residence, has a vital interest in the efficiency of schools in every corner of the state. To permit ignorance to develop in any section, or to allow the people of any portion to rear children who are not prepared for civic duty, would be to undermine the foundations of democracy and imperil our future.

Moreover, in those sections where the popular intelligence is the lowest, and where education is needed the most, the educational system, under a system of absolute local control, would there be the poorest. It has been found necessary, therefore, to create state departments of education, to give them certain administrative control over local educational matters, in order that the people of the state may be assured of a system of education, of a certain standard of

efficiency throughout the state, regardless of local feeling and interests.

In other words, no community can be a law unto itself. There are vital, valid reasons why the units of government are created as large and comprehensive as they are. There is a real human reason for every department, every bureau, every division and every office in the government of your state, and if there is not, that office or bureau ought to be abolished. The introduction to state government should be another repetition, by fresh illustration, of the fundamental principles that government is a means to an end, that the test of its efficiency is its capacity to serve the best interests of humanity, that its laws and institutions are but the necessary instruments through which the people work out their destiny, that every function performed has a deep human significance, and that it is only through the cooperative process, made possible through law and order, that progress is achieved.

This brings us to the consideration of the federal government, where the same method should be repeated. After the Declaration of Independence, the thirteen colonies found themselves thirteen independent, sovereign nations. During the continuance of war, the pressure of a common foe held them together in a partly efficient state of cooperative endeavor, under the common counsel and guidance of the Continental Congress. But when the war was won, and this pressure was removed, the differences between the colonies received new emphasis. They tried in every possible way to gain the ends that each colony desired, without committing themselves to any effective, cooperative endeavor, but conditions grew worse instead of better.

They became involved in boundary disputes that threatened serious controversies. While there was a provision in the Articles of Confederation for the settlement

of such disputes, there was no effective way of enforcing it. New York, New Hampshire and Massachusetts almost came to blows over territory that is now Vermont. There was actual warfare between the citizens of Connecticut and Pennsylvania over disputed rights to Wyoming Valley. Similar disputes between other colonies threatened the peace and prosperity of the country.

Then there were commercial rivalries, resulting in trade discriminations and retaliatory legislation. For example, New York proceeded on the theory that she could prosper only by tearing down the trade and well-being of her competitors. She discriminated against Connecticut and New Jersey, until war seemed probable, and it required the resourcefulness and influence of Washington to preserve peace. Hostility was carried to such a point that it resulted in a boycott and embargo being resorted to by Connecticut against New York, while general freedom of trade and commerce, that would have been profitable to all, was very substantially impaired. In describing the disordered state produced by these conditions John Fiske declared: "The different states with their different tariff and tonnage acts, began to make commercial war upon one another. No sooner had the other three New England States virtually closed their ports to British shipping, than Connecticut threw hers wide open, an act which she followed up by laying duties upon imports from Massachusetts. Pennsylvania discriminated against Delaware, and New Jersey, pillaged at once by both her greater neighbors, was compared to a cask tapped at both ends. The conduct of New York became especially selfish and blameworthy. . . . Of all the thirteen states, none behaved worse except Rhode Island."

More important still, perhaps, was the inability of the thirteen colonies to make adequate provision for protection

against foreign foes. If the Continental Congress entered into an agreement with foreign countries, and a particular colony felt that it might profit by refusing to be so bound, it disregarded the treaty stipulation and the Continental Congress was powerless to prevent. Thus our foreign relations could not be satisfactorily adjusted, which only increased the danger from foreign enemies. Moreover, the capacity of the colonies to wage effective warfare depended, in a large measure, upon their being able to finance their projects, pay their debts, and build up a national credit. But there was no effective means by which this could be accomplished. The Continental Congress would impose certain quotas on the colonies, but it had no way of enforcing payment. Each colony, fearful lest it pay more than its fair share and dissatisfied with the method of apportionment, vied with every other colony in seeking to give a relatively smaller share of the sum demanded. The inevitable followed. From 1781 to 1786, Congress laid requisitions to the amount of ten million dollars, but received from the colonies less than one-fourth of that amount. During the fourteen months immediately preceding the formation of the Federal Constitution, there was not enough paid into the general treasury to pay even the interest on the national debt. Under such conditions the colonies faced bankruptcy and an absolute loss of credit, both at home and abroad. In the face of such conditions they could scarcely hope to contend successfully with any foe that might assail them.

These and many other facts, the enumeration of which is prohibited by the limit of space, made the formation of the federal government absolutely imperative. The colonies, as already observed in a previous chapter, did not unite in the federal government because they had lost any of their devotion to their individual states, nor because fric-

tion, jealousy and hatred between them had disappeared, nor because they were moved by any spirit of universal love. They joined in the federal government because bitter experience had taught them that they must. Like every successful institution of government that exists, it was framed to meet certain specific needs that could not be adequately met without it. The colonists built it, not out of love for the idea of a national government, but because they had come to believe that it was only through such an instrumentality that the freedom, security and liberty of the states could be made permanently secure.

History has amply vindicated the soundness of their judgment. The functions of the federal government have gradually increased. They are so obviously important and make such clear appeals to the emotional life, that that phase of the problem does not need additional illustration here.

Finally, we come to the question of foreign policy, world politics and international affairs. The new eminence that America occupies in world affairs, can not and must not be ignored. No course in citizenship that did not introduce this subject can be complete. Here, again, we should use the same approach. Just as neither the home, the city, nor the state can exist independently, because of the nature, extent and character of their needs, so nations can not dwell in absolute and "splendid isolation," however much they might so desire. The life of our present civilization is too complex to permit it. We need things produced in all the sections of the earth's surface, and, to a more or less extent, other nations need the products of our soil and effort. This means international commerce and dealings, international agreements, treaties and understandings, and international friction, conflicts and difficulties.

To meet these needs, the statesmen of the world have been

struggling for centuries to evolve a system of law as an effective basis for the growing needs of our international life. The body of international law that we now have, is the result. In addition to some of the fundamental needs thus provided for, the nations found it would be highly useful to arrange for international postal service and telegraph service. The different customs provisions of the different countries, the lack of a uniform system of weights and measures, the need of a world-wide struggle against certain types of disease, and many other matters, have been forcing the nations farther and farther along the line of international organization and administration. As a consequence we have to-day such accomplished results in the field of international organization as the Universal Postal Union, Universal Telegraph Union, Universal Wireless Telegraph Union, an International Union for the Publication of Customs Tariffs, International Bureau of Health, and many others.

Another method of meeting the national needs of an international character, has been the development of foreign policies on the part of the individual nations. Such policies are promulgated as a basis of conduct for the nation involved, in the belief that it will be a valuable instrument in the protection of national interests. The Monroe Doctrine is such a policy and should be approached and studied from this angle. It is a means to an end. It is the promulgation of a principle of conduct for America, which we believe will best preserve our national interests.

The greatest problem between nations, however, is the problem of war and peace. To meet this problem has been the age-long dream of statesmen and philosophers. The development of international law, the growth and rapidity of international conferences over world affairs, the increasing tendency to submit important claims to arbitration, the Hague Conferences—all are methods contributing to this

solution. The proposed league of nations, now being considered by the great nations of the world, is the next step that is proposed. Like all other political developments, this proposal has come in answer to an obvious need, in this case, an appalling need. It is only in approaching it from this angle that we can hope to reach an intelligent conclusion. Will it be an effective instrument to safeguard the peace and justice of the world, without the resort to the devastating crime of war?

Thus, we find our foreign relations, as well as all other departments of our political life, bear witness to the basic idea and point of view that is essential to civic intelligence. Much of the popular misinformation regarding the league of nations would never have developed were we accustomed to approach problems of politics from the standpoint of fundamental needs. Again, in the development of international law, we find the same idea exemplified that we found in the rules and regulations of the home, that in the last analysis, law is a basis of cooperative effort, and for that reason an absolute necessity to any kind of modern society.

If the nature of the law, and its importance as the basis of our political and social life, seems to have been too much emphasized, let the reader pause and meditate. As I write this chapter, I am informed that a great body of organized men have determined to set aside a lawful agreement between them and their country, to stop some of the fundamental instruments of production and distribution, to bring on a state of starvation and famine, in wanton violation of the law, because they do not want Congress to approve a certain section of a pending bill. The offending measure may be unwise or unjust. It may, perhaps, be open to fair and intelligent criticism. But when the organized laboring men of America base their appeal to Congress upon threats

of illegal force and brutal intimidation, the time has come for those who believe in law and justice as against the forces of arbitrary power, to assert themselves.

This, together with the prevalence of mob law, the recent outbreaks of race riots, and the growth of a radical, lawless class, may well cause us to pause and wonder. These individual outbreaks may bring on others or may be used to illustrate the fundamental need of a return to first principles, to demonstrate the inherent need of law, and that law alone can afford a safe basis of progress or achievement. If this can be made a part of the conscious life and thought of the children of America, if they can learn this great fundamental truth as a basis of their life philosophy, if they can approach the problem of the future from this point of view, the freedom and destiny of our nation may be safely entrusted into their keeping.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. How can the functional approach be used in the study of your community? What specific functions would you utilize?
2. Are there any practical difficulties in using the functional approach in all social science work? Are they insuperable? What are they?
3. Are there any subjects in civics where the functional approach can not be used with profit?
4. Can the rules and regulations used in the school be utilized in developing an understanding of the importance and function of law?
5. How far can student government be profitably employed as a laboratory method of studying the nature and character of law?
6. Would the detailed explanation of the purpose of the rules adopted in the school and their discussion by the students aid in the understanding of the nature and function of law?
7. What is the psychological explanation of the fact that government is more interesting when studied from the view-point of its functions?
8. Explain in detail the relation between the evolutionary point of view and the functional approach.

9. If all citizens acquired the functional approach what specific effect would it have upon the efficiency of democracy? What evils would it eliminate?

10. Give illustrations of political reforms which have been formulated without regard to the needs of the public. How would the functional approach have affected this?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brewer, David J., *American Citizenship* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1902).
Chapter IV, "Obligation of Obedience."

Lowell, A. Lawrence, *Public Opinion and Popular Government* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1913).
Part III, "Methods of Expressing Public Opinion."
Part IV, "The Regulation of Matters to Which Public Opinion Cannot Directly Apply."

Bradford, Ernest S., *Commission Government in American Cities* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1911).

Reed, Thomas Harrison, *Form and Functions of American Government* (World Book Company, Yonkers, N. Y., 1916).
Part I, "The Background of American Government."

Hall, Arnold B., *Monroe Doctrine and the World War* (A. C. McClurg Company, Chicago, 1920).
Chapter I, "The Foundations of the Monroe Doctrine."
Chapter II, "Formulation of the Monroe Doctrine."
Chapter III, "Evolution of the Doctrine 1823-1869."
Chapter IV, "Evolution of the Doctrine 1869-1918."
Chapter V, "The Pacific and the Far East."
Chapter VI, "Dollar Diplomacy and the Caribbean."
Chapter VII, "Enforcement of the Doctrine."

Kimball, Everett, *The National Government of the United States* (Ginn & Co., Boston, 1920).
Chapter I, "Constitutional Background."
Chapter II, "The Evolution of the Constitution."
Chapter III, "Making the Constitution."
Chapter IV, "Constitutional Principles."

Fiske, John, *American Political Ideas* (Houghton, Mifflin Company, Boston, 1911).

Farrand, Max, *The Framing of the Constitution* (Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1913).

Kasson, John A., *The Evolution of the Constitution of the United States of America and the History of the Monroe Doctrine* (Houghton, Mifflin Company, Boston, 1904).

Cleveland, Frederick A., *Organized Democracy* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1913).

Munro, William Bennett, *The Government of the United States* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1919).
Chapters I-VI.

Young, James T., *The New American Government and Its Work* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1915).
Chapter XXVIII, "Public Opinion."
Chapter XXIX, "Direct Legislation" (Short Ballot).

CHAPTER VI

THE STORY OF THE COMMUNITY

A NUMBER of years ago, in a small city of some four thousand inhabitants, there occurred a dramatic political conflict that shook the community to its very center. The city had been made dry under a local option law. The city officials, however, had consistently refused to enforce the law. The saloons were operating without a license. Gambling was carried on notoriously and without restraint. Immorality and lawlessness flourished, until the citizens of the community became aroused. They demanded the enforcement of the law, but without effect. Public opinion seemed impotent.

To meet this situation, a group of citizens organized and prepared to fight the evil. It seemed that victory must be assured, for the clear majority of the community were unhesitatingly arrayed upon the side of public decency. They put forward their chosen candidates for the offices of mayor and marshal. These candidates confidently entered the primary of the dominant party. They were pledged to a program of law enforcement, and on that platform sought to defeat the renomination of the sitting officers.

The party primary election was in the form of a mass convention, open to all the party members of the city. It was held in a room scarcely large enough to contain all the voters of the party. The members turned out *en masse*. It seemed clear that the forces of righteousness would prevail. But unexpected complications arose. The enemy, seeing themselves outnumbered, fought for delay. They

resorted to all manner of obstructive tactics. They caused needless confusion and disorder. Their henchmen, well supplied with cheap cigars, filled the atmosphere with obnoxious smoke, until even the most hardened and experienced suffered some inconvenience. Hoodlums, half drunk, were turned loose to "rough-house" the assembly, much to the consternation and discomfiture of the elder and more dignified of the group.

As these tactics were continued, and as the night wore on, the more timid and less aggressive gave up the fight, and turned toward home. Moreover, only those quit who were on the side of decency. This continued until their enemies were left with a majority, when obstructions seemed to cease, nominations were made, and the forces of evil prevailed. It was the old, old story of the strongly organized minority, out fighting the loosely organized and indifferent majority. The friends of criminality fought with fidelity and determination. They never hesitated until the fight was won. Their opponents lacked the sustained interest, the fixed determination and the effective team work that could give them victory.

Nor is this an isolated or unusual incident. It is typical of what is continually taking place throughout our land. The power of the determined, organized minority to rule is an established axiom in our political life. Nor does it mean the loss of popular government, as superficial critics would have us think. In the party convention just described there was no breakdown in popular control. Every man had an equal voice, and the opportunity to make that voice effective. But many did not place a high value on that opportunity. They voluntarily chose the ease and comfort of home, to the political struggle for the supremacy of their ideals. They deliberately and knowingly left the nomination of candidates for public office to the discretion and judg-

ment of those they left behind. They, in fact, by voluntarily absenting themselves, delegated their choice of candidates to those who had remained.

In spite of these conditions, the local papers and the good citizens of the town decried the absence of popular government. They declared the bosses and machines had robbed them of their victory. Democracy no longer existed, and in its place had been erected an invisible government that ruled with despotic power. Thus the good people of the community sought the comfort of a spiritual or moral alibi. They criticized everything and everybody but themselves, and yet they, themselves, were the only ones to blame. They accepted the orthodox accounts of invisible government, with its grasping tyranny, as a vicarious atonement for their own evils of indifference and neglect. When the local press declared its abiding confidence in the integrity, courage and idealism of the community, and laid all the blame upon the wicked machinations of the political machine, the people responded with unanimous approval. Here was the voice of a prophet for which they long had yearned. Here was a message that met their every need. It salved their conscience, it flattered their intelligence, and it "passed the buck." It released them from any possible share of personal responsibility, and provided a cleansing bath of spiritual and moral immunity.

Therein lies one of the great tragedies of democracy. Instead of facing his mistakes and taking responsibility for the consequences of his error, the citizen seeks escape through the sophistries of the demagogue. In the city I have described, there was no invisible government with resistless power. There was no lack of democracy. There was no machine to coerce the popular will. All such talk was sheer, unadulterated political "bunk." There were present all the instrumentalities of popular government.

The people could have nominated whom they pleased had they had sufficient interest to fight it to the finish. Had they been willing to sacrifice a few hours of personal inconvenience, the victory would have been their own. Nothing could have won for the wicked, save the indifference of the virtuous. Nobody could be nominated, save by the votes or the acquiescence of the majority. True it is, the unfair tactics of the opposition made the victory a little more difficult to attain. But it was always possible. It was always within their grasp. It was only by their voluntary withdrawal that the enemy could win.

Viewed from any angle, analyzed in any light, there is no escape from these conclusions. Yet had there been one in that little city, with the courage to tell the truth, and to say that the victory of the wicked was a voluntary gift from the righteous, there would have arisen a chorus of outraged indignation. And yet such were the plain unvarnished facts.

A study of the community which is to contribute to the solution of its problems, and the civic efficiency of its members, can not ignore this fundamental situation. Out of such a study, there should come a vivid consciousness of the vital facts of political life; instead of the complacent acceptance of the flattery of demagogues, there should develop a keen, dynamic interest in the welfare of the community, with an accompanying conviction of personal accountability. Unless these things follow, education becomes pedantic, impotent and unreal.

How may these things be accomplished? Certainly much can be done by bringing to bear upon the study of one's neighborhood, the evolutionary point of view and the habit of critical analysis. From these there will inevitably result an increasing interest in the community itself, as the unraveling of its story discloses the romance and human interest locked up in its history. Thus the story of the

community will be a constant challenge to the student's instinct of curiosity. As the satisfying of this instinct takes the student deeper and deeper into the intimate details of his surroundings, there is laid the basis for a growing interest in community welfare and an affectionate attachment to its destinies. As these forces gather strength, the student is being splendidly equipped for the political battles of the future. For in the last analysis, the reason the determined organized minorities so frequently win, is that they are more interested in the triumph of their cause than are their opponents in the welfare of their city. The members of the determined minority very frequently have a bread-and-butter interest. Their jobs or their investments may be at stake. On the other hand, the great bulk of the people have no interest more vital than their general desire that the good shall ultimately prevail. If we want them to take a more dynamic interest, we must develop in them a more vital attachment to their community and its welfare.

Much has been written, from time to time, concerning the proverbial incompetence of city government in America, as compared with the city governments of other lands. In this connection, it has occasionally been pointed out, with great significance, that the people of the average city in America take much less pride and interest in their city and its affairs than do the residents of foreign cities. Undoubtedly there is a vital connection between the two. It is not difficult to see, that, with an increased interest and pride in one's city, there would go an increased willingness to fight and labor in its behalf.

But how do we account for the difference in local interest? Perhaps the most persuasive explanation is to be found in the migratory nature of our population. In many European cities we are told that the same families will live in the same cities, in the same neighborhood, and even in the same

house, for generations. Under such circumstances there develops a wealth of romance and tradition, handed down from father to son, permeating every detail of their environment. The very familiarity of the scenes, the intimate knowledge of its details, and the deep personal significance that would attach to the otherwise commonplace elements in the situation, would result in a deep and affectionate regard for the community, such as one experiences for the scenes of his early home and childhood.

In America, however, where our population is in a continual migratory state, such a romantic and human interest in the community, where one happens for the moment to reside, is almost impossible. We have many cities where the percentage of native born is infinitesimal, and some states where their native sons form but a minor portion of their population. Moreover, where people do live in cities for any time, the tendency to move about from place to place is so well established that moving day, in our larger cities, has become an established institution. Add to this the great hordes of foreigners that annually seek our shores, and we have a situation that is as perplexing as it is dangerous.

It seems fairly obvious, that, under such circumstances, the development of a pride and interest in local affairs will not be automatic. If we are to have men and women deeply interested in community life, that interest must be the result of early training and education. By formal instruction and study we must seek to overcome, in developing an affectionate attachment for the locality, the unfortunate handicap imposed by the shifting character of our population. At the same time the student will be learning that, in the history of his neighborhood, there are stories of absorbing interest, and in the fighting of its battles, there is

the zest and exaltation that come to those who struggle in a worthy cause.

Another by-product of community study is that it opens up new lines of interest, stretching far back into our nation's history, and in extent, throughout the nation and the world. The history of every neighborhood is so inseparably interwoven with the history of the nation and humanity, that these new lines of contact are varied and inevitable. As a result, when the maturing child, in other subjects or advanced studies, again crosses these old familiar lines of interest, he experiences that glow of satisfaction and joy that comes to all of us in the crossing of familiar paths. He begins to realize the intimate relations between all phases of human effort. He is laying the basis for a source of joy that may endure through life, as he has the opportunity to indulge his historical interest.

The possibilities of education in establishing these familiar paths, were brought home to me very vividly one day, several years ago. I was taking an all-day trip through a neighboring state with a friend of my college days. It was dry, hot and dusty. I was bored by the scenery as I saw only trees, dirt and dusty vegetation. By skilfully taking advantage of a technical loop-hole, inadvertently left by the faculty of my alma mater, I had been able to graduate without the required courses in botany and geology. My friend had not been so clever. The result was that he found in the passing scenery, not mere dirt and dusty vegetation, but interesting geological formations, that possessed for him an absorbing interest, an interest that diverted his attention time and time again throughout the day. He was crossing familiar paths that I was too blind and ignorant to see. If we can build in the intellectual equipment of youth these familiar paths, leading into many and varied

phases of social and political life, rich in the romance and experience of youth, we will be building dynamic sources of power and energy, and developing a capacity for interest in one's community, that may yield large dividends for society in the years that are ahead. Those who receive such a training will be found better and more zealous guardians of the community's welfare. Against them the organized minority can not so easily prevail.

In teaching the story of the community, the same fundamental principles already discussed and illustrated in previous chapters, should prevail. It will be my purpose for the remainder of this chapter to illustrate the application of those principles, in the study of local history, and to indicate how, thereby, a vital interest in community life may be developed. For purposes of illustration, I desire to use the city of Franklin, a typical Indiana town of about five thousand population. I select this town for the sole reason that I happen to know something of its history.

To develop the spirit of critical inquiry, the teacher should begin with the setting of problems, not for his own decision but for solution by the pupil, acting under the direction and stimulus of the teacher. Such problems as would readily occur are the following: Why was the city named Franklin? When and by whom was it founded? Why was it located where it was? What are the forces that contribute to its growth? Other towns have grown up, only to become deserted. Why has not Franklin been deserted? These questions go directly into the fundamental problems underlying the community life, and yet they involve fundamental principles in their simplest forms, and capable of being comprehended in terms of the pupil's observation and experience. In the setting of such problems, the fullest possible appeal is made to the instinct of curiosity.

Methods of thought, analysis and observation are stimulated that too frequently are never employed. Things that before were regarded as monotonous and commonplace, under the stimulating genius of an artful teacher, now take on a deep and refreshing interest. But most important of all, the boy and girl are beginning to think, are beginning to have an interest in their community, and are beginning to come in contact with the vital facts of our social life.

But a word of caution must be urged. Like any other method that is worth while, it is not perhaps so simple as it seems. It requires patience, tact and ingenuity. The whole idea would be wrecked if the teacher, having set the problem, should proceed to its solution. On the other hand, if left entirely to the resourcefulness of the pupil, time will be wasted, interest will lag and poor methods of thought and inquiry will prevail. The teacher must leave the solution to the pupil, but must tactfully keep her hand on the situation, suggesting here, restraining there, calling attention to bad methods, loose thinking, or unworthy evidence, and so contriving all the while, that the pupils will find their own solution and win their own triumph, before the problem has lost its interest and the children their zest.

Take the problem of why Franklin still continues to enjoy a normal growth instead of becoming a deserted town. Put that problem to the class. Bring it home to them, and ask them to find a solution. Why do people continue to live in Franklin? Some member of the class, perhaps, has moved there because the father was a county official, and he lives in Franklin because he has to work there. Another child may contribute the information that he knows a family that moved to Franklin in order to put their children through college. It follows that if there is a courthouse and a college, that there must be living near them

the officers, teachers and students. These people must have groceries, clothes, homes and fuel. It must be the business of others, therefore, to supply these necessaries.

Then, there are factories and mills that have to have workmen, and they increase the need for still other people who can serve them, such as barbers, doctors, lawyers, and all forms of businesses, professions, occupations and trades. But are these all? Some pupil will have already thought of the people living out in the country and tilling the land, who need food, shelter, coal, machinery, supplies, and all kinds of skilled labor and professional service. A very large percentage of Franklin's business comes from this productive source. Innumerable other matters will be suggested, thrashed out and tabulated as the children, stimulated by competitive zest, strive to bring new and significant facts to light.

And what is the result? These children are learning, in a way they never will forget, the basic interrelationships that criss-cross through every phase and angle of community life. I know grown men to-day who do not seem to comprehend that there are mutual relationships between capital and labor, and who still cling to the theory that the destruction of one will mean the well-being of the other. I know intelligent business men and bankers to-day who do not realize these mutual relationships between the farmer and the business man, and who can not comprehend that one of the most effective ways to promote the wealth of the city is to increase the prosperity of the farmer. They are blind to the obvious fact that the purchasing power of farmer customers is directly conditioned upon the productive capacity of his toil.

I know so called hard-headed business men to-day who can not see that the problem of a community building and promotion is largely a problem of cooperative efficiency,

in which the forces of all should be devoted to increasing the efficiency of each. In view of these well-known facts, the real importance of directing youthful thought along lines of accurate thinking can scarcely be imagined. To equip the child with the fundamental comprehension of these interrelationships is a splendid start in the development of the efficient citizen.

It is not possible to follow out here many of the problems that might be suggested, and we will, therefore, restrict ourselves to a limited few. Take, for example, the problem of how Franklin received its name. Some pupil would undoubtedly guess that it was named after Benjamin Franklin, and there would then remain the question of why? Who was Franklin, and what was the evidence? A little investigation by the pupils, tactfully supervised by the teacher, would disclose the fact that Franklin was so named by the first Board of County Commissioners, upon the suggestion of one Samuel Herriott, the first clerk of Johnson County. Mr. Herriott had just read the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin, and was so impressed with the genius and greatness of the man, and the profound wisdom evidenced in the autobiography, that he took a direct interest in seeing that the city bore his name. Here is a natural and interesting introduction to one of the great men of America, and to a great autobiography. One student might be asked to give a brief report on Franklin, and another on his autobiography. Thus new lines of interest are opened up that reach far back into one of the significant periods of our nation's history, which the student will cross and recross with increasing interest and joy as he recognizes the old familiar paths.

Another problem that should be set is why Franklin developed where it did. Why was not the town built farther east or west, or north or south? Was it a mere accident or

were there definite forces that controlled? What were these forces? Did the topography of the country have its influence? Did the fact that it was located in the center of the county, and therefore an appropriate location for a county-seat, have its influence? Did the building of the old state road from Madison, north, through what is now Franklin, affect the situation? What influence did the railroad have? Was the town located before the building of the railroad, or vice versa? These questions can not be answered here, but they illustrate the method of attack. A class of pupils that will grapple with these problems, and will make the recitation room a history laboratory, where all the students will bring their discoveries and ideas, and unite in the common effort for their solution, is receiving a training in civics that is sound, fundamental and dynamic.

Another very interesting and valuable type of problem to propose is to determine the significance of the names given to the city streets. This is peculiarly suitable for the classes in the grades. Beginning with the streets passing the schoolhouse, the process may be carried on to all the streets of the city, omitting, of course, those whose names have been arbitrarily assigned. For example, one of the school buildings in Franklin is located on Hurricane Street. Whence did this name come? In the discussion and investigation that would follow, it would undoubtedly develop that it was called Hurricane Street because it was but the continuation of Hurricane Road. But why did the road bear that descriptive name? There is a creek running through Franklin that also bears the name Hurricane. Could there be any relation between the name of the creek and the road? The pupils may easily be led to discover that the road and the creek run through the same territory, which would rouse the presumption that there was a connection between the two.

Some of the pupils may learn through the interviewing of some of the old settlers—an experience that is both interesting and valuable to both the old settler and the pupil—or, perhaps by consulting the county history, that when the early pioneers settled in that neighborhood, they found along the banks of the creek and the adjacent territory, unmistakable signs of a hurricane having swept over that vicinity at some previous day. Thus the creek and the road, as well as the country neighborhood in that locality, have received the name of Hurricane. The idea of a hurricane would make a vital appeal to the imagination of youth, and would further stimulate curiosity in finding what other interesting stories might be concealed in the history of the community.

Now, proceeding to the other streets in the vicinity, the other street on the corner is Madison Street, while the next two streets south are Jefferson and Monroe Streets, respectively. It would not require much time for the pupils to discover after whom the streets were named, and perhaps some interesting episodes in connection therewith, to attract additional attention. Here are introduced to the child's consciousness, in a psychological manner, three of America's great statesmen. There should follow a brief account of these men and their places in our country's history, in order that the pupil may understand why the city should seek to honor them by the naming of its streets. All this time the student is beginning to see, reflected in the story of his community, some of the history and romance of the nation. He is continuously following out new lines of interests that are as varied as they are vital. His increasing knowledge and experience will ultimately develop them into familiar paths of history.

The most vivid single experience of my early school-days was obtained by such a method as I have described. I was

in the third grade. The teacher set us to the task of working out a map of Franklin. She did the drawing on the blackboard, extending streets and putting in the public buildings, as she was instructed by the class. I do not believe there was a member of the third grade that did not look forward to this period with genuine eagerness. Street names, peculiar angles in the highways, and similar details were so fixed in my mind that to this very day I am able to recall them. And all of this is in spite of the fact that we were working on a section of Franklin with which I have never since been familiar. This part of the city and its street names are far better fixed in my memory than are the portions of the city in which I was born and reared, as we never had time in our map making to get to the latter portion of the city.

As I write these lines I can remember the zest with which we pupils vied with one another in getting information, finding unexpected little streets and alleys, and discovering mistakes in the development of the map. It was stimulating, instructive and pedagogical. This teacher had the problem of attention solved, from the beginning to the end of the work. The ingenuity, resourcefulness, and initiative of the pupils were all called into play. Significant information was driven home in a way never to be forgotten. Our interest in the community was being unconsciously developed. To this teacher, the study of the community was a very effective means of developing the best intellectual, social and moral capacities of her pupils. She was equipping them with the capacity, the interest, and the point of view for the militant type of citizenship that our modern life demands.

Among many other street names in Franklin that carry a fascinating story is Oyler Street. Many of the pupils by inquiry at home, or by other means, will discover that this

street was named after Colonel Samuel P. Oyler, a veteran of the Civil War. There are many things in connection with the man's public career that the class would find helpful, interesting and inspiring. Perhaps the outstanding feature occurred, when, in the latter part of his life, he was elected mayor of Franklin. Among the issues that were involved in the election was the enforcement of the Sunday and liquor laws. Colonel Oyler enjoyed the reputation of being very liberal-minded on those subjects, and drew much of his support from men of like ideas. When he entered upon the performance of his duties, however, he astounded his friends and enemies alike by taking a courageous, high-minded and sincere attitude toward his oath of office. He had taken an oath to support the laws and constitution of his government when he entered the Union army, and that oath had been scrupulously and heroically observed during four long years of civil war.

When he took his oath of office as mayor of the city, he did so with the same sincerity, devotion and determination that his oath should be observed inviolable, that characterized his career as a soldier and an officer upon the field of battle. The day he assumed his office, he issued a proclamation declaring his intention to enforce the law fairly and impartially, and with the best of his energy and ability, and he did as he declared. He was denounced, threatened and cajoled, but he never hesitated or deviated from his established course.

Here certainly was a refreshing incident. Here was a man to whom patriotism was a duty of peace as well as of war; a man who had the courage of his convictions in politics as well as in battle; a man who was willing to accept a public office which most men of his career and reputation would have deemed beneath them, and make of that office an exalted duty to his city and to his nation. This story

ought to have a thrill for the teacher and the pupils alike, as they develop its details and comprehend its significance. Doubtless there are other equally important matters hidden in the commonplace names of those surroundings, that would prove of equal interest and value, and that would challenge the curiosity and resourcefulness of the youthful mind.

There is, near the city we are describing, a highway called the Three Notch Road. Back of this peculiar name lies a very interesting story, vouched for by local historians, but the accuracy of which I have never seen verified. The unraveling of this story is an ideal problem to set to a class. Perhaps the most obvious clue which the pupils will discover is the idea of the blazed trail, and that this particular road was originally marked by a blazed trail of three notches. Few if any of the students will know anything personally of a blazed trail, but it is a subject that will intensely interest them, and here is an opportunity to introduce them to some of the customs and methods adopted by the pioneers.

But the next question will arise of why have three notches when one would do as well to mark the trail. A little consideration and imagination will disclose the fact that trails occasionally cross, and travelers would become confused, if all trails were indicated by the same kind of notches along the way. But why was this three instead of two or four, or instead of bearing some other distinguishing mark? In answer to this question, it has been asserted that the trail was developed in pre-revolutionary times, and that the three notches were with reference to King George III of England. Here we find the name of a highway linking up with colonial history and in a very significant way, for additional questions at once suggest themselves. What people were traversing this territory at that time, and for what purpose? This will lead to the discovery of informa-

tion regarding the fur trade in those early days, and the traffic that resulted between the southwestern Indiana and southern Illinois districts, and the Toledo-Detroit region. The Three Notch Trail is declared to have been one of the trade routes between the two sections, and it is from that original source that we have the Three Notch Road of today.

Another similarly significant highway may perhaps be mentioned with profit. Running in a southwesterly direction from Franklin is a thoroughfare known as the Mauxferry Road. The problem of tracing this name is an excellent one. An ingenious teacher would doubtless suggest, among other things, an analysis of the name itself, and it would logically follow that it had something to do with a ferry. The name of Maux would doubtless have some significance. Then would ensue an inquiry following up the leads contained in the name itself. By following the general direction of the road, by ascertaining when it was built, and what were the main cities or places of importance at that time and in that direction, considerable progress may be made. This line of investigation will lead one, among other places, to the Ohio River and to Corydon, the capital of the state in early times. Near Corydon is a town named Mauxport. The location of Mauck's Ferry should easily follow. A statute passed by the Indiana legislature in 1823 provided for the re-location of "a part of the state road, leading from Mauck's Ferry to Indianapolis." This road ended at Franklin, because it there joined the state road from Madison to Indianapolis.

It must not be forgotten that some of these problems, being rather difficult and elusive, may require a great deal of aid from the teacher. It can not all be left, in many cases, to the unaided initiative and ingenuity of the pupil. But the teacher's aid should be by way of suggestive ques-

tions, which would direct student initiative rather than supplant it. Like any other method of teaching, it will not succeed unless used with tact, judgment and discretion.

Another group of problems that can be used in this connection is the working out of the history of the more important institutions of the community, such as the different churches and schools. One of the most interesting hours of my youth, and one that I can now vividly recall, was spent in hearing a venerable deacon in one of Franklin's churches, reading the history of the foundation and development of his church. He was one of those men who had not lost touch with humanity in his advancing years. In the story that he unfolded, he had not lost sight of the tragedy and the pathos, the heroism and the humor, and every one who listened was drawn nearer to the institution and the community it served, by the intimate and human account of a simple but moving narrative. He had the genius to see, in the apparently commonplace development of this institution, a deep human significance, and an account of the tireless toil and devotion of its early members, that was both stimulating and inspiring. Incidentally he gave to those of my generation an intimate insight into some of the customs and ideals of the pioneers. There are few churches in any community that can not produce an effective, interesting and stimulating story, if one will only get at the facts and have sufficient sympathy to sense the elements of human interest.

In Johnson County, of which Franklin is the county-seat, there has been developed a system of consolidated schools that in many respects presents remarkable opportunities. Those who are teaching the history of that community will find there some splendid material. In the first place the problem should be set of accounting for the location of the school and then of its consolidation. What were the con-

ditions that prevailed before consolidation? What steps were taken to secure it? What about the struggle that was involved? What was argued in opposition? What was the nature of the arguments on either side? Here is introduced a vital public question, the wise determination of which required courage, foresight and vision. Here is a chance for the students, in developing the history of the community, to develop their own ideas and to begin habits of critical analysis and observation, as applied to the public problems of life. In such a study there is a sense of reality, and such a lack of pedantry, that its very realism gives it zest and interest. This splendid system of schools was not developed without hostile, though honest, opposition. The program was not accomplished without labor, statesmanship and patience. And what better place can there be for the pupil to learn that the every-day problems of the community demand these heroic and basic qualities?

If the student can be brought to realize the importance of the task that has been accomplished; if he can come to appreciate and comprehend the local statesmanship that was involved, if he can learn to visualize the significance of the achievement and its results, he will have a new and enriched sense of the dignity, importance and opportunities of community leadership. When it is understood that much of this splendid record of accomplishment was due to the perseverance, vision and determination of the county school superintendent, these children will view with a clearer vision and a more adequate comprehension the real possibilities of this vitally important office, which have been too frequently ignored.

The story of this community would not be complete without unraveling the story of its dominant institution, Franklin College of Indiana. Here, again, the problem approach may be very effectively employed. The college is located on

a little knoll on the east side of the city. One of the first problems should be why was the college located in Franklin? Why was it not built in some other city? Were there any peculiar reasons why Franklin, at that time, should be chosen as the site? Another set of questions would have to do with who founded the college. What interests contributed the money? What was their purpose and motive? What have been the chief factors in its development? These questions will lead into many interesting and informing discussions. They will display a missionary and altruistic spirit on the part of its founders, that children so frequently fail to identify with public institutions. In the vicissitudes of its early struggle for existence, there are stories of conflict, heroism and self-sacrifice, that will drive home vital lessons that can not be ignored. Normal, generous and sympathetic youth will respond nobly to such a story. They will find in it an opportunity for their altruistic and social instincts and emotions to seek expression. Thrilled with the spirit of exaltation that follows, they will learn the joy of service and the happiness of sacrifice.

In every community, large and small, there is so much of the ennobling, the heroic, and the altruistic side of human effort stored away in the untold secrets of its life, that the opportunities are appalling and bewildering. As one tries to appraise the results that might follow, were these opportunities to be exploited in an effective way, one is dazzled by the possibilities one beholds. If these ideals, hopes and aspirations that one finds articulate in the story of every neighborhood, could be impressed into the impressionable consciousness of youth, what it would accomplish in the development of virile dynamic citizenship, it is almost impossible to estimate.

It must not be supposed that the ideas I am here seeking

to develop are for the sole and exclusive use of the teacher of local history or civics. It is to be hoped that teachers of English will find here suggestions for themes and compositions that will prove helpful and interesting. Certainly the topics here suggested would afford adequate opportunity for the student's self-expression and imagination. There are such elements of humor, tragedy, devotion and heroism in every neighborhood, to those who have the imaginative genius to find them, that the pupil will not lack for a sufficiently varied group of interests, to enable him to give expression to the diverse elements of his nature. Moreover, he is seeing these things more nearly at first hand, through his own observation and experience, and he is, therefore, much more likely to see the elements of tragedy and heroism as they really are, rather than as pictured by his favorite writer. When his contact with the forces of life is thus gained directly, there will be a sense of reality to it all, that will be most wholesome and inspiring.

A distinguished school superintendent once told me of visiting the class in current events. He was a great believer in such work when properly handled, and always had at least two classes in operation, one in the high school, and the other in the two upper grades. Invariably, he said, upon visiting those classes, he found them discussing foreign events and matters of national interest at Washington. There seemed an unwritten rule against discussing events nearer home. State matters were rarely dealt with, and local matters were always ignored. And yet there are few communities that do not have their own local developments and matters of current interest. One ingenious teacher, working in a small town where there was a very live chamber of commerce, always included the important proceedings of that body in his course in current events. The result was

every student was thinking and studying in terms of the local community, and was acquiring the invaluable habit of making its problems his own.

Teachers in charge of debating and similar work, may frequently find rare opportunities presented by the problems existing at their very doors. It goes without saying that it is such problems that have the fullest sense of reality to the student, and that he is most competent to discuss. A principal once related an incident that is significant here. His teacher of public speaking and argumentation was accustomed to assign the old trite problems for debate. He had not been succeeding, and the principal thought this to be an important cause of his failure. He suggested, therefore, that for their next debate they argue the question of whether the main street of the city should be paved. The teacher did not like the subject. He had no prepared arguments or selected bibliography "on tap." None of the debaters' guides or handbooks had outlined arguments or collected material on such a provincial question. Even the teacher's note-book was found unproductive on this vexing problem. Obviously, if such a question was to be debated, some one had to do some thinking, and display some resourcefulness, in the building of arguments and the gathering of material. The teacher did not understand he had been employed for that. He was hired to teach debating.

Finally, the principal had his way, the subject was announced, and the preparation begun. It was decided, in view of the character of the question, to invite the city council to be present. This gave the students a new sense of the dignity and importance of the functions they were expected to perform. The students soon became enamored with their task, because it was real and practical. Their search for evidence brought them in contact with prominent members

of the community, and the city administration. They found these men interested and often holding contrary opinions. They found a stimulus in their task they had never found before, because it connected them up with life.

In their quest for evidence, the debaters began to consider the example of neighboring cities. They investigated different types of paving, expenses of upkeep and repair, and the probable wearing quality of each. They discussed and argued it at home, with their friends, and every place they went, until most of the people in the little city were aware that the question was pending. The debate was a big success. They had the largest number of visitors that day in the history of the school. The question became a vital one for the community. A little more than a year later the street was paved.

The pupils who participated in that debate had an experience they never could forget. They learned something of the thrill that comes to those who engage in honest conflict over public issues. They viewed their relations to the community and its problems as something more vital and important than they had thought. Their training for practical, civic accomplishment, had, in fact, begun.

A departmental teacher of history in the seventh and eighth grades, in a little city of some three thousand inhabitants, tried this theory in teaching local history. She proposed to the class that they write a history of the county. The proposal met with spontaneous enthusiasm. In the meanwhile, the teacher had carefully prepared an outline for the class to use. The first problem she set to the class was the formulation of a plan or outline for their work. With the true artist's skill, she directed their energies and attention until they had developed a plan and outline that harmonized with her own. They would take up a topic at

a time, different aspects of the topics being referred to two or three students together, although all were welcomed and encouraged to produce all they could.

After thrashing a matter over until they had all the evidence that was available to the students, the teacher sought to formulate a statement of the facts, as it had been established by their efforts. In the formulation of these statements, the students took the most critical care to see that no mistakes occurred, and that nothing was omitted. When the statement was so worded as to be acceptable to the class, then the teacher dictated it to the pupils, who copied it in their note-books. Thus they wrote the history of their own county. It was my privilege to inspect these note-books, and the results achieved were marvelous. The resourcefulness, the ingenuity, the historic spirit, and the interest in the community that it developed, were remarkable. These boys and girls walked several miles into the country to interview old settlers who might have some information that would be valuable. They hunted up the records of some of the old church organizations in order to trace the history of the local institutions. They sought out files of old newspapers, letters of old residents, and everything that curious students, or a resourceful teacher, could suggest.

I talked with the superintendent about the results achieved, and found him entirely enthusiastic over the work done. He reported that the influence of that one class for that one year had done more to awaken the interest of the community in its history and development, than all other forces combined. The children in questioning their parents, and in interviewing others, had imparted something of their enthusiasm for the history of the community. The superintendent informed me that he had been compelled to ask the teacher to go a little slow, as other teachers were complain-

ing that they were unable to get their students to work, as they were too absorbed with their history class.

It must not be supposed that the teacher's part in this method of approach is unimportant. It takes more resourcefulness and tact than the old-fashioned, pedantic methods required, but it avoids the deadly monotony that seemed inherent in the older system. The teacher whose work I have just described told me she thought she never did so much work as she did the first time the method was employed. It was her careful thought and preparation, however, that gave her such conspicuous success, and after the matter had been once carefully arranged and successfully carried out, it became much easier and increasingly interesting and delightful.

The story of the community, if developed according to the suggestion here made, becomes an important and effective means of developing the evolutionary point of view. No child can follow this method without coming to the resistless conclusion that the principle of cause and effect operates as resistlessly through our social and political life as it does in the realm of science. He can not escape the conclusion that the community, like all social life, is a continuous process of development. He finds that advancement comes by growth. His whole view-point is adjusted to the wholesome idea that progress is by evolution, not revolution.

Nor is this all. There comes also the habit of critical analysis and inquiry. Curiosity is aroused as never before, as he finds that his normal craving for romance and the heroic can be satisfied by studying the life about him. Critical analysis, motivated by the instinct of curiosity, and directed at the life and institutions of the community, has opened up new worlds of experience in which his imagination is free to roam.

Again, as the vital life of the community is bared to him,

with all its realities of struggle, sacrifice and tragedy, there wells up in the ardent spirit of youth, a deep sense of obligation and devotion to those whose courage and heroism have won his youthful heart. The spirit of emulation quickly responds, and the pupil pictures himself as battling for the welfare and progress of the community. Thus we are building a sentiment of constructive patriotism, both virile and effective. In the study of the locality, there is constant opportunity for the appeal to instinctive and emotional life. The appeal, being based upon conditions with which the child is intimate, does not lose in its force, but gains tremendously in its practical value. This patriotic sentiment need not wait until the peace of the country is imperiled before it begins to function. It functions with each new public problem that confronts the developing intelligence of youth.

The patriotic sentiment is thus strengthened, and its attention directed to the practical problems of the community, by the intimate knowledge which the pupil secures. One may view with great equanimity suffering, hardship and injustice, when visited upon strangers not within our sight. One may likewise calmly behold the government of his community becoming demoralized, rotten and ineffective, if his knowledge of the community is meager, his attachment slight, and his understanding of its real human significance very scant. But if he knows the community intimately, if he has felt a deep human interest in his history and struggle, if there has developed that sense of affectionate regard that comes with an intimate knowledge of group life and struggle, if he has learned to see beneath the surface and to read the deeply human significance of rotten and inefficient government, then he will respond. He will find here an ample challenge to his patriotism, his manhood and his self-respect. The parental instinct, accelerated by feelings of

outraged indignation, and all the emotional power of the patriotic and self-regarding sentiments, will be summoned to the struggle.

Such a citizen will not be awed by the bluff, the determination and the desperate tactics of the determined, organized minority. He will not accept plausible accounts of the weird and resistless power of invisible governments that do not exist. He will neither seek nor accept the spiritual and moral alibis proffered by the smug, the complacent and the self-satisfied. He will not retreat in the face of his foe, though the hour be late, the conditions harsh, and the fight prolonged. He would no more desert his cause in the hour of peril than would our heroic soldiers have fled from the advance of their Prussian foes.

I do not mean to imply that a single course in community history is going to regenerate completely our citizenship. I make no such absurdly pretentious claim. I do argue, however, that if the teachers of our public schools can devote themselves heart and soul to the social view-point, if they can make the various courses of the curriculum each yield its quota to the intellectual and moral training of the boy and girl, if they will lose no reasonable opportunity to inculcate in youthful consciousness a virile and passionate sentiment of patriotic fervor, if they will continually nourish, develop and direct the rich instinctive and emotional life of youth to respond to the call of human need, there will be developed in every community a few valiant leaders who will dare and do in defense of the community they have learned to love. And where there are leaders in such a cause, they will always find support. It is in the training of this leadership that the hope of our democracy must rest.

It should be remembered that if every community could produce but one such leader in each decade, the future of democracy might rest secure. In the political battle de-

scribed at the opening of the chapter, one strong, virile and courageous leader could have organized his forces, held his men in line and secured the triumph of a righteous cause. To find, develop and train these leaders, and to lay the basis of a public opinion that will respond to their clarion call, is the task we must essay.

A most important factor in the achievement of this end, is the available material, in the study of which the right qualities of heart and head may be developed. It has been the purpose of this chapter to demonstrate that in the story of the community are concealed vast treasures of suitable material. The particular community discussed was in no way unusual. Opportunities of a similar nature exist at the very threshold of almost every teacher in the land, and yet how often has it happened that local history and civics have failed to yield results? How many of these opportunities are being seized by the other teachers in the performance of their various tasks? What we need is a human outlook on the problems of the school, a vision of its fullest and richest possibilities, and an imagination and resourcefulness in connecting up its activities with the vivid realities of life. We fail to see the splendid possibilities before our very eyes.

In his famous lecture entitled *Acres of Diamonds,* Russell H. Conwell tells of an ancient Persian who, desirous of great wealth, decided to seek his fortune in a search for diamonds. He sold his farm, left his family in charge of a neighbor, and departed on a long but fruitless quest. At last he became discouraged. His money was gone. He had nothing left but poverty and wretchedness. Goaded by desperation, he sought relief in self-destruction, and was heard of no more. While this tragedy was taking place, a diamond was accidentally discovered in the sands of the farm that the old Persian had abandoned. The owner, in great excitement, rushed out into the garden to dig the sands, and

discovered many and more valuable gems than the first one he had found. Thus it happened, that had the old Persian "remained at home, and dug in his own cellar, or underneath his own wheat field, instead of wretchedness, starvation, poverty and death, in a strange land, he would have had *Acres of Diamonds.*"

The teacher who can glimpse the real significance of his task, who can keep in touch and sympathy with the vital incidents of current life, who can come to the study of his own community with both sympathy and ingenuity, such a teacher will not need to go to alien peoples or foreign lands to find materials for his task. In the very vicinity where he works, in the daily environment of his life, and in the commonplaces of his surroundings, he will find the opportunities that he seeks. For the teacher who is alert, every community has its "acres of diamonds" at his very door.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. What elements compose the determined organized minority of your community?
2. If the patriotic, intelligent citizens of your community were to organize effectively to work for the good of the community, what concrete result might conceivably be accomplished?
3. Why do they not organize?
4. What practical difficulties would a leader encounter if he attempted to perfect such an organization and carry out such a program?
5. What can the schools do in regard to these difficulties? Be specific and concrete.
6. What practical difficulties would a teacher meet in teaching the history of the community in the manner suggested in the text? How could these be met?
7. Could local questions be currently considered and studied, without involving the school and teacher in local politics? How? Be very concrete here.
8. Mention five things in the history of your community that

could be profitably studied by the problem method and indicate specifically how you would plan the work.

9. In what ways does the history of your community tie up with the history of the state and nation? How far should this connection be traced in teaching local history?

10. Suggest five topics for debate that are potentially live, local issues in your community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, *Bulletin of Information No. 37, Proceedings 1907.* "Report of an Experiment in the Kellogg Public Library at Green Bay, Wis."

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, *Bulletin of Information No. 54, Proceedings June, 1910.* "Suggestions for Organization and Work of Local Historical Societies in Wisconsin."

Hart, Joseph K. (edited by), *Educational Resources of Villages and Rural Communities* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1913). Has a splendid group of suggestive questions at the end of each chapter.

CHAPTER VII

RURAL LIFE AND GOVERNMENT

TWO or three decades ago, Clay County, Kentucky, was made notorious by the Baker-Howard feud. The mountain whites, as they were called, seemed unable to resist the primitive call for vengeance. Descendants of the purest Anglo-Saxon stock of which our nation boasts, they sacrificed all other interest in devotion to their bloody task. The feud drained the community of its finest men. It sapped their productive energies. It left widows and orphans, poverty and desolation, in its wake. It paralyzed the social and moral life of the community. It imposed an effective barrier to the beneficent influences of civilization, and condemned the children to lives of ignorance and crime.

Out of the very tragedy and suffering of the community came the leadership that was to save it. James Burns was caught in the meshes of the Baker-Howard feud. He had fought in many of its battles. In one of them he was wounded and left for dead. Upon recovering consciousness he painfully made his way to a distant part of the mountains where he could have rest and allow his wounds to heal. In the days of meditation that followed, the futility, the tragedy and the wickedness of the struggle in which the community was absorbed, came home to him with vividness and force.

He left the mountains and sought employment where he could. For a time he was a roustabout on a boat on the Ohio River. Finally he found his way into West Virginia where he had relatives and where he became settled for a time. While here, he united with a church and definitely

dedicated his life to the Christian ministry. Feeling the need of education, he spent a few months attending classes in a university. But he could not resist the call of the mountains. He returned to Clay County to teach and preach to the folks among his native hills. He became convinced that Christianity and education were the only forces that could save his neighbors from the evils of moonshine and the destruction of the feud. Despite the discouraging words of his friends, he determined to build a school in the very center of his native county.

He began by calling together twelve old men from the opposing clans. He reasoned that the older men were less belligerent, and more inclined to accept an appeal for a régime that would be better and more peaceful. He won them over to his cause, and they signed their names as trustees to an application for a charter for Oneida Institute. He then faced the task of persuading the younger men to support the work. He summoned them to a meeting in an old mill. They came, about twenty-five from either side, heavily armed. This was the hour for which he had long prepared. With native eloquence and an obvious sincerity he pleaded for his cause. He described, from his own intimate knowledge, the evils of the life they led. He portrayed their own dislike and disapproval of the system that they endured. He declared that they hated the life they lived, that their sons were being reared for slaughter, and that the only way to end the bloody business was to stop it then and there, and "to let Christian education take the place of rifle practise, and progress supplant destruction."

Unable to resist the force of his logic and personality, they agreed to a temporary cessation of hostilities. He had won their consent but not their cooperation. They would wait to see what he could do.

In the words of Doctor James M. Stifler:

"He had his vision, his faith in God, and about twenty cents with which to start a school in the heart of the mountains; but he did it. He begged a bit of land on an ideal site on condition that he put a schoolhouse on it. He took an old crowbar and, with the use of the blacksmith's forge, he made a set of stonecutter's tools. With his own hands he quarried out the rock, and all alone one morning, with God for his audience, he laid the corner-stone. His prayer of dedication was interrupted by the crack of a young feudist's Winchester, fired at random as a taunt.

"Alone he wrought with that masonry. Shamed by his self-sacrifice, a near-by farmer gave him fifty dollars in money, a tremendous sum. Others brought rough lumber and laid it down near his growing foundation walls. With his own hands he dressed those hard oak timbers and boards. And so he got his material for the building. The fifty dollars paid for the hardware and glass. Many a night, too tired to walk the four miles to his home, he lay down on the shavings and slept, and many a day, when no one offered him food, he went out and hunted pawpaws and berries to keep himself alive. Fired by his vision, and the actual appearance of his building, others came and began to help him with a day's work, and so the building was erected."

The school opened in 1899 with one hundred students and three teachers, including Mr. Burns. The latter had to earn a living for a large family while doing his teaching, which covered subjects entirely new to him. It was with the greatest difficulty that he kept ahead of the class. But the work grew. The school flourished. His personality won the hearts of the people. His sincerity and common sense commanded their respect and confidence. The fight was won.

In a brief time the attendance grew to five hundred students. The school property was soon valued at one hundred thousand dollars. In Clay County and the four adjoining counties, seventy-five per cent. of the teachers of the dis-

trict schools received their training at Oneida. With the opening of the school the old feud spirit steadily declined. Since then there has not been a serious outbreak. There has developed a new generation of boys and girls that hate bloodshed and destruction. The evils of moonshine have been more stubborn in their resistance, but they have "constantly declined in popularity and profusion." This community, in the midst of the Cumberland Mountains, forty miles from a railroad, has been regenerated by the leadership of a single man. The despair of our civilization but a few years before, this county has become the hope of the mountain region. This illustration stands out as the great example of what can be accomplished in the most hopeless environment, by a great teacher who has vision, faith, courage, personality and common sense. The knowledge of this triumphant experience in the Cumberland Mountains should be a continuing inspiration to those in quest of opportunities to serve. To those who seek to instill the spirit of service into others, it should be an example of resistless power.

Before we began the study of rural life and government, I wanted the reader to have his emotions aroused and his imagination fired by the dramatic story of Clay County's educational pioneer. Here was a man who found his "acres of diamonds" in the environment of his daily life. He saw the rich opportunities of his humble community. In the mountains of Kentucky he found a challenge to his manhood and patriotism. It was in the meeting of this challenge that he sprang to immortal fame.

This should illustrate in an effective way the opportunities afforded by life and government of a rural community. No one can teach rural local government in such a way as to develop leadership, stimulate effort, and create a dynamic, constructive patriotism, who ignores the life of the com-

munity. It is only when government is expressed in terms of life that it becomes interesting and real. It is only when its success or failure becomes written into the lives of the people that it is either significant or important. It is only in so far as government plays a rôle in the service of the group that it is worth our while. Rural life must, therefore, be intimately associated with rural government, if we are to teach it effectively, interestingly or accurately.

But instead of attacking the problem of rural government and life, we have too frequently ignored it. We have been impressed with the rapid growth of gigantic cities. Our attention is gripped by the dramatic setting of the conflict between capital and labor. Our interest is engrossed in the impelling problem of monopolies and trusts. These varied interests, because of the spectacular setting they enjoy, have too easily blinded the popular eye to the problem of the rural life and government. While interested in the destiny of the great cities of the country, we forget that over half of our people live in rural communities. While absorbed in the vexing problems of labor, we neglect the fact that one-third of the workers of the country draw their living from the soil. While astounded and perhaps alarmed at the tremendous growth and centralization of industry, we fail to realize that the capital invested in farming, and protected by rural government, almost equals the total amount of wealth invested in manufacturing and transportation.

The whole problem of the farm, with all its fundamental questions, comes within the purview of rural life and government. Its political and economic importance is convincingly set forth by President Butterfield of Massachusetts Agricultural College. "We are aware that agriculture does not hold the same relative rank among our industries that it did in former years, and that our city population has increased far more rapidly than has our rural population. We do not

ignore the fact that urban industries are developing more rapidly than is agriculture, nor deny the seriousness of the actual depletion of rural population, and even of community decadence, in some portions of the Union. But these facts merely add to the importance of the farm question. And it should not be forgotten that there has been a large and constant growth both of our agricultural wealth and of our rural population. During the last half-century there was a gain of five hundred per cent. in the value of farm property, while the non-urban population increased two hundred and fifty per cent. Agriculture has been one of the chief elements of America's industrial greatness, it is still our dominant economic interest, and it will long remain at least a leading industry. The people of the farm have furnished a sturdy citizenship and have been the primary source of much of our best leadership in political, business and professional life. For an indefinite future, a large proportion of the American people will continue to live in a rural environment."

With these facts in mind the teacher is able to show the pupil the tremendous importance of this phase of his study. Moreover, it is hoped that in meditating along the lines of thought here suggested, the teacher will grasp the fuller significance of the rural life problem to the welfare and future of the nation. In giving emphasis to the fundamental significance of the agricultural problem, President Butterfield pertinently inquires if the farm problem is merely one of technique, plus business skill, plus certain economic principles.

"Is it not perfectly possible that agriculture as an industry may remain in a fairly satisfactory condition, and yet the farming class fail to maintain its status in the general social order? Is it not, for instance, quite within the bounds of probability to imagine a good degree of economic strength

in the agricultural industry, existing side by side with either a peasant régime or a landlord-and-tenant system? Yet would we expect from either system the same social fruitage that has been harvested from our American yeomanry?

"We conclude, then, that the farm problem consists in maintaining upon our farms a class of people who have succeeded in procuring for themselves the highest possible class status, not only in the industrial, but in the political and the social order—a relative status, moreover, that is measured by the demands of American ideals."

This is not the place to discuss in detail the rural life problem, but with the attention it is now receiving by eminent leaders and scholars, it needs no words from me to emphasize its importance. It is one of the problems democracy must solve. It is one of the questions that the citizens of the future must be prepared to meet. Any civic training that does not recognize this fact and does not correlate this basic problem with the other problems of our democracy, is inadequate, if not misleading. The political importance of sound rural life is persuasively stated by Professor Gillette.

"The farmer's advance does not mean others' injury, but his progress in all good things will contribute to the general upbuilding. His advance means the promotion of the common good. His better education means the intellectual enrichment of all other classes. His improvement in leadership so that he is competent to take care of his interests in county, state and nation will bring about a revolution in political life which will offset the undue influence of special privilege in government. If the cities are corrupt and hold the balance of power for evil, as some would contend, an enlightened and strengthened agricultural vote would act as a countervailing influence."

Ex-President Roosevelt emphasized the national interest in rural life in the following passage:

"Our civilization rests at bottom on the wholesomeness, the attractiveness, and the completeness, as well as the prosperity, of life in the country. . . . Upon the development of country life rests ultimately our ability, by methods of farming requiring the highest intelligence, to continue to feed and clothe the hungry nations; to supply the city with fresh blood, clean bodies, and clear brains that can endure the terrific strain of modern life; we need the development of men in the open country, who will be in the future, as in the past, the stay and strength of the nation in time of war, and its guiding and controlling spirit in time of peace."

It is with problems of such basic importance that rural government is vitally concerned. In introducing the topic, however, let us not forget the functional approach. Let us first understand the family and its fundamental importance. Let us organize the experience that the child has gained in the home, into terms of law, authority, government and functions. Let us fashion out of the materials of his daily life, the concepts that will become his working tools in the study of his government. In the chapter on the functional approach, we have seen how local government came into existence because of needs which individuals and families working independently, could not secure. An enumeration of the functions of rural government, an emphasis upon their importance to the community, and a discussion of why they could only be performed through cooperative effort, would be a very fitting introduction. It must be remembered, however, that to do this too hastily or briefly would defeat the very end we have in view. The idea should not be developed more rapidly than it can be fully comprehended. Having once been fully comprehended, it should be repeated time and time again, until this method becomes a habit of thought, and the functional approach an established point of view. The institutions, rules and regulations of the rural government, must not appear to the student in any other

light than as obviously necessary instruments for the achievment of the common purposes of the group. When this necessary relation between government and functions is definitely established, then we are ready to begin to describe and analyze the framework of government itself.

In beginning this phase of the study we should begin with the question "Why?" We have already met the problem of why rural government of some kind is necessary. The particular departments of government will be found to have come to meet some of the particular needs. But this will not explain the different methods adopted in different sections of the country to meet the local needs. For instance, we find in New England that the basic unit of rural government is the town, while in the South we find it to be the county. Why should there be this totally different emphasis? In a previous chapter we found that those two types of government were the definite result of the difference in the economic, social and topographical conditions of the two sections of the country.

But in other sections of the land we have still different types of rural government which seem to be mixtures of the two types just suggested. Whence came these types? What conditions or influences created them? These are problems that should be solved. It should not take long to discover that there were some colonies where the conditions were not the same as those of New England and yet different from those in the South, as Pennsylvania, for example. In such a colony one might expect to find neither the county nor the town fully developed, but a compromise of the two, which is just what one finds.

There are two forms of the mixed type of rural government which are generally called the "county-precinct" and the "township-county" types respectively. In the first, the emphasis is on the county and it more nearly resembles the

southern type. In the latter the emphasis is on the town and is more similar to the towns of New England. Some states have one form, some states have the other, while several states, such as Illinois, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska and North Dakota have both systems in different sections. Here are some other very interesting problems. Why do some states have one kind and other states another? Why do some states have both? What is the explanation of this diversity? Moreover, history shows us that in some states there has first been established the "county-precinct" type only to be later changed to the "township-county" type, but there have been very few changes, if any, the other way. What is the explanation here?

The township-county type was first found in Pennsylvania where it was doubtless due to a compromise between the opposite types to be found in the colonies to the north and south of her. It was largely through the influence of Pennsylvania that this type was introduced in the Northwest Territory. But what has been the determining influences in many of the later states? This problem will not be difficult to solve, and doubtless some pupil will guess its solution in the beginning. In states where the people from New England dominate, the emphasis will be on the town. Where, however, the state is settled largely by people from the South, the emphasis is the opposite and the county-precinct plan is found.

But how about the states where both systems are found as in Illinois? There the problem is the same. It was a compromise between the different views of people coming from different sections of the East. Interest in the problem is still further increased by the fact that originally there was only one type, and that the county-precinct type, while to-day the great overwhelming majority have the township-county form. A little thought and investigation will show

that the first constitution of the state provided for the county-precinct type. But why was this the case? This will lead to an inquiry as to the early settlers of Illinois which would show that they came largely from the South. The later settlers, however, came largely from the New England and Middle States, and therefore favored the other type. These people had so increased in numbers that when the constitution of 1848 was adopted, they secured a provision giving to each county the right to adopt the township basis of organization if it so desired.

The county or county-precinct plan being simpler, more symmetrical, more easily managed, was generally considered better adapted to thinly settled districts. Especially was this true in states originally settled from the South. But when population increased, more interest in town government began to develop and those from the New England states began to urge some form of township-county government. Thus we find, in tracing back the historical origin of our rural government, an interesting story which connects us up definitely with the early days and life of the Republic. We also find, what is equally important, that some of our governmental forms to-day are merely historic survivals that have no special reference to the particular functions they are intended to perform. Certainly the realization of this important fact is a part of the training for effective citizenship.

By this method of treatment another valuable by-product is achieved. The student is freed from the dogmatic conviction, too frequently preached, that the town government of New England was the result of the moral and political superiority of the Puritan. There still clings to my boyhood knowledge of history, the idea that the town meeting was a result of the virgin love of liberty, while the county government of the South was the product of those who

worshiped aristocracy rather than democracy. During my days in the public schools these two forms of government were used as additional evidence, if any might be needed, of the inherent moral perversity of the South and the spiritual superiority of the North.

Whatever may be said of the relative moral qualities of the two sections, as evidenced by the growth of human slavery in the section where it yielded the greatest profits, certainly nothing is to be gained, and much may be lost, by such mischievous efforts to misread history, and to create hatred and suspicion over incidents that in nowise merit them. History and institutions should be interpreted in the light of truth and life, and not in the service of an ulterior cause, however worthy it may have been. That the people of the South adopted a county form of government, has no other significance than that they were sufficiently hard-headed and practical to build the kind of government that best met their peculiar needs.

Another unfortunate result of the "holier than thou" interpretation of the New England town meeting is the popular conception that it has helped to create in favor of a blind naive insistence upon the principle of home rule as a panacea for public ills, and as the natural and inalienable right of every American community. The idea of home rule, when properly understood and limited, may be a very valuable concept to American statesmanship. But when urged with stubborn insistence against every kind of state administrative control over the technical aspects of local problems, it becomes, not an instrument, but an obstacle of progress.

I can well remember when as a youth in the public school, I had to forego the use of slates and substitute therefor pencil and tablet. The State Board of Health had determined that certain primitive methods of cleansing the

slates, in which children seemed determined to indulge, were insanitary and the board therefore ordered the abolition of slates from the public schools. I can remember some of the local opposition that it aroused. What right had the State Board of Health to interfere with the rights of the community? The fact that it saved life and prevented disease was nothing, compared with the outrageous violation of fundamental right. "Kill our children, but permit us home rule," seemed to be the unconscious logic of their cry.

The same point was well illustrated by a more recent incident. A state had created a state commission to regulate the public utilities of the commonwealth. In the course of time it had occasion to lower the rates charged by many local utilities. It had a corps of engineers, accountants and economists, men who were expert in these problems, who could make an examination, determine the facts and make a just and fair decision. No single city could afford to develop such effective machinery for the solution of its problems. It meant, therefore, that the community must depend upon the state machinery, or ignore the problem, or try to solve it without sufficient expert advice, in which case justice and wisdom would be quite difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. This seemed the best solution that was at hand.

But it encountered opposition. A "home rule" league was organized to fight this "unwarranted invasion of American rights." I listened to one of its founders give an eloquent address in its behalf. Not once did he argue that the locality could provide better machinery for the solution of the problem. Not once did he argue that the new system was incompetent or inefficient. Not once did he argue that it would not do justice to all concerned. His one and only plea was that it violated the principle of local autonomy.

He painted in glowing terms the New England town meeting as the birthplace of American liberty. He eulogized the ideal of home rule as the very flower of American democracy, consecrated by the blood of heroes. It was this ideal for which the fathers fought and died upon the frozen hills of Valley Forge. To have this ideal blighted by the humiliating spectacle of a state commission fixing the price of gas in his native city outraged his red-blooded Americanism and challenged the foundations of our democracy.

It is difficult to believe that a man making such an appeal could take himself seriously or be taken seriously by others, and yet he was. Here was a need for critical observation, for freedom from the tyranny of established phrases, for relief from the evils of static dogmatism. Here, again, the public were asked to sacrifice substance for form, human interests for literary phrases, and fiction for fact. When we can get our students to revering government only as a means to legitimate and worthy end; when they will measure the value of phrases and conceptions by their contributions to human weal, rather than by the perfection of their rhythmic cadence; when local government and home rule are studied only in the light of their actual contributions to human happiness, instead of being blindly worshiped as patriotic and inspiring phrases, then we may hope for progress. No laws, no public regulation, no political panacea can stay the reign of the demagogue. His rule will continue as long as our civic body will respond to "bunk" instead of brains, and to fiction instead of fact. And this in turn must, to a large extent, depend upon the training of the public school.

Then let us start right at the very beginning. Let us approach the study of rural government as but an organized expression of the community life. Let the student learn (let him become so impregnated with the doctrine that it

never can be forgotten) that the institutions and laws that constitute his rural government, are but the conscious devices or instruments which men have adopted as the basis of their cooperative efforts to meet and solve the problems of their common life. Let them realize that this was true of the fathers as they built up their town meeting in the North and the county government in the South. Let them never forget the test of these different plans is the service that they render. And let them not forget that the glory of the fathers consisted, not in the false assumption of their perfection, but in their ability to see life as it was, to build institutions that fitted into the conditions that they confronted, and to face courageously and effectively the tremendous problems that barred the pathway of national progress. If they would emulate the inspiring examples of colonial patriots, it will not be by worship of the trite, the pedantic, or the orthodox, but by studying the problems of to-day and bringing to their ultimate solution the same courage, critical vision and common sense that characterized the statesmanship of the fathers.

We now come to a detailed consideration of rural government. Just as we used the functional approach to show the necessity and nature of rural government in general, so we should use it in developing the various departments of the local organization in particular. For example, if we want to take up the health department of the local government, we would begin with the problems of public health. The general nature of disease, with particular reference to those that are communicable, should be taken up. The importance of health should be emphasized. The many ways in which the sickness of one affects the health of others should receive attention, while the general subject of epidemics, with the tragedy and terror that accompany them, should have careful consideration. These all contribute to the very im-

portant problem of bringing home to youthful consciousness the importance of the public health, the impossibility of adequate protection by private enterprise, and the corresponding importance of the health department of the government.

There are few subjects that would offer better opportunities for effective emotional appeals and which are better adapted, therefore, for the social and patriotic training of the child. It is when government becomes consciously connected with such problems that the lesson of individual responsibility may be driven home, and the sentiment of dynamic Americanism may be developed into an effective force for better and more efficient government.

The opportunities for this dramatic appeal to the instinctive life of youth seem so many and so obvious that they scarcely require discussion. From an economic standpoint the question of health is a matter of startling importance. It has been stated on good authority, that the special expense involved in administering to the sick in this country represents five hundred million dollars every year. The total annual loss from illness, due to diminished production, has been estimated at another five hundred million dollars. The loss to the country yearly, of productive power, through the premature death of workers, is estimated at another half billion of dollars, which brings up the total economic loss to one billion and a half. Suppose we could save a considerable portion of this loss, think what a saving it would mean to the struggling, toiling millions of our land. To-day, when the excessive cost of living is bearing down with such cruel and deadly force upon the families of so many, sapping their vitality, killing ambition, and bringing misery and want, this increased production would have a deep human significance that it would be difficult fully to comprehend.

But we are here dealing only with the economic aspects

of the situation. What about the sorrow, the heartaches, the loneliness, the orphans and the destitution that sickness can produce? Here again the importance of the public health can easily be brought home to the experience and understanding of youth, and he will begin to understand local government in terms of human interest.

When these matters have been sufficiently discussed, then we are ready to inquire what provision in our local government has been made for the public health. The local officers in the particular government and their official powers and duties may then be briefly discussed. The emphasis, however, should not be upon the technical matters of law and government, but upon the importance, to the community, of the particular duties entrusted to their care. We want the students interested primarily in results and their achievement. We want them to remember, with a vividness that can not be forgotten, the importance of those official functions. We want them never to forget the tragedy that will follow the failure properly to perform them, and the splendid, magnificent results that follow from their faithful and efficient discharge. If we can accomplish this, we will have tied up the dynamic forces of the child with the efficiency of the local office. We will have created a patriotic sentiment that will function as aggressively and effectively in these basic problems of peace as it has in the more dramatic affairs of war.

The care of the charitable and penal institutions of the locality is another important function entrusted to local government. The possibilities of the use of the orphans' home as a means to bringing home to pupils, in an intimate and dramatic way, the vital importance of local government, has been discussed in a previous chapter. Opportunities of the same nature are provided by the other charitable as well as the penal institutions of the community. No one

with normal sympathies and a reasonably human outlook on life could fail to be touched by the pathetic incidents of men and women, who in old age find themselves helpless, without friends and yet dependent upon the care of others. The arrangements provided for their care by the local government, thus becomes a matter of very vital interest. Mismanagement and incompetence may mean not only heartbreaking cruelty and hardship, but the abuse and perversion of a very important institution to improper and unworthy ends. An institution that is managed with care, judgment and vision, is doing a humane and noble work, that gives to every thoughtful citizen a thrill of pleasure, and a sense of pride, that makes him a better citizen and a nobler man. But let the institution fall into disrepute and the average citizen avoids all thought and contact, because he desires to shun the thought of misery which will give him pain. In time, he becomes hopeless and cynical regarding government and politics, and is content to leave them to the care of others.

Nothing succeeds like success and nothing tends to quicken pride and interest in local government so much as the successful creation and administration of these institutions. The sympathetic appeal and the noble achievements they are able to accomplish will not fail to catch the popular imagination. How to start the public interest enough to secure the initial success, is the fundamental problem. Like many problems that have to do with public opinion and individual responsibility, it will have to be solved largely by the educational process. The child must learn in his youth the dramatic possibilities that are involved. He must have an emotional and instinctive life developed, that is keyed to this class of appeals. He must have learned that in attacking and solving just such problems as these, he will find that joy and exaltation for which he longs, and which comes to

every normal youth in the performance of altruistic deeds. Our problem is so to connect the splendid, buoyant, emotional powers of youth with the problems of the community that in their solution he finds a challenge to his manhood, his heroism, and his patriotic sentiment.

When the possibilities of these institutions have been made clear, then the part of government responsible for their control should receive attention, until the importance of the office involved is made specific, vivid and clear.

One very important set of functions generally entrusted to local government is the question of law enforcement. In approaching this problem let us forget none of the preliminary essentials, if the pupils are to have the right point of view regarding the nature and function of law, and the necessity for its interpretation and enforcement through the power of the community and the state. It would be far better to ignore it completely than to approach it with the "taking everything for granted" attitude. Let us first review the necessity for rules of conduct in the home, and the necessity for some one in authority who could lay them down and give them force. Then, as neighborhood and community problems develop, cooperation became as necessary between the homes as it had been before, within the home. But cooperation could not take place without principles or laws, any more than baseball could be played without rules. Therefore, there grew up a body of rules or laws, some of which originated in the customs of the people, while some have been developed by the courts, as they have tried to lay down fundamental principles as a basis of deciding disputes that come before them for decision. Still other rules have been adopted by the state legislature, an institution which will be studied later.

The necessity of law as a basis of community life should be made clear. In the olden times, each family would make

its own clothes, shoes and shelter; each family would do its own butchering, prepare its own foods, and live its own life, largely independently of others. But the clothes were coarse, the shoes inferior, the houses without modern comforts and conveniences, and the food greatly restricted in variety, kind and quality. There was little wealth in those days, and what the working man regards as necessities today, were then regarded as the prerogatives of kings and queens.

But with the industrial revolution and the use of steam and machinery, things could be manufactured much more cheaply than before. This, however, required the division of labor. Men no longer made their own shoes and clothes, but they could be better and more cheaply made by machines in factories, and obviously every man could not have a machine and factory for his own shoes. And so the process developed until one man made shoes, another pins, another machinery, etc., throughout the whole of industry. Thus society became complicated, and each depended upon the work of others for many of the necessities of life. A man who made shoes received wages, and with wages he purchased from others the things he had to have. The farmer sold his produce and bought in town shoes, clothing and food. All of these exchanges and arrangements could not take place unless there were rules governing their conduct. There had to be rules governing contracts in order that persons might make arrangement to purchase the things they needed, and feel sure that when the time came, they would get that upon which they had agreed. It was necessary, therefore, to have rules determining what constituted a valid contract, that fraud must not be employed, that undue advantage should not be taken, that contracts should be properly interpreted, and then when properly made, they should be observed.

Think of how helpless one would be where there were no rules or customs governing contracts, and therefore where binding agreements were impossible. One could not buy or sell a farm on credit, for there would be no way of knowing whether the money would be paid. One could not hire a man to work upon the farm for he would not know when, if ever, he would get his pay, and the farmer would never know how long the man might stay or when he might refuse to work. Much of modern life is based upon contracts of one kind and another, which would be impossible without rules or customs governing them.

But this is only one small class of examples illustrating the need of law. Take the public health measures, especially those dealing with epidemics, and consider how safe one might be if there were no such laws or if they could be defied with impunity. Suppose that a person afflicted with smallpox were allowed to roam the streets, attend school and church, and mingle freely with the public. There would follow an epidemic of smallpox that would cause untold suffering, anguish and loss of life. The health and safety of all are thus dependent upon the adequate quarantine laws and their efficient administration.

Then there are pure food and drug laws that are enacted to protect the individual from drugs and foods that are impure or unwholesome. One can not go to a chemist to test the purity of foods or drugs every time one buys them, and it therefore becomes necessary for the state to enact laws that will prevent the sale of improper articles, and will compel the manufacturer to state expressly just what the article contains. The injuries to health and happiness that have been wrought through the continuous use of impure and poisonous drugs would afford a story of human tragedy that would make one wonder why more such laws have not been enacted.

Then there are laws that are passed to protect liberty and property. Most of us live in such peace and security that we forget that it is only through the wise enactment and efficient administration of the law that this peace and security is achieved. To emphasize the importance of this fact, a gifted teacher whom I know, asked a pupil who had a very pretty necklace, if she passed anybody on her way to school. She asked her if the necklace were valuable. If so, why did not the man that she passed take the necklace from her? He could easily have done so, had he tried. If she answered it was because the man was good and kind, then she was asked if the man would have taken it if he had been cruel and wicked. Here an interesting discussion developed, involving policemen, jails, fines, etc., but out of which confusion finally came the consciousness that it was the potential power of the state, in the last analysis, that protected the necklace.

This can be carried further by asking the girl what would happen to her necklace if she were living in the more lawless parts of Mexico, or in some section of benighted Russia where law and order have not yet been established. The alternative to an adequate system of law and its efficient enforcement, can be brought home with such striking effect that it will have a marked effect on youthful understanding. Let the pupil have glimpses of what has happened to innocent and self-respecting folk in our own land on those special occasions, when, for the time being, anarchy has supplanted law. The recent race wars and some of our industrial conflicts will afford sufficient evidence.

These several topics should be so studied and considered that the value of lawful government makes an irresistible appeal to the imagination, the impulses and the sentiments of youth. The very real terror and menace of anarchy

should be driven home, until the sentiment of patriotism will respond as vigorously to defy the forces of lawlessness within, as it does to oppose the foreign foes without. This sentiment does not involve a static conception of the approvel of the established order, but a deep and intimate understanding of the necessity of lawful processes to human progress. This sentiment is based upon the proposition that law and liberty are in concord, not in conflict, and that evolution, not revolution, affords the surest means of progress. Our youth must gain this conception, if it is to profit by the history and experience of the race.

We are now ready to approach the local departments of government that look after the enforcement of law. If the necessity of law has been made clear, the student is prepared to recognize the tremendous importance of these officers. He sees their importance to the community. He can readily glimpse the terrible consequences that would prevail should they lack courage, or conviction. The importance and significance of rural government thus comes home to him with vividness and conviction. As partly responsible for its success or failure, his opportunities and duties as a citizen will make a strong appeal to the generous and heroic impulses of youth.

Another function of rural government is the education and training of the youth in the public school. It would be difficult to find a subject of greater social significance than the rural schools. It is significant that the great bulk of thinkers and writers upon the rural life problem tend to find in the development and perfection of the school, the hope of the community, and the solution of its problems. Space does not permit a discussion of this fascinating problem, with which thinking teachers are perfectly familiar. The transcendent importance of this subject is so obvious as to need no further comment. To reduce this information

to the terms of the experience of the child would seem to require no special aid.

There are many examples and many splendid books that bring out the facts in an interesting and convincing way. Perhaps the best method of approach is to relate the achievements accomplished in some neighborhoods by a rural school that has been efficient and successful and where the teacher has developed a high degree of community leadership. The effect on the social life of the community has frequently been far-reaching and important. The study of problems of agriculture and domestic science by the pupils and their demonstration upon the farm has taught many a parent invaluable lessons that he had thought himself too old to learn. The organization of corn clubs, pig clubs and calf clubs has stimulated private initiative, brought home the value of scientific training, encouraged business methods and systems of accounting, provided profitable and interesting employment during vacation periods, increased the production of the community, and established habits of thrift, foresight and frugality, that will yield large dividends through life.

The development of the idea of the civic center with the gathering together of the people of the community, has helped to restore to farm life something of the old thrills and comradeships that gave the bright and glowing colors to farm life in the days of the barn raisings and the husking bees. In these gatherings they thrash out their common problems, study out cooperative methods for their improvements, and as they unite in the solution of their common problems, they learn anew the joy and thrill of common enterprise. There seems to be no limit to the dynamic force that can be generated through the developments of community consciousness. Such a revolution in a rural community means a spiritual and social regeneration of rural

life. Farm life passes from a competition in drudgery to a competition in business management and scientific effort. Barren isolation gives way to cooperative effort. Study, community activity and intelligent planning afford alluring variations from the monotony of manual toil. Farm life becomes not only more productive but more abundant. It has a broader outlook and a spiritual quality that is more dynamic and profound. And out of this all comes a better citizen and a broader man.

That this regeneration may come through the influence of a rural school may seem unduly optimistic. But in relatively short periods, many of these things have been actually accomplished. And we have yet only scratched the surface of the possibilities that lie ahead. It is with such a program as this, based upon specific accomplishment, that we may enlist the interest and enthusiasm of the pupils. Once they get the vision, they have gone a tremendous stride in the preparation for effective citizenship. Local government, with its rural school, will remain for them a matter of more than passing interest. It will mean to them the possible realization of a dream, both graphic and alluring.

It will be impossible to treat of all the functions of rural government and the machinery adapted for their performance. Enough has perhaps been written to suggest some helpful methods of approach by which the subject-matter of the chapter may be utilized in the intellectual and moral development of the boy and girl.

But it must not be supposed that the subject of rural life and government is completed with a consideration of governmental functions and the appropriate machinery. Perhaps this has been one of our great mistakes. We have not always seen that training for citizenship in a bigger and broader conception than training for the suffrage, as fundamental and important as that is. There are innumerable

duties of citizenship that find no connection with the ballot box, and yet that are essential to an aggressive and militant democracy. There are many community enterprises, requiring cooperative efforts, that are essential to the fullest and best life of the people, that are not provided for by the forms of law. Some of the finest public service that I have ever seen has been performed outside of public office. In modern life, there are innumerable appeals that challenge the best and noblest instincts of the race, that can best be met through the initiative of private enterprise. A citizen who does not respond to this appeal, who can not cooperate with his fellows in response to such a call, who feels no sense of personal accountability for the public weal, is not prepared for the duties of democracy.

One of the needs found in every community is the religious one. Men have always sought religious expression, whether it be in the fantastic rites of barbarism or in the cultivated forms approved by the modern church. In modern times men have organized for the effective expression of religious life, whether in the forms of theological controversy, religious wars or the service of humanity. With the growth of civilization and the spread of intelligence, the church has developed to meet the spiritual needs of the new life. Many of its earlier functions have been supplanted by secular institutions. But there still remains important work for it to do.

Modern religion represents a vast storehouse of dynamic force. When intelligently interpreted, it meets deep-felt wants in the lives of all. This force should be developed and utilized. Some institution must provide the means by which the religious aspirations of the people may become articulate in their daily life. The church, if properly conceived, may answer this deep-felt want. Here the religious emotion may be nourished and directed. Here men and

women may meet on the common ground of humanity. Here, under proper leadership, they may get a clearer vision of life, a higher conception of its duties, a nobler idea of humanity. Such an institution will not solve the technical problems of the community, but it may develop a generous ardor, a moving spirit of altruism, and a genuine sense of community fellowship, that will provide the motive and desire to support effectively the leadership of the intelligent and informed in the fields of technical endeavor.

Students of rural life have emphasized the evils of isolation, lack of fellowship, and the absence of spiritual and altruistic motive. Here certainly is an institution that will tend to break through the barriers of isolation, bring the people together in the bonds of human fellowship and religious aspiration, and give to their life and effort a spiritual and human touch that is so much required. It is the purpose of the church, when properly conceived, not to restrain and hamper life, but to give life and to give it more abundantly.

Related to the work of the rural churches is the work of the County Young Men's Christian Association. Its purpose is declared to be the uniting "in a town, village, rural community, or in the open country, the vital forces of young manhood for self-government, physically, socially, mentally and spiritually, and to give expression to these resources in community life for the betterment of others." Its method of operation is "to discover, enlist, train and utilize leadership." It seeks to organize the energies and activities of the young men of the community into lines of useful and beneficial endeavor. Wholesome recreation, formation of good habits, emphasis upon right living, and the service of God through service to the community are some of the things it seeks to stimulate. In some cases buildings are erected, and secretaries are employed as means of perfecting the

organized social and spiritual life of the community. What such an organization can mean in the life of a lonesome country boy, eager for companions, responsive to true leadership, and anxious to participate in the team work of the community, it is impossible to say.

But these organizations require financial support, membership, loyalty and cooperation as essentials to their success. Unless our boys and girls have seen the crying needs, unless they have felt the importance of their success, unless they have developed a patriotic sentiment that functions in terms of social as well as political life, they are not prepared for true community citizenship.

Another voluntary organization, already referred to, is the civic center. It generally centers about the school and involves the organization of the various interests of the community. Farmers' institutes, women's clubs, domestic science clubs, university extension courses, boys' clubs and similar organizations function through the civic center. The good that results from such development is obvious. It is another foe to isolation, extreme individualism and mutual suspicion. Here the folk find comradeship, altruism, broader vision, sympathy and tolerance. Here they learn the value, the importance, the necessity and the thrill of cooperative endeavor.

But all of these things require leadership, vision, courage, loyalty to the community interest, and the capacity to lose one's self in the interests of all. Here is another demand upon the citizenship of the future that we must meet. Here is another aspect of constructive patriotism for which we must provide. The efficient citizen is not merely, therefore, an intelligent voter or a valiant soldier. He is one that lives through and in the life of his community, whose patriotism is as broad as humanity and as powerful as the deepest instinct of human nature; and who finds joy and

zest in the continuous struggle toward the development of a community life that is wholesome, generous and dynamic.

It may be suggested that the books in civics which the teacher is required to use may not be suitable to the task at hand. Certainly some of them are not inherently suited to the method or point of view that I have attempted to defend. This does not mean, however, that they may not be so employed by the teacher who has the courage, imagination and inventive genius to find a way. If a text is devoted primarily to the structure of government, then the functional approach may be easily supplied by any teacher of intelligence and zeal. If, on the other hand, much is said of functions and the definite organization through which the functions are performed is too briefly treated, it will not be difficult to provide sufficient material of a supplementary nature. This is quite frequently necessary, particularly in reference to local government. But whatever be the problem, let us face it squarely and remember that our task is to make the citizenship and not to teach the text. Let us seek no alibis in the fancied mistakes of the man who wrote the book. Let us not forget that social, moral and intellectual training is our immediate aim and citizenship our goal.

What will be the significance of this new rural citizenship in the life of a nation as a whole? Increased production will contribute its quota to ease the cost of living and bring relief to the poor and impoverished. The half of our people, those upon the farm, will have found a more joyful and more abundant life. But more important still, the whole nation will have gained from a new citizenship whose broad vision, generous ardor, and warm blood will introduce a new and vital element into our national life. At present we seem torn by the convulsions of a class struggle that is stern and bitter. Its ultimate decision seems fraught with

imminent peril. If labor should establish a supreme control, it would hardly do justice to the public and its opposing foes. If capital should control the nation in the selfish interests of its class, justice would suffer and peace would not endure. Some place between the two extremes, there must be the golden mean. Some place from American citizenship there must arise a group who care not for the dictates of capital nor the demands of labor, a group that recognizes no loyalty save to the ideals of our nation, no creed save that of justice, no ambition save the service of humanity. With half of our citizens upon the farm, removed from immediate participation in industrial welfare, it is from the rural life that such a group will largely come. In the reconstruction of rural life then we are reestablishing the foundations of our democracy.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. Enumerate some of the things in rural life that may be used to make an effective appeal to the instinctive life of the student.
2. What vital, immediate interest do those who live in the cities have in the regeneration of rural life?
3. What pedagogical advantage is there in having the student trace out the origin of rural government?
4. Can you state specifically just what was the weakness in the argument, cited in the text, in favor of home rule and against the regulation of local rates, by a state public utility commission?
5. What immediate interest do the people who live in the city have in the rural life of the surrounding territory?
6. Give illustrations of the problem method and how it could be employed in the rural life of your community.
7. What voluntary organizations of your community deserve special study? How would you approach the matter?
8. Suggest the three best illustrations by which the necessity of law may be brought home to the student in connection with the study of rural life and government.
9. In what activities in your community could the pupils take an active part?

10. Outline a definite program of functional approach for the study of your rural community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Butterfield, Kenyon, *Chapters in Rural Progress* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1907).

Cubberley, Ellwood P., *Rural Life and Education* (Houghton, Mifflin Company, Boston, 1914).

Eggleston, J. D., and Bruère, Robert W., *The Work of the Rural School* (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1913).

Gillette, James M., *Constructive Rural Sociology* (Sturgis & Walton, New York, 1916).

Betts, George Herbert, and Hall, Otis Earl, *Better Rural Schools* (Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis, 1914).

Bailey, Liberty Hyde, *Country Life Movement in the United States* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1911).

Waugh, Frank A., *Rural Improvement* (Judd, New York, 1914).

Hart, Albert B., *Actual Government* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1908).

Chapter X, "Rural Units of Government."

Munro, William B., *The Government of the United States* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1919).

Chapter XXXVII, "The History of Local Government."

Chapter XXXVIII, "County Government."

Chapter XXXIX, "Towns, Townships and Villages."

Farwell, Parris T., *Village Improvement* (Sturgis, New York, 1913).

Fairlie, John A., *Local Government in Counties, Towns and Villages* (The Century Company, New York, 1906).

Galpin, C. J., *Rural Life* (The Century Company, New York, 1919). This is a very valuable discussion of the social and political aspects of rural life.

Sims, *The Rural Community* (Scribner's, New York, 1920).

Where to write for further information:

The United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
State College of Agriculture.
State Experiment Station.
County Agent of Agriculture.

CHAPTER VIII

CITY LIFE AND GOVERNMENT

"THERE is no denying that the government of cities is the one conspicuous failure of the United States. The deficiencies of the national government tell but little for evil on the welfare of the people. The faults of the state governments are insignificant compared with the extravagance, corruption, and mismanagement which mark the administration of most of the great cities."

These words of James Bryce, representing as they do the mature reflections of a distinguished statesman and scholar, must challenge the attention and interest of thoughtful citizens everywhere. Moreover, while his criticisms are leveled primarily at the governments of great cities, there is much evidence that the governments of smaller cities have been subject to just rebuke. Perhaps their evils have not been so gross or their misconduct so criminal, but it would scarcely be denied that they have failed to express accurately the best ideals and aims of American democracy.

In the same chapter in which this distinguished author uttered his condemnation of city government, he expressed the hope that better days were ahead, as he saw the people awakening to the evil and demanding adequate reforms. "Rogues are less audacious. *Good citizens are more active.* Party spirit is still permitted to dominate and pervert municipal politics, yet the mischief it does is more clearly discerned and the number of those who resist it daily increases. In the increase of that number and *the growth of a stronger sense of civic duty rather than in any changes of mechanism*

lies the ultimate hope for the reform of city governments." (Italics are mine.) Subsequent developments have vindicated this hopeful prophecy, and yet there is much that remains to be done.

There was a time when it seemed that city government was hopeless. The people, absorbed in business enterprise, in the quest for markets and the competition for trade, seemed to view the misery and hopelessness of city life with a cynical indifference. They seemed to take it as an inevitable result of city growth. They lacked the imagination, the sympathy and the human understanding to see in the great proportions of the modern city, the real hope of democratic achievement. For where men are gathered together in great throngs, united in the interests of a common life and a common economic destiny, there is opportunity for team work and cooperative enterprise, such as can exist in no other way. The slums and tenements of a great city seem to offer little hope for human amelioration, but when one sees them replaced with model tenements, modern playgrounds, social settlements and civic centers, one gets a glimpse of the brighter vision that is yet to come.

If the industrial city, with its miserable hovels and desolate tenements, where children are born to open their eyes on scenes of poverty, misery and disgrace; where they are reared amid the corrupting influence of crime and immorality; and where their only heroes and heroines are too frequently the successful sneak thieves or the painted women of the streets, if such a city will reflect, in the lives of its poorer children, the cynical and blighting influences that made the environment of their youth, then the hope and the possibilities of the city become clear. For the environment can be changed. Crime can be blotted out. The miserable hovels can be made to disappear. The civic center and the school can replace the brothel and the den. Supervised

recreation in public playgrounds can supplant the unorganized play amid the evil influences of the city streets. Civic art, expressed in innumerable different forms, may replace the desolation of the filthy streets, with their wretched tenements. The gang instinct of the boy may find expression in the directed efforts of athletic leagues and civic clubs instead of in the criminal pranks of hoodlum gangs.

Travelers tell of visiting cities of Europe where the little children of the streets whistle and sing the great music of the masters, while our children know only the rag-time of the dance-hall. Just as these children reflect in their musical taste the influence of their environment, so will they reflect in their personalities, their characters and their lives, the ideals and aspirations that they find expressed in the life around them. If they live amid an environment where the spiritual, the altruistic and the human find an adequate expression, and where the community radiates the joy and hope of democracy and opportunity, these forces will find articulate expression in their lives and deeds. In these cities where there are found such marvelous opportunities to provide an ideal environment for the boys and girls, is to be found much of the hope for an improved and perfected democracy.

This vision of the city as one of the hopes of democracy must come to the teacher if she is to teach municipal life and government with the interest and imagination that their importance merits. It is only when one's own imagination is fired with vision and conviction that there comes the largest power to carry the lesson and inspiration to others. And it is in this vision that one must find a large part of the dynamic force with which to enlist and stimulate the instinctive and emotional life of the boy and girl.

The study of city life and government must be begun with the proverbial question, "Why?" Why do we have

great cities where people live in such congested conditions, where rents are raised so high, where housing conditions become so difficult, and the dangers and complexities of life increase with such tremendous speed? Why have not the people remained upon the farm and in the rural communities, where these particular and more glaring evils have not appeared? A glance at statistics will show that the growth of cities has been tremendous in the last century particularly in the latter half. In 1850 the percentage of people living in cities of over eight thousand inhabitants was only twelve per cent. In 1860 it had increased to sixteen per cent., in 1900 to thirty-three per cent. and in 1910 to almost thirty-nine per cent.

These figures have been so startling to many that there has grown up at various times a storm of protest against the rapid growth. "Back to the soil" has become a slogan with many movements, whose only aim has been to prevent the growth of powerful and wicked cities. But the problem is more fundamental than these enthusiasts have been willing to admit. Therefore it is important to set to the student the problems presented by this marvelous development in city growth. Why has it been so rapid? What forces have contributed? Are they permanent forces? Can people be educated so that they will not flock in such great numbers to the cities? These are fundamental questions that can not afford to be slighted, and that provide the ideal materials for class-room work, particularly among the more advanced grades.

As these problems are put to the class, the first response will probably represent the personal reactions of the class to the relative attractiveness of rural and city life. In spite of the many drawbacks of city life, there will be those who prefer the life of the city to that of the farm. It is well known that thousands will deliberately live in poverty in a

city, rather than in reasonable respectability upon the farm. The reasons for this will help to drive home the needs of more social life upon the farm which has been emphasized in the preceding chapter. They dislike the isolation. They long for the crowd, for human relationships, for the interest and zest of the day, things which too frequently are entirely lacking in rural life. It would seem, therefore, that if people are to be made content with rural life, and the rural movement is to meet with any success, that it must be through some kind of regeneration of rural life as has been previously suggested.

But will this take care of the entire problem? If the great majority of the people desired to return to the farm, would it be possible? This brings up the question, which will occur to students very readily, what will the people do upon the farm? Moreover, if everybody leaves the city, what will the manufacturers do for the labor to man their factories and produce the manufactured goods that the farmer has to have? It will soon become obvious to the class that such a wholesale movement would involve fundamental industrial and economic changes.

The nature of these changes may be illustrated by reversing the questions. What happened in the middle of the last century when the people began to leave the farm and move to the city? If in 1850 only twelve per cent. of the people lived in cities and now thirty-nine per cent. live in cities, what has the farmer done for labor on the farm? Since people can not live without the food and clothing that comes from agricultural production, how has the production been maintained, with the great shift of people from the farm to the city? Here is a problem that goes to the very gist of the situation. How can sixty-one per cent. of the people now do the work upon the farms when eighty-eight per cent. were required in 1850? A little ingenious ques-

tioning will draw out the significant fact that much of the work now done by machinery was then done by hand. This introduces the whole subject of the industrial revolution and the application of steam and machinery to the various methods of production and distribution.

The children by inquiring at home as to methods of agriculture employed in the youth of their parents, and by comparing them with the methods of to-day, will not lose much time in discovering that, through the invention of machinery and mechanical power, one man now does as much work upon the farm as was formerly done by many. A comparison of the old and modern methods of harvesting, thrashing and sowing grain will bring this out in a clear and vivid manner. It has been declared that one man now does as much work upon the farm, with the aid of labor-saving devices, as was formerly done by fifteen. In other words machinery has tended to supplant man labor upon the farm. But what became of the men whom the machinery had displaced? If one man now does the work formerly done by fifteen, what has become of the other fourteen who are thereby left without employment? It will doubtless be suggested that if they stay upon the farm they will starve or live on the bounty of others, since there is no work there for them to do. Then what could they do?

In the meantime it may be wise to set another set of problems. Who is making the machinery that is being employed upon the farm? Who manufactures the thrashing machines, the drills, the mowers, the tractors and the other new devices that have revolutionized agricultural methods? Do not these industries require labor for which there had been no previous demand? Where did the big factories get the men they needed? The answer now seems obvious that the men released upon the farm secured employment in the factories that were springing up as if by magic. For

with the application of steam to machinery and manufacturing, the industrial productivity of the nation increased by leaps and bounds. The demand for manufactured goods increased not only with the growth of population but with the rapidly expanding wants of a prosperous people. The luxuries of one decade became the necessities of the next. In the meantime, the demand for agricultural products only increased about as rapidly as the population, since man's capacity to consume the products of the farm tends to be stationary, while the demand for manufactured articles increases with his inventive genius and the desire for luxury and conveniences.

But this creates another set of problems. Why do the factories locate in the cities? Why should the tremendous increase in manufacturing mean a corresponding increase in the population of urban centers? These problems will not be difficult for the children to answer when their attention is called to the benefits of large scale production. This means that factories to be productive must be large. This involves the employment of a large number of employees who must obviously live in the vicinity of the factory. For instance, one steel plant may employ ten thousand men. These employees, with their families, and the mechanics, the artisans, professional men and merchants who serve them, will furnish the population for a city of considerable dimensions. It is this process multiplied many times that produces our greatest cities and that has increased the total urban population of the country.

But this merely raises another problem. Why do these factories gather in the same cities or localities, resulting in the tremendous cities that we have? Why do they not scatter out more, relieving the congestion where it is the worst? This raises some very interesting questions, which the children should be interested in solving. Take, for

instance, the city of Chicago. Why have industries flocked to Chicago? Why have they not scattered to other cities where property would be cheaper, home-building easier, and the worst problems of the great city could be evaded? Are there any special reasons why one would want to erect a great factory in or near Chicago? Take another city, Gary, Indiana. This city has grown from a mere desolate sand-pile in 1905, to a city of over sixteen thousand in 1910. What caused this marvelous development in five years? The answer will be rather obvious to many. It was the building of a great steel plant there that made the city. But why was the steel plant erected at that point? Why should the directors of the steel plant pick the sand-hills of northern Indiana, bordering upon Lake Michigan, for the location of their plant? Was there a valid reason or was it the mere whim or caprice of the directors? What advantages would they find in this location?

These questions go to the very bottom of the question of the location and building of cities. The student should be directed to inquiry along the lines of the influence of transportation, the proximity of raw material, the question of supplies of fuel, and similar matters which lie at the bottom of the questions propounded. Let them look at the map of the United States with particular reference to the cities of Chicago and Gary. Call their attention to the fact that the railroads east and west across the northern portion of the United States have to converge at some common point on or near the south end of Lake Michigan in order to get around the lake.

Then call their attention to the cheap system of transportation provided by the Great Lakes and the nature of the country that is tapped by this system. This includes the rich mineral deposits of Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan, the coal deposits of Pennsylvania, and markets for the

finished products in eight states, and some of the most populous and wealthy sections of the Dominion of Canada. In addition to this, is there any significance in the fact that Chicago is located near the cheap coal fields of Indiana and Illinois? From all of these varied factors, it will not be difficult to understand, and for the children to discover, why the territory covered by Chicago, Gary and the neighboring cities, was selected as the site for many manufacturing enterprises.

From these considerations the children learn anew that cities, like other phenomena of our political and economic life, do not merely "just happen," but are the result of some antecedent causes. Since the application of steam and machinery to agriculture, manufacturing and transportation, great cities have been inevitable and the location has been determined by considerations of industrial efficiency and strategic relation to sources of raw material, markets for the finished product, and cheap and effective means of transportation. The industries that were erected without regard to these considerations could not compete and disappeared. Thus city life in America is not the result of the whim or caprice of our people, but the inevitable outcome of inexorable economic laws.

Several distinct gains are achieved by this method of approach. In the first place, it helps to fasten upon the child the evolutionary point of view, with its insistence upon tracing results back to their ultimate causes. City government, the growth of great centers of population, their location in particular places—all these factors have back of them great principles of social and economic laws, in accordance with which our municipal life evolves. In the explanation of these causes lies an appeal to the instinct of curiosity and a challenge to one's intellect, that it seems almost criminal to neglect. Of almost equal importance is the sane

and accurate attitude toward city problems that is bound to follow. To one who has thus approached the problems of municipal government and life, the absurd notions that have from time to time prevailed, that the hope of our nation lies in the return of our people to the farm and rural community, will fail entirely of its appeal. For such an appeal is fundamentally opposed to economic laws that will not be denied.

The citizen with such a training and approach will regard the city as a necessary problem, and he will center his energies, to the extent that he be interested, not upon the hopeless task of its destruction, but upon the more practical program for its solution. A vast gain will have been made when we take this attitude toward the city, and when we recognize that its wickedness is not an inherent element in city life, but the mere product of civic blindness and neglect. The solution of our city problems is not the destruction of our cities, but the education of their people. The very conditions of congested population that emphasize its wickedness and horror are the opportunities for a program of public education and social training that no other conditions can produce.

As a result of the fact that economic laws have determined the location and development of cities, it follows quite naturally that economic considerations have been the controlling elements in the building and planning of the cities that have been built. In the desire to recognize and observe these more obvious economic laws, certain other considerations of the highest importance have been ignored. In the planning and arrangement of cities, it too frequently has been forgotten that the city is not only to be the site of industrial production, but also the home of the people who produce. Considerations of health, civic art, public convenience, and ordinary comfort have been ruthlessly ig-

nored. As a result, beautiful sites that should have been preserved for parks and playgrounds have been monopolized by industrial interests. Consider what an unobstructed lake front, running through the entire south side of Chicago, and devoted to a public park, would mean to the people of Chicago, but most of it is ruined by a group of railroads that have monopolized the shore.

Factories have been built without regard to whether the surrounding territory is a fit and wholesome place for the families of employees to make their homes. The people would live the best they could. Unscrupulous landlords, taking advantage of the fact that people have to live where they work, have built dreary, desolate tenements, without regard to health, comfort or decency, and the people, left without a choice, have had to make these tenements their homes, at rents that too frequently have been exorbitant.

With this unfolding of the causes that have produced our cities, we are now ready for the problem of municipal government itself. And again we begin with the question, "Why?" Why have a special government for the city? Is not the government of the township or county sufficient for the people's needs? Are there new forms of cooperative effort necessary in the city to solve problems that did not exist in the rural districts? It takes but little imagination for the boy or girl who understands the gigantic size of some of our cities, and the economic factors that determined their development, to begin to see the problems that inhere in the conditions of a congested population. Things that are safely left to individual discretion in rural life could not be so left in the conditions of the modern city. Garbage removal, sewerage disposal, fire protection, water supply, traffic regulations, building restrictions, city planning, provision and regulation of market facilities, regulation of street-cars, busses and other forms of urban transportation,

housing conditions, parks and playgrounds, adequate systems of police, prevention of disease, prohibition of nuisances, paving and cleaning of streets and the preservation of peace and order, are among the many peculiar problems that confront the people of a city. Life in a city would soon become unbearable unless these problems were partly solved at least.

A mere recital of the problems is sufficient to indicate that they can not be solved either by private enterprise or the simple organization of rural government. Therefore, additional government is required, and the people have established it. Municipal government, like the organization of the family, or the machinery of a town or county, thus comes into being as a means to very definite and important ends. And it is only as it meets these ends, solves these problems, and serves the people of the community, that it can be said to be successful. This conception can not be emphasized too frequently, and any presentation of any form or kind of government, in any other way than so as to emphasize this fundamental fact, is to that extent failing to prepare and equip the student for effective, aggressive citizenship.

Moreover, it should be made clear that the many regulations and restraints that are made upon the lives and liberties of the people, are not made for their inconvenience but for their service. It is entirely too easy for us to regard some of these regulations that vex us with their restraints, as arbitrary interferences with our individual rights. This attitude is, no doubt, responsible for no small portion of the disrespect for law that seems entirely too prevalent in America. It is this unintelligent and mistaken conviction that makes a policy of law enforcement almost impossible in regard to many things. Nor is there reason to believe that this situation will be remedied until the great majority

of our people recognize the importance and significance of law and government, and their absolute necessity to the accomplishment of the things that most of us hold dear.

When we can view the laws of the community the same as we view the regulations of the home, as the wisely adopted measures to insure the enjoyment of our liberties and powers, then may we hope for permanent reform. When we can comprehend that government, in a democratic country, is nothing but the basis or instrument through which the people cooperate for the better ordering of their lives, we may expect a more intelligent attitude toward the problems of government and law. When the first city ordinances against the abominable habit of expectorating upon the sidewalks were enacted, they were practically impossible to enforce. But with the proper education about the dangers of communicable diseases and how easily they might thus be spread, the enforcement of the ordinance became much easier. The first game laws were generally received by the populace as unwarranted interferences with customary rights, and generally met with secret, if not flagrant, violation. But when the game became so scarce and the objects of the law were brought home to the people, they then saw in it a way by which the game might, in the interest of the community, be preserved for future years. It goes without saying that it was only then that its enforcement became effective.

These illustrations merely emphasize the practical importance of the functional approach and the evolutionary point of view. When people see in government an instrument for their service, it will receive their continuous support. When they can see in its laws, regulations that are intended for their betterment and which in fact provide them with the means of enjoying more fully their liberties and rights, their enforcement becomes feasible, and they

lose their contemptuous dislike for law. This makes for a sentiment of law and order, conceived only as an indispensable means toward the accomplishment of worthy ends, and supported by the forces of enlightened self-interest and the hopes of altruistic endeavor, which are the only conceptions of law and order that can endure.

Having shown the absolute necessity of city government as a means of meeting the pressing problems peculiar to city life, the time has now come to take up the forms of the government itself. This should always be preceded by a series of problems dealing with the origin and history of the present forms as they are found. In trying to account for the forms of government found in American cities, some very valuable experiences may be gained, and some very ingenious work in problem solving may be done. The history of the development of city government in America, while not very gratifying, is at least exceedingly instructive. Without attempting to trace in detail the development of city government in the United States, there are some outstanding features that need suggesting. In the first place the growth of cities in the United States has been so tremendous, and the new problems created thereby have come with such bewildering complexity and rapidity, that it was a task of gigantic proportions. Added to this are the additional factors that at the time of the beginning of the growth of American cities, there also occurred the popular movement against suffrage qualifications, and this, moreover, was followed by great increases in the tide of immigration.

With the new cities springing up overnight and bringing with them problems that were new and varied; with the bars of suffrage being lowered until, in many states, it was not even required that one should be a fully naturalized citizen before he be allowed to vote; and with swarms of foreigners seeking our shores, receiving prematurely the

right of suffrage; with the corrupting influences that appeared with the development of public utilities, special franchises, and fabulous public contracts, it does not seem strange that the burdens cast upon our earlier forms of municipal government should have proved to be heavier than we could bear.

With the beginning of municipal government, the early statesmen, realizing that the older forms inherited largely from England were no longer suited to the new class of problems, nevertheless made the fatal error of assuming that the form of government that had been so conspicuously successful in the federal government, and which had been copied in the state governments with more or less success, would be suited to the problems of the city. They began at the wrong end of the problem. Instead of analyzing their problem and then building machinery of government that would be suited to it, they asked themselves what kind of government they thought they liked, and tried to force municipal problems to fit the machinery thus established. The principle of separation of powers, which may be highly important in a sovereign government, but which can have no possible value in a municipal organization, was nevertheless established and has been retained tenaciously until the beginning of the present century. Some structural changes were made from time to time, but none of them was fundamental nor went to the bottom of the problem of what kind of organization the solution of municipal problems really required. Occasional outbursts of public wrath directed against obnoxious personalities in municipal politics, occurred from time to time, but without any great permanent effect upon the problems of city government.

In connection with this history of municipal government that should be supplied by the teacher, there should be set the problem of accounting for the consistent failure of the

forms of government established, and with that problem the question of accounting for the creation of the commission form of government. The commission form of government was a revolution in the history of American cities, not because this represented the last word in city government, but because it marked the abandonment of the theory of separation of powers, and an effort to find some form of city government that was really adapted to the needs of the modern city. Where was the first city government by commission established? What were the conditions that led to its creation? What were the reasons for this sudden departure from the principle of separation of powers that had been observed for almost a century? The answer to these problems will bring out the tragic events in Galveston, Texas, in 1900, the breakdown of the regular government under the stress of the flood and the conditions that followed, and the effort to create a government that would be effective and get things done. We are then ready for the questions as to why the system was so widely adopted as it was? What were its elements of strength? In what ways was it superior to the older forms that it supplanted?

These questions will develop the fact that so many of the modern problems of the city are more businesslike than they are governmental in their nature, that a form of organization more nearly adapted to the needs of business administration would be better. Has this form been supplanted? What are the latest developments in city government? What is the business manager form of city government? How does it differ from the commission plan? How has it succeeded? Why did not the earlier forms of city government succeed? These and other problems will stimulate the student along lines of thought that will have a distinct value. The purpose here is, not to introduce a technical discussion of the relative merits of the modern

forms of city government, which would be too advanced for ordinary work in the public schools, but to bring out the fundamental principle that the failure of the old forms was due to the fact that they were not consciously adopted as means to the achievement of definite ends, the solution of existing problems. On the other hand, in so far as the modern forms have succeeded, it has been because the problem was scientifically approached, and a form of government adopted that seemed suited to the ends in view. When the public once gets the vision that city government is a means to an end, and they set themselves to the task of building machinery that will afford an effective means, success has been marked and rapid.

Moreover, the other fundamental lesson of democracy must not be ignored. With the development of the new ideas of government, there has developed with it an increasing interest in government and a pleasing growth of civic spirit. Without that spirit the new vision and attitude toward municipal government would not have come, and without the civic awakening the visions would have been impotent and sterile. The interrelationships of the moral and intellectual requirements of effective citizenship and dynamic Americanism ought never to be ignored.

We come now to the study of city government through the consideration of the functions that it performs. While the subject of city government in general may be taken up through the functional approach with the higher grade pupils, the best results are generally obtained by a study of the city in which the school is located. If it is desired to give some attention to the general subject of city life and government, this can best be done after the study of the local city, and by way of comparison. The important thing is to begin within the range of the pupil's experience and interest, and by the process of his unfolding knowledge

and widening experience, bring him to an understanding of the forms and mechanics of government that have been adopted to perform the functions, with which he is made personally familiar. By this method, government becomes a vital reality, clothed with human interest, and expressed in terms of the pupil's experience. This seems to me to be the very essence of education.

Obviously, the public health is one of the most important functions of the city and the one with which we might naturally begin. In the discussion of the preceding chapter on Rural Life and Government, much was said about the health of the community, and how its importance might be very graphically brought home to the child. If there are such possibilities in rural government, think of how tremendously they are increased in city government, with its problems of congestion, and the correspondingly increased risks from epidemics and communicable disease. As already indicated, in rural communities such matters as the garbage, sewerage and water supply may be left with reasonable safety to private initiative, but that is not true in the life of a city. An infected water supply may involve the health of the whole city and involve a tremendous loss of life. Mr. Godfrey, in his informing book on city health, cites a dramatic example that will bring home the importance of the municipal control of water supply in a way that can not be soon forgotten.

"In April, 1885, the town of Plymouth, Pennsylvania, contained eight thousand men, women and children. The general health was excellent, and the water supply from a clear mountain spring far above the town seemed unusually good. Like a whirlwind came the plague. Out of that eight thousand, eleven hundred and four contracted typhoid fever, and one hundred and fourteen died. Rich and poor alike were taken, and through every part of the town, highlands

as well as lowlands, the fever raged. And this terror came from a single case of typhoid brought back from a great city whose polluted waters caused the fever. This case existed in one of the only two houses that could contaminate the water system. From this source came the decimation of the little town far below."

To-day the efficient city protects the public health, not only by fighting the spread of communicable disease, by free dispensaries, by the abatement of nuisances, and the establishment of free hospitals, for the care of the poor, but has advanced beyond these remedies and is concerned with the prevention as well as the cure of disease. Doctor Lederle, health commissioner of New York, has declared: "Every advance in sanitary science goes to strengthen the position that the problems of preventable disease and misery are largely social problems and must be met and solved by collective action on the part of the community." What some of our great cities have been able to accomplish in their struggle against preventable disease is illustrated by the records of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and Boston. New York has reduced the death rate per thousand from twenty-seven in 1881 to seventeen in 1909. Chicago has reduced the rate from twenty-one to fourteen during the same period. The Philadelphia rate has fallen from twenty-two to seventeen, while that of Boston has gone down from twenty-four to eighteen. This record of the city's triumph over death is most encouraging, and brings home in a most amazing way the vital relation of city government to the interest of every child. And yet New York, which leads the country in its generous support of health measures, devotes less than two per cent. of its annual appropriations to this important work, as compared with five per cent. for fire protection, nine per cent. for police, and seventeen per cent. for education. What marvelous opportunities will open

to the city with the vision and courage to devote a considerable portion of its revenue to the fight against disease? What untold amount of human suffering and heartaches could be prevented; what pitiful examples of desolation, poverty and discouragement could be avoided; what a contribution to the happiness and well-being of the community could be achieved by such a program of municipal accomplishment?

The vital significance of municipal efficiency is demonstrated by the comparative statistics of Cleveland and Cincinnati. These two cities have enjoyed the reputation of being among the best and the worst governed cities of the United States respectively. The average annual death rate of Cleveland from 1901 to 1905 was 15.5 while that of Cincinnati for the same period was 19.3. In other words the failure of the people of Cincinnati to secure as efficient government as that enjoyed by Cleveland caused the death of four persons each year in every one thousand of population, or the death of twenty persons in every thousand of population during the period mentioned. This would mean that during that time, two people out of every hundred paid with their lives the penalty of inefficient government. Surely the possibilities of what municipal authorities may accomplish in the saving of life and health affords an adequate appeal to the best there is in the boy and girl. They are now ready to take up the study of the departments of their own city that are vested with the duty to protect the health. It is certainly not claiming too much for this method, to assert that they will now approach it with a sense of seriousness and interest, and with the comprehension that they are dealing with an institution that writes its history of achievement or failure in terms of life and death. To suppose that they will not develop a more wholesome interest in their local government when thus studied, and a corre-

sponding increase in their sense of personal accountability, seems to me to be a slander upon the nature of the average boy and girl.

A number of years ago a ship became disabled in a great storm on Lake Michigan, just off Jackson Park, situated on the south side of Chicago. All men aboard had perished or been saved, but one, who could be seen clinging to the rigging of the disabled ship. Life-saving crews made effort after effort to reach the craft which seemed unable much longer to withstand the gale. Hundreds and then thousands of people gathered along the shore in the cold and wind and rain, watching the pathetic figure clinging to the ship. They seem rooted to the spot, unable to turn away. What was that subtle but resistless force that held them thus enthralled? It was a deep and fundamental interest in the struggle to save a human life. In every local government in the land to-day, forces of progress are waging a never-ending battle to salvage human life. The struggle is not so dramatic in its setting, but infinitely more dramatic in its importance, because of the larger number of persons that is involved. Our task, then, is to bring to the knowledge and experience of the pupil a vivid understanding of the true significance of the proper functions of city government, in order that he may see in the conflict for better government the gripping drama presented by the struggle over human life.

Another function that should be considered is that of providing municipal recreation. This is not merely a question of pleasure but one of health, morals and decency. The need of recreation and the evils of failure to provide for it are convincingly stated by Professor Beard.

"It is not only the children who suffer under the industrial revolution. The adults need recreation just as much, and commerce has seized upon this need in a thousand forms.

Just consider for a moment the position of the typical family in the great city: those who are old enough to work, often including the mother, and children, are at the factory from eight to twelve hours a day, laboring at machines which require intense application, and continuous nervous tension. The home is a cramped tenement, or a small wooden house on a dull gray street and with a miserable apology for a back yard. These conditions produce a passion for relaxation—what John Collier calls 'an emotional rebound which makes a desire for pleasure which is almost hysterical.' The flashy 'white city,' the sensational moving-picture show, the 'unlimited' dance-hall, the saloon, the yellow press—these are the inevitable commercial responses to this desire for relief from the intense monotony of urban industry and life."

In a report to the National Education Association, Mr. Hetherington, in speaking of the relation of recreation to crime said that "after having studied for two years the careers of 480 inmates of a juvenile reformatory, personal data indicated that seventy-five per cent. to eighty per cent. might have been saved an institutional career had they had normal play experience. Social workers agree that the 'bad boy' is largely the product of restricted or misdirected play energies. Juvenile delinquency diminishes in districts where playgrounds are established."

Nor must it be supposed that this is a subject of interest only to the larger cities, for there is not a small city in the land where children would not be better off physically, morally and socially if their spare hours could be filled with supervised recreation, where they could learn the ideals of the "square deal," the necessity of team work, the joy of full and wholesome living. Space does not permit my going into the many other important functions of the city, but these two classes should suffice to illustrate the principle I have in mind. It is through the functions that city government becomes human and real. By tracing back the func-

tions to the machinery that fulfills them, interest is fastened upon the government as the necessary agency for the accomplishment of the thing desired. And back of the agency lies the people, whose privilege and duty it becomes to see that these agencies perform their functions, and that the interests of justice and humanity shall prevail.

If the limitations of time are such that the subject of city life and government can not be adequately treated as here suggested, the introductory part dealing with the history of municipal government should be the part omitted, in order that full time may be allowed for the functional approach. It is here that one is surest of making an effective appeal. It is here that the child's interest can be enlisted, and it is here that the virile, instinctive response must be secured. It is the study of his own city and its vital problems that brings to him the definite challenge of a larger, nobler citizenship. Then if time remains, the general aspects of municipal government and the problems that they raise may be profitably considered.

But as with rural government, so it is with city government. There are many problems of fundamental importance that are left to individual initiative, and for the solution of which individuals must voluntarily contrive. Training for citizenship must include an understanding of the importance of these voluntary institutions, and an eagerness to participate fully and effectively in all the organized life of the community. What has been said in the chapter on Rural Life and Government regarding the church, the Y. M. C. A., the civic center, and the various improvement organizations applies with equal force to the city. Some of the most notable achievements in the realm of municipal government have been initiated and worked out through the instrumentality of such organizations, while others have been equally

efficacious in aiding citizens to perform their civic duties with greater accuracy and efficiency.

The work done by many local historical associations in stimulating interest in the community and its history has accomplished much, and teachers frequently can secure from such organizations cooperation that will prove both stimulating and helpful. Civic art leagues, especially in smaller cities, have accomplished much in spreading the idea of the city beautiful, in inaugurating "clean up" weeks, and in securing the cooperation of the schools in the practical work of making their own city more beautiful, healthful and attractive. The Red Cross, representing the organized sympathy of the community, in its splendid mission of mercy, affords a most stimulating example of what tremendous results can be secured by voluntary, cooperative effort. The various charitable organizations, the chamber of commerce, the parent-teachers' organizations, and similar activities should receive consideration, and where possible, should secure the cooperation of the school.

It is frequently desirable to have the representatives of the various local organizations appear before the class and explain the work in which they are engaged, and permit the pupils to ask questions and to become intimately acquainted with the ideals and personalities of those in charge. In the study of voluntary organizations, as well as in the study of government, the functional approach should always be employed.

One aspect of civic training in this connection remains to be noted and that is what is generally called "civics in action." It is the utilization of the students and their equipment in the public school, for definite community service. "Clean up" weeks inaugurated and carried out by school children are very common examples. During the threatened

food shortage at the beginning of the war, when every effort was being made to get those who could to raise their own foods as far as possible, the school children in many cities were systematically organized and put in charge of gardens. One of the most extensive and successful experiments along this line was carried out at Two Rivers, Wisconsin, several years ago, under the supervision of W. J. Hamilton, at that time city school superintendent, and who at the same time acted in the capacity of civic secretary for the community.

The discussion of pending public problems was always carried on in connection with the debating, literary and civics work of the school. When essays of unusual merit were written, dealing with local problems, the local press carried them in the daily paper. Many of the improvements there adopted, generally not to be found in a city of that size, such as public parks, bathing beaches, and extensive street improvements, were initiated by the discussions in the public school. If the public became interested, then a public meeting was held in the school where the matter would be discussed and, perhaps, experts invited to give special information.

The city health department was located in the high school, and the class in chemistry assisted in milk inspection and the other functions entrusted to that department. The closest kind of cooperation was established and maintained with the seven important voluntary organizations of the city. In some of these organizations, much of the work was performed by the children, where it could be correlated with their daily tasks. The record of constructive public achievement left behind is a profound testimony to the possibilities of "civics in action" as a working concept. But, doubtless, more important still is the effect upon the character and training of the pupil. He was here learning

something of the thrill that comes from public service and from the devotion of his talents to the public weal.

Perhaps no single organization is of more importance to the direct efficiency of government than such civic organizations as the Municipal Voters' League, a very excellent example of which is found in the city of Chicago. It is the function of this organization to gather together all the information possible regarding the qualifications, experience, training, and probable efficiency of the various candidates for city council. Frequently there are candidates for city office with whom the voter has no acquaintance. Most citizens regard themselves as too busy to take the amount of time required to make a careful examination of the various candidates, and in some cases it would require a great deal of effort and exertion. Therefore, a voluntary organization that can get the confidence of the public, and that will give this information to the voter, is performing an almost necessary function. But such organizations become possible only to the extent that there are men of vision, patriotism and leadership, who voluntarily respond to these calls of human need. To point out the opportunities, to train the pupil to comprehend and appreciate these needs, and to develop a dynamic patriotism that will force them to respond, is the mission of the teacher.

The study of municipal life and government affords rare opportunities for this tremendous task. Its problems appear in dramatic setting. They touch human interest and instinctive life at a thousand different points. They afford innumerable challenges to the instinct of curiosity. Here civics in action has infinite possibilities. To the student of city life, dynamic Americanism means more than a mere generous emotion; it means a program of definite tasks and a plan of concrete individual accomplishment, motivated by the resistless appeal to instincts and emotion.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. A prominent student of city government has declared that "the city is the hope of the democracy." Explain in detail how this may be true.

2. How may the above statement be utilized in developing dynamic Americanism in connection with the study of city life and government?

3. In the teaching of city life and government, would you first deal with the origin and development of the forms of city government or with the functions of city government? Why?

4. How may city life and government be utilized to develop new afferent inlets into the instinctive life of the child? Be specific in your answer.

5. How may it be utilized to develop and train the efferent aspects of the psycho-physical dispostion? Trace this out in detail.

6. How may the study of city life and government be utilized to develop a respect for law? Give examples.

7. How far may the general principles of the forms of city government be profitably studied in the public schools? What good results would you hope to accomplish by it?

8. In answering the above questions, what considerations should govern your decision? How would you determine what phases of the subject deserved attention? Be specific.

9. What practical opportunities does your community afford to apply the principle of "civics in action," and how could such a program be best arranged?

10. What practical suggestions can you make for the coordination of the functions of your city with your work in civics and community study?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hill, Hibbert Winslow, *The New Public Health* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1916).

Pollock, Horatio M., and Morgan, William S., *Modern Cities* (Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York, 1913).

Howe, Frederick C., *The Modern City and Its Problems* (Scribner's, New York, 1915).

Beard, Charles A., *American City Government* (Century Company, New York, 1912).

Munro, W. B., *The Government of American Cities* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1912).

Reed, Thomas H., *Form and Functions of American Government* (World Book Company, Yonkers, N. Y., 1916).
Part IV, "Local Government."

Hart, Albert B., *Actual Government* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1908).
Chapter XI, "City Governments."
Chapter XII, "Problems of City Government."

Munro, W. B., *The Government of the United States* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1919).
Chapter XL, "The American City."
Chapter XLI, "Municipal Organization."
Chapter XLII, "Municipal Administration."
Chapter XLIII, "Commission and City Manager Government."

Goodnow, F. J., *Municipal Government* (Century Company, New York, 1909).

Rowe, L. S., *Problems of City Government* (Appleton, New York, 1908).

Where to write for further information:

National Municipal League, North American Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

National Conference on City Planning, 19 Congress Street, Boston, Mass.

National Housing Association, 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York City.

American Civic Association, 913 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

Playgrounds Association of America, 1 Madison Avenue, New York City.

The American City (published monthly), 93 Nassau Street, New York City.

State Board of Charities.

Russell Sage Foundation, 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York City.

United States Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.

American National Red Cross, 1624 H Street, Washington, D. C.

National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 315 Plymouth Court, Chicago, Ill.

CHAPTER IX

FUNCTIONS AND GOVERNMENT OF THE STATE

ONE of the most frequent complaints coming from teachers of civics is that they have been unable to interest their classes in the study of state government. So great has been this difficulty that it has not been uncommon to see a class in civics which has entirely omitted this important and fascinating subject. These same teachers frequently succeed splendidly with the federal and local governments. The former they find affords more spectacular events of interest, and the latter seems to come more within the understanding of youth. State government appeals to youth as neither spectacular nor intimate. When one considers the tremendous importance of the matters entrusted to the states, the importance of the problem here suggested will scarcely be denied. The conservation of human life in the struggle against industrial disease and accident, the conservation of natural resources, the creation and development of educational facilities, the development of general policies in the interest of public health and pure food and drugs, the prevention of child labor, the protection of domestic peace and order, and the creation of adequate machinery for local government, are but a few of the important duties devolving upon the state.

Perhaps the very difficulty encountered is due to a failure to appreciate its fundamental significance. It scarcely seems possible that any one who realized the great importance of the tremendous functions entrusted to the state, would find any difficulty in making the study of that subject one of

absorbing interest. Herein lies the difficulty. The teachers who seem to have the most difficulty are generally those who see in the study of the state, not an analysis of its functions, but a description of its framework. To them it is not a vital creation with human functions to perform, but a dry and uninteresting legal skeleton. In the federal government with its spectacular presidential elections and its duties of national defense, they find matters of vital interest and appeal. In the local governments, with their obviously intimate connection with the lives of all, they are able to awaken some interest and response.

I have no desire whatever to detract from the importance and opportunities of local government. I hope they will continue to be, to every teacher, increasing sources of invaluable material. But it should be remembered that just one of the functions of state government is the provision and creation of the machinery of local government and the assignment to it of its functions. A local government can do nothing without the authority of the state, and it has no means except those so provided. It is true, that in response to the demand for more home rule for cities, some of these functions are being delegated in a few states to the people of the community, but it is still within the power of the state to withhold or grant these powers, and to fix the conditions upon which they may be enjoyed. Moreover, some of the most important and vital functions of local government consist in the enforcement of the laws enacted by the commonwealth. Much of the capacity of the local government to serve the people of the community, therefore, depends on the wisdom and efficiency of the lawmaking department of the state.

Moreover, in the solution of the fundamental problems underlying the conflict between capital and labor, with its strikes and lockouts, and its lawlessness and brutality, the

commonwealth is concerned with problems of the most dramatic possibilities. In the fight against industrial disease, with all its horrors and its desolation, and with its infinite possibilities of ameliorating human suffering in its most horrible and pathetic forms, there is a challenge to red-blooded Americanism that can not be ignored. In the conflict with industrial monopoly, where the stake is the protection of the poor against the pitiless exaction of selfish and arbitrary power, there is an appeal to the nobler instincts that can not be excelled. These are but a few of the possibilities afforded by the study of the functions and government of the state.

However, in utilizing the functional approach, a word of caution may be wise. It has not infrequently happened that one has become so enamored with the dramatic possibilities of governmental functions, that one is tempted to ignore entirely the framework and machinery of government. No worse mistake in the training of constructive patriotism could be imagined. The appeal to the instincts and their accompanying emotions is not done as an end in itself. No class in civics or Americanism should seek to occupy the place of the melodramas or the "movies." To arouse fine emotional thrills without translating them into a program of personal accomplishment for the public weal, is nothing more than taking one's class out on an emotional spree. To set before them the inspiring spectacle of a great commonwealth fighting against the forces of greed and power, thus arousing the latent forces of patriotic fervor, without directing them along a definite pathway of concrete achievement, is one of the worst forms of a spiritual debauch.

Unless the functions are traced back to the machinery that is charged with their performance; unless the dynamic forces aroused within the child are brought to function upon the appropriate department as the only means of

definite accomplishment; unless the righteous anger and indignation that pour forth from time to time, in a splendid stream of resistless power, are directed against the men and departments who have failed, the whole idea of dynamic Americanism becomes a hollow mockery. The machinery of government and the men who are in charge, must stand out clear and vivid, in the light of the tremendous functions that they perform. Unless this is done the child can not learn to apply the doctrine of strict accountability to the men in power. He may burn with the fires of patriotic desire, but unless he knows the necessary machinery or organization through which the desire may be achieved, he is impotent and helpless. To arouse the glorious ardor and enthusiasm of youth, without directing it into the channels of definite and concrete service, is a wanton and a wicked waste.

There must, therefore, be a vital and real connection between the functions of government and the machinery entrusted with their performance. The student must learn to think of one in the terms of the other. If he finds that vital considerations of public health have been ignored, he should not only be trained so that he will see, in his imagination, the human suffering that will result, but also so that the emotional force aroused by such a vision will instinctively be directed against the department and men who are concerned. To make our youth susceptible to great emotional response, without training its habitual expression into effective civic achievement, amounts to naught. Americanism that does not lead to a sustained and vital effort toward the concrete realization of its ideals, is neither practical nor worthy.

At the very outset of this program there are difficulties that we must face. The objection will be raised that if matters of current and vital interest are discussed, some of

them will have political implications of a partisan character, and immediately the teacher is in trouble with some irate patron. It is useless to dodge the difficulty for it is there. A little consideration, however, may help to show that it is more apparent than real. There can be no doubt that if the teacher ventures upon issues over which political parties are contending, trouble is likely to ensue. It is equally clear that if a teacher leads in an attack upon some public official, because the teacher honestly and sincerely believes him unworthy of public office, an unpleasant situation may arise. It may also be admitted that if the teacher becomes a champion of any of the proposed political reforms, which may not be partisan issues at the time, he may find himself castigated as a "socialist" by irate patrons who are as reactionary as they are stupid, and who call all things "socialistic" with which they do not personally agree, or which they can not understand.

These are real difficulties that may become serious and that no thoughtful teacher will ignore. There are two suggestions, therefore, that it is hoped will help very materially in the solution of the problem. In the first place let the teachers remember that they are not employed to teach their hobbies, to defend particular dogmas, or to carry on any kind of propaganda, however important may be the cause, or sincere its advocate. Whenever these things are done, criticism will follow, and in my judgment it ought to follow. The purpose of the school and the teacher is the education and training of the boy and girl, and not the promulgation of disputed doctrines. The teacher is not there to do the thinking for the pupils, but to help the pupils to think. He is not there to control their conclusions but to help them find conclusions that are honest and intelligent, the product of evidence and of thought. The province of

the teacher is not to dogmatize but to stimulate; not to control thought but to develop it.

If the teacher will stick to the problem method and leave the students to discover their own theories, he will be a much better teacher, and will be occupying safer ground. Some months ago a case came to my attention that affords an excellent illustration. A teacher of civics in an Indiana high school was brought up before the school board for teaching socialistic doctrine in the class room. He asked for an investigation of his teaching. It is true that socialistic conceptions came up for discussion from time to time, because there were some boys from socialistic homes in the class. When such matters came up he pursued his usual policies of suggesting pertinent questions and problems, and then left them to the class for discussion and investigation. One critic asked him if he permitted socialistic questions, and he responded that he could not help it. He was there to stimulate and not to repress. Surely the school board would not want a boy to be denied the discussion of his problems in the class, if they were pertinent. How else could the boy get the views of others, learn to think for himself, to see the weakness of the socialism he had learned at home, and be prepared for the problems of life?

The question had come up over a discussion of the municipal ownership of a particular public utility, and certain boys had come to the conclusion that municipal ownership was right, and had startled their parents by so announcing their conclusions. But the teacher, being a good teacher, was able honestly to assure them that he had never expressed his opinion upon the subject, one way or another. All that he had sought to do was to encourage the class to study and investigate the problem, which at that time was before the people of the city for practical determination. Did the

school board think it unwise to permit the students to study public problems of the community? Was it the desire of the school board that the teacher take a certain position, satisfactory to the school board, and compel the students to accept that position? If not, then what more could the teacher do, to avoid teaching heresy, than he had done, *viz.*, confine his activity to stimulating the pupils to study and discuss, only insisting that they use honest and efficient methods? Perhaps the school board was not satisfied with the results of its investigation, but it was placed in a position where it was necessary to appear satisfied. The position of the teacher was impregnable. Perhaps it is interesting to note that when the investigation was pending, the members of his class, without the suggestion from any one on the outside, unanimously signed a petition asking the school board to retain the teacher.

The other suggestion, one of far less importance, is that if there are subjects upon which local feeling is so high that it may be unwise to deal with them, even by the problem method, there are always plenty of other functional matters, which at any one time are not matters of such popular concern, to which the teacher can safely resort. No live teacher need ever be in want of ample materials that are both safe and effective.

One other matter should perhaps be noted in this connection. The employment of either of the suggestions given, must not be considered as an evidence of weakening or want of moral force. Unfortunately, there are those who confuse bigotry with determination, and impudent recklessness with daring courage. There are those who prefer to propagate their own illusions rather than teach their students to think. With monstrous conceit, they conceive of their own theories as the great eternal verities of life. They prefer to implant these notions in the youthful mind, instead of developing

a growing thirst for truth. When such a teacher receives the stern rebuke that he so justly earns, he seeks relief in the vagaries of self-heroics, and an alibi in the appeal to academic freedom. Nor do I wish to belittle the fundamental importance of the principle of academic freedom. It is one of the very bulwarks upon which a free democracy must be founded. But the time has come to deny it as a refuge to those who have been its worst abusers. It must not become an alibi for intolerable conceit and bigotry. Its true disciples will find it not only necessary as a safeguard of political liberty, but an invaluable adjunct to successful and inspiring teaching. It is in the problem method of approach, sincerely and honestly conducted, that the real spirit of academic freedom reaches its fullest fruitage.

Coming to the consideration of the functions and government of the state, again we should begin with the question, "Why?" In the chapter on The Functional Approach, the inadequacy of local government and the consequent necessity of a larger governmental unit was pointed out, probably, with sufficient fulness. This point should be made very clear and obvious to the child, before taking up a detailed consideration of the different functions. The line of development, begun with the consideration of the necessity of the family, together with its rules, organization, and authority, as an indispensable means of social progress, should be carried out through the local government, the state government and to the national organization. If this is done, there follows by the most natural methods, a growing consciousness of the whole fabric of our national life. To a student so trained, our government never will appear as a weird fantastic group of legal technicalities, but as a necessary and evolving organism, indispensable to our national existence. Such a student will approach the problems of government with the true evolutionary point of view, and free from

the evils of the static mind. His test of political efficiency will not be in the application of inherited dogmatic tests, but the standard of efficient service to the national ideals.

Perhaps one of the most fascinating and important functions of the state is its program for the conservation of human life. This involves the fight against preventable disease, industrial disease and accidents, child labor, and the constructive programs for safeguarding the health of infants. Here is a group of functions that are of tremendous importance to the state, that make an immediate appeal to every one who will give them but a moment's impartial consideration. The reason progress has been slow is that most people have failed to realize that in the control of their state government these important issues were at stake. It seems incredible that the general lassitude and indifference frequently prevailing at state elections could be based upon any other ground than an utterly inadequate conception of the tremendous issues that always are at stake. To develop the habit of associating with every state election the important functions involved, is, then, one of the objects that we must keep in mind.

Consider, for a moment, the work of preventing industrial disease and accidents. No civilized country in the world renders up such an awful annual toll of human life, and yet we are told that half of it can be prevented. By proper inspection, the installation of preventative devices, the adoption of adequate safeguards for dangerous machinery, the annual toll of accident and disease could be cut in half. This very important task is one of the functions of our states. Mr. A. C. Reis gives a striking statement of the facts and their human implications.

"For every minute of every day of every year industrial accidents send one working man to the hospital or to the grave. Our factories annually kill or cripple 225,000; our

railroads speed by and leave in their trail 94,000 workers, dead or maimed; our mines blot out the life or crush the limb of 12,000 more. In all, 542,000—men, women, children—pay their annual tribute to the machinery of American industry.

"Yet industrial accidents are scarcely half of the toll of industry. Silent, gaunt, appalling—stands the grim spectre of industrial disease. To-night, in New York City, in the cellar of a white lead factory, two Italians are emptying copper pans filled with carbonate of lead. They bend close over the open vessels, breathing in the fine white particles of poisonous dust. The faces of the men are withered and ghastly with the pallor of disease, their eyes are sunken and dimmed with the blear of growing blindness; their lips are parched and blotted with lines and blotches of blue. These men—victims of the poison of lead—have worked before those pans for only two months. They came eight weeks ago—strong, sturdy immigrants from the orange groves of Naples. They stand there to-night—in this their dreamed-of land of opportunity—doomed to blindness, insanity, paralysis, the agonies of a slow, creeping death.

"There are ten thousand white lead workers in the United States, and white lead manufacture is but one of over a hundred different industries in which workmen are menaced by the poison of lead. Lead poisoning, morever, is only one out of thirty industrial poisons. Arsenic palsy, sulphide madness, mercury convulsions—these also lurk in the factory and in the mill. Tuberculosis claims 70,000 toilers every year. The potter's cough, the grinder's rot, the caisson worker's chokes—these all add their human toll. Three hundred and thirty thousand die each year from industrial disease. Unknown thousands drag on—lingering year after year—steeped in poverty and despair—their bodies wasting—their strength ebbing—waiting, hopeless, for the end.

"Even this is not all of the toll of industry. The dead, the crippled, the diseased—these are but the wage-earners. Add to them the fatherless children forced to drop their play and stunt their bodies in industry; and the widowed mothers driven into drudgery because pinched faces wait at the table for bread; add the young orphan girls who may be dragged into slavery, because their home is broken up

and starvation haunts their path. To the 400,000 dead; to the 500,000 crippled; to the unnumbered thousands racked by disease—to them add these millions in misery. Then you have the toll of industry.

"The appalling and yet hopeful part of this story is that one-half of this suffering can be prevented. The lives of 200,000; the limbs of 250,000; the health and happiness of millions—this sacrifice of American industry is needless. The accident rate in American industry is more than twice as high as that in the industries of Europe. The railroads of the United States kill three times as many for the same number employed as do the railroads of Germany. The coal mines of the United States kill from two to nine times as many as do those of England, Belgium or France. The death rate in American mines, moreover, during the past twenty years has trebled, while in every nation of Europe it has been cut in half.

"We need not turn to Europe to prove that one-half of the fatalities in American industry can be prevented. In our own Middle West, wherever a conscientious effort has been made, industries have checked the reckless waste. The Wisconsin Steel Company in 1911 reduced its accidents fifty-five per cent. over 1910. The Northwestern Railroad decreased its fatalities twenty-seven per cent. last year. The Fairbanks-Morse Manufacturing Company at Beloit, Wisconsin, has reduced its casualties seventy-two per cent. in six years. The Illinois Steel Company in 1902 killed or injured 3,750 men out of every 10,000 employed. Illinois Steel in 1912 killed or injured only 890 out of every 10,000 employed. Its death roll last year was one-fourth of what it had been ten years before."

Here is a challenge to the citizenship of every state. Individuals may seek to avoid the blame by asserting that such matters should receive the voluntary attention of the private employer. But this will not suffice. Perhaps some blame may be theirs, but in many cases, the competitive situation makes it impossible for one man to adopt adequate inspection and safeguards unless his competitors do the

same. I have heard manufacturers before legislative committees pleading for the adoption of legal measures dealing with these evils, in order that they might adopt humane measures without suffering from the competition of those who did not so desire. Nor can one escape the facts that these evils are to great extent prevented in Europe and could be partly prevented in America, if we only would. Where, then, is that sense of American chivalry of which we like to think? Are the ideals of our democracy too high among the clouds to render this practical service of saving human limb and life? Can a nation that ignores this crying evil have a sincere devotion to the cause of justice and humanity? Does an Americanism that tolerates these conditions represent the true ideals of our democracy? So long as this continues, does not the mark of Cain belong on your brow and on mine?

The solution of this problem is not so easy as it at first may seem. A mere spasmodic outburst of righteous indignation will not suffice. Laws must be carefully drawn by expert draftsmen who understand the manufacturing situation, and the unnecessary conditions that cause accidents and disease. The bill must be enacted, and its provisions must be enforced by inspectors who are competent, industrious and sincere. The only force that can produce these ultimate results is an enlightened public opinion, motivated by dynamic forces that can not be stilled, and directed by an intelligent understanding that knows when and how to act. I do not wish to minimize the difficulties in the way. They are real, but not insuperable. To those who will argue that I ask too much, I answer unless we can develop an Americanism that will accomplish this, democracy will fail. No government that tolerates such conditions permanently, can long endure.

So far the appeal has been general, but it may be brought

much nearer home. There are few urban communities where some factories do not exist. In such communities there will likely be children who have friends or relatives employed in industrial enterprise. It will not take much imagination for them to realize that they have something deeply personal at stake. The failure to enact the proper law may bring sorrow and poverty to their home. The appointment of an incompetent factory inspector may mean the crippling of a relative or friend. By this way government may be made intimate; personal interest may be enlisted, and the generous and altruistic emotions may be aroused. It is in the marshaling and directing of these fundamental forces in definite assaults upon specific evils, that Americanism becomes worthy of its name.

There is another department of state government with its attendant functions that I find is frequently overlooked, that we should consider here, *viz.*, the state health laboratories, found now in almost every state. In Wisconsin, for instance, there is a State Laboratory of Hygiene, whose function it is to make analysis of all kinds of matters dealing with communicable disease and its causes. This might very easily be omitted from a survey of the functions and departments of state government, but it would be a very unfortunate omission. If a local health board, or the school trustee, or the teacher, or some other citizen of the state, should fear that the source of water supply is impure, they can communicate with the state laboratory, and will receive promptly a container with instructions how to take a sample of the water and send it in to the laboratory, where it will receive a scientific analysis. Those who have had personal experience with epidemics of typhoid, can readily understand what such service may mean in terms of the life and health of the community.

About a year ago, in a little country community, an epi-

demic of diphtheria broke out in the public school, seven children taking sick and two dying at the very start. The local authorities telegraphed for the assistance of the state laboratory and a competent man was sent at once. By scientific tests he determined at once who were the "carriers" of the disease and those who were susceptible, and by proper segregation and treatment they had the situation under control in two days, without another case or death occurring.

In another small city of the state the school authorities became concerned over the health of the school children, and sent to the laboratory for assistance. The director answered the call, and under his suggestion and stimulus, the physicians of the community were organized and undertook the periodic medical inspection of the children of the public school. Many pupils were found unfit to be doing work, others in need of operations if they were to develop into strong men and women, others in dire need of glasses, and still others who were an absolute menace to the school because of tubercular infection. I need not dwell further upon this question, for enough has been said to indicate the human importance of this department. Suppose a man were placed in this office who had neither the ability nor the vision of the possibilities of the work. Hundreds of lives annually might lie in the balance, and yet it is doubtful if the public would protest. Not because the public is brutal, but because it is ignorant of the importance of the office and the method of its appointment, and is lacking in the imagination and emotional response needed to make effective protest.

Another group of functions of vital importance over which the state has either direct or ultimate control, is the creation of the machinery for the administration of justice, and the promulgation of laws and rules for their guidance

and control. The delays and expense of justice in our courts present a very real and fundamental evil. It is one of the causes of popular disrespect for law. A due regard for justice demands immediate relief. Former President Taft presents one aspect of the evil in the following words:

"There is no foundation in the attitude of the courts for the complaint that the courts are made for the rich, and not for the poor; for the judges of this country are as free as possible from prejudice of that kind. But the inevitable effect of the delays I have referred to is to oppress and put at a disadvantage the poor litigant; and while I do not mean to say that it is possible, humanly speaking, to put the rich and the poor on an exact equality in regard to litigation, it certainly is possible to reduce greatly the disadvantages to the man of little means, if the courts and legislatures would devote themselves to the elimination from the present system of those provisions which tend to prolong the time in which judicial controversies are disposed of.

". . . . No one can examine the statistics of crime in this country and consider the relatively small number of prosecutions which have been successful, without realizing that the administration of the criminal law is a disgrace to our civilization. Some of the causes for the lax administration of the criminal law may be found in the lenient, happy-go-lucky character of the American people, absorbed in their own affairs and not fully realizing that this tremendous evil exists in the community."

It is true that the problems involved are technical, upon which a definite public opinion would be impossible, but the evils are obvious, the state legislatures and the courts are the ones responsible, and it is possible to arouse a public opinion that will demand that those in power shall find a remedy for the abuse. Again the problem of creating adequate courts for the poor litigants, the establishment of juvenile courts with appropriate powers—all problems of the utmost importance to the public weal—are left to the

discretion of the state. This means that they are left to the people of the state, and unless we train the patriotic sentiment to function in the terms of these vital problems, they never will be solved.

One of the important by-products of this method of instruction is that it will attract attention to the possibilities of service by the state to all its citizens. The railroad and utility commissions are ready to assist those who are having difficulties with carriers or other utilities, and who are not able financially to sue them in a court of law. The departments of agriculture, in many states, stand ready to help the farmer solve the technical problems of his business, which would otherwise go unsolved or involve the employment of an expensive expert. These and many other services the modern state supplies its citizens, and the greatest difficulty sometimes encountered is to get the people to utilize the services that are at hand.

Approaching the problem of state government from the point of view of these and the many other important functions that I have been unable to describe, the total impression gained must necessarily be a tremendously increased appreciation of the importance and significance of a state government and its functions. The proper discharge of every one of these functions depends at one time or another upon the wisdom, sagacity, the patriotism and the common sense of the three great departments of the state government, the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. The time is now ripe for a consideration of the general state government as a whole. The functional approach to the question of separation of powers, which plays a prominent part in the general system of government, has been amply discussed in Chapter V. Some time may now profitably be given to the part that these three departments have to play in the discharge of the general functions of the state.

Unless this is done the citizen may know that something is wrong, but he will not know whether to attack the legislature, or to criticize the executive. Political power, and a sincere desire to make its use effective, amount to nothing unless one knows the points of contact. Unless he can point the accusing finger at the guilty one, and apply political pressure at the vital point, civic righteousness must come to naught.

Again we must meet the situation that some of the textbooks which one must use, do not contain the material, the usage of which is here deemed important. This may increase the difficulties or augment the amount of study to be done by the overworked teacher, but it need not necessarily defeat the employment of the method. Most books will probably give a very good account of state government in general, but not make any systematic attempt to describe or visualize its important functions. Frequently important details will be lacking, since the book may be written for general use and not for the particular state. This does not mean that the books are not usable and very valuable. It means merely that the teacher must supplement the contents of the book with his own study of the particular state, and his own descriptions of the functions that it performs. The important work of the various departments is generally outlined, and the results attained described in official reports of the various departments, which are usually to be had for the asking. Moreover, there is an undoubted advantage in this situation, for those who have the time and energy adequately to prepare. The teacher comes to his task with a freshness, with a personal interest and zest, that comes from having been in personal contact with the problem studied. There is an absence of artificiality and a sense of reality that is very contagious and effective. I understand the heavy duties that are frequently placed upon the

shoulders of the teacher, already overworked. I shrink from suggesting anything that means additional effort, but frankness compels me to say that I do not believe the average teacher can make the study of social and political life and institutions a real and practical success, nor can he develop the emotional response and the virile sentiment of dynamic Americanism, without thoroughly steeping himself in the life and effort of his particular community and state. I sincerely hope that the time is not far distant when this fact will be recognized and suitable provision made by the school authorities of our land.

Having considered the government as a whole and from the point of view of the functions that it performs, we may consider the general problems of state government, its historic origins, and its general tendencies. Here we come to the problem method again, with some splendid opportunities to develop the evolutionary point of view and the habit of critical observation. Where did we get the general idea of state government that we find exemplified in most of the state constitutions? By this time, if the preliminary work has been effectively done, the student is on the alert for just such problems. He will know that back of it there must be some explanation. Did this particular form of government, based upon the theory of separation of powers, come as a result of the analysis of state problems and a conscious effort to erect a form of government especially adapted to their solution? When did most of the important problems arise? Did they arise before or after the general principles of state government had evolved? These questions will bring out the fact that the modern functions of state government came very largely as a result of the industrial revolution, which followed rather than preceded the form of government we still retain.

Then how can we account for the general form now in

use? What precedents were available, if any? It will not take long until some one has discovered that in many fundamental respects, the states are patterned largely after the federal government. Why should this have been done? Why did not the people study out the problem of state government independently of the federal government? Several reasons will, of course, suggest themselves. In the first place, the problems of the most importance that confronted the people of that day were international and national, rather than local. Local problems were not regarded with much interest. The federal government, however, for the time being, absorbed their attention. It was but natural, therefore, for the people, when the time came to adopt their state constitutions after the establishment of the federal government, to which they had given so much thought and attention, to pattern their constitutions largely after the national one. They had no peculiarly outstanding problems at that particular time to divert them from this natural tendency.

The tracing of the antecedents of the Federal Constitution is a subject that properly belongs to the following chapter and will therefore not be considered here. There is one important difference, however, between the state and Federal Constitutions which should be noted. The students might well be put to the task of discovering any important differences between the early state constitutions and the Federal Constitution. Some one would discover the difference in the concentration of power in the president of the United States, as distinguished from the decentralization of executive power between several coordinate and independently elected executive officers of the state, over which the governor has no or little power.

Why should this change have been made? Had experience demonstrated the failure of centralized power as ex-

pressed in the Federal Constitution? Were there peculiar conditions in the states that seemed to demand such action? The inquiry would probably disclose three explanations, all of which doubtless had their influence. In the first place, at the time of the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the framers were impressed with the necessity of a concentrated administrative power, largely because of military reasons, and because of the dramatic need of strong executive power, demonstrated by the failure of the Articles of Confederation. When that was adopted and the immediate emergency was passed, there was a natural reaction from the extreme position taken in the Federal Constitution, and this reaction began to occur just about the time the first new constitutions were being formed.

In the second place, there was not the military need of a centralized executive in the state governments, and in the third place, the election of the other officers in a state would be a much simpler matter in a single state than in the whole country. The next question is, has the change been wise? Has it produced good results? Which administration, on the whole, has been the more efficient, the state or the nation? Has this difference had anything to do with it? Some time ago a newspaper in Wisconsin carried the following story: A man in the northern part of the state had drawn a large sum of money from the bank one day and was returning to his home late at night, his home being located on the outskirts of the city. He discovered that he was followed by a suspicious-looking character and became alarmed. Finally, being convinced that the man was after his money, he stopped under an electric light, took the money from his pocket, deposited it in an envelope he found in his pocket, and then dropped the envelope containing the money in the mail box on the corner, and went peacefully to his home. The "hold-up" man could easily have broken

the mail box and secured the money had he dared. But that was a violation of federal law and he did not dare. Apparently, however, he would not have hesitated to have robbed the man at the first favorable opportunity, the man being protected only by state law. This is not an unusual attitude. It is a matter of common observation that many people will violate various state regulations of minor importance with impunity, but they would hesitate a long while before they would violate the postal regulations of the United States. Has this condition anything to do with the two methods of organizing the executive power?

This is a question of more than academic importance since one of the reforms now being pressed with vigor in many states is the adoption of what is known as the short ballot in state government. The advocates of the short ballot point to the federal government, and say that its administration has been much more efficient because it has been centralized. They argue that it is much more popular because if all the administrative authority of the government is centralized in one man as it is in the presidency, it is much easier for the public to fix responsibility for all matters of administration, and to place the blame, or give the credit, as the case may be. Whereas, if the administrative responsibility is divided between several different officials, all elected, it is very easy for these men to "pass the buck" from man to man, and thus evade popular responsibility for their public acts. It is answered by the opponents of the short ballot that if it is democratic to elect one officer, it must be more democratic to elect them all. Moreover, if the appointing power is vested in one man, he will abuse it, build up a political machine and use it for personal or partisan purposes.

It is not for the teacher to take sides in the controversy, but he can render no more useful service than to get the children to working on these questions, testing out the argu-

ments, and hunting for the evidence. This is the kind of work where the real power of critical analysis may be developed, and where the pupil must be impressed that the only test worth while is the test of service to the state. Practical questions, if not presented until the student is prepared for them, and then taken up in the critical spirit, will engage the liveliest interest of the student, and frequently call for the exercise of the powers of thought and critical analysis that might otherwise lie forever dormant.

Another question should be raised in this connection. Have the changes that have taken place in state government been carefully studied out with special relation to the character of problems to be solved? In other words, have the makers of our state constitutions always regarded government as a means to an end? Or have they, occasionally, adopted certain conceptions, not because they contributed to the solution of specific problems, but merely because they coincided with political prejudice or tradition? This is a very vital problem and may be the subject of much profitable investigation.

This thought and investigation may be directed by some of the following questions. What has been the character of the problems coming before the state government, particularly since the industrial revolution? Have they been technical problems, requiring expert, technical knowledge, such as health legislation, quarantine regulations, milk inspection tests, simplification of court procedure, methods of safeguarding dangerous machinery, selecting the most efficient system of sanitary sewage, etc., or have they been broad problems of public policy, not requiring special knowledge or training, but only involving facts of common knowledge and the exercise of common sense, such as the general question of prohibition, the issuance of bonds, or the passage of a soldiers' bonus law? Which group of questions presents

the most fundamental problems to the commonwealth? Do both require the same kind of machinery for their successful solution?

In recent years there have grown up two apparently conflicting tendencies, one a tendency toward more direct democracy, evidenced by the movement for the initiative, referendum and recall, and the other toward the development of special technical commissions such as industrial commissions, tax commissions, railroad commissions, and state boards of health with vastly increased powers. These commissions are generally not subject to direct popular control, and have wide quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial, and administrative powers. In matters of legislation within their sphere, the legislature generally lays down merely the general policy and leaves to the commission the development of the technical details. Are these two movements inconsistent? If so, which is correct? Which seems to give the finest service? May one method of procedure be better in one class of cases, and the other method preferable in the other?

In recent years there has been a very encouraging movement toward the reconstruction of state government. It has been contended, whether rightly or wrongly, that state government, on the whole, has not been well organized. It is proposed, therefore, to survey the whole field of the needs of state government with the idea of developing a framework of government that will be suited to its peculiar functions. Therefore, the questions we have been raising are very practical questions. Should these new constitutions recognize both the movement toward the more direct democracy and the tendency toward technical commissions? What should be the attitude of the intelligent citizens on these problems of the future? It is my profound conviction that

by this method of approach, the student will get a clearer understanding of the nature and theory of our democracy and the method of its organization than he can ever get in any other way. The teacher who fails to use the current political problems as laboratory material, with those students who have completed the preliminary study of the functions and purpose of government, is missing an opportunity to do a splendid and an interesting work. When approached in this patient and thoroughgoing way, the capacity of the young student to think intelligently upon these problems is frequently astounding.

I am continually in receipt of letters from persons interested, asking me for suggestions on a course in "Americanism"—what it should include, and how it should be taught. The tenor of these letters frequently indicates that they look upon "Americanism" as some special subject by itself, some subdivision of civics, or some special aspect of our national life. As I conceive "Americanism" it is not so tangible or simple. I conceive it as a complex of many vital but illusive factors. It should represent a wealth of generous, emotional power, trained to instant response to every cause where justice, decency and humanity are involved; it should include an intimate and sympathetic outlook that can comprehend the varied factors of our national life; and, finally, it should include those qualities of moral and intellectual vigor that can fuse this emotional power, this intimate knowledge, and this point of view into a resistless, sustained and determined force, that can translate the ideals and the aspirations of American democracy into the constructive statesmanship of accomplished fact. In the life and character of Abraham Lincoln I think we find the embodiment of this ideal. The development of this complex sentiment is not easy but it is worth while. It is not simple, but to the

extent that we attain it, it is eminently practical. In seeking it we may not get far, but surely it is in the direction that we ought to go.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. How can the interest aroused in local life and government be carried over and utilized most naturally, in the study of state functions and government?

2. Explain the practical importance of covering both the function and the framework of government? What evils follow from the study of functions alone and what evils result from ignoring them entirely?

3. How may state government and functions be utilized to develop the afferent aspects of the psycho-physical disposition? Illustrate definitely.

4. Illustrate the development of the efferent aspects of the psycho-physical disposition through the study of state functions and governments.

5. What opportunities does the study of state government and functions afford for the development of habits of critical observation?

6. Is it practical and desirable to consider current issues in connection with the class-room work? What are the dangers and how may they be avoided?

7. Would a mock state constitutional convention be a good way to study the general framework of state government? Should it precede or follow the discussions of state functions?

8. What state departments, not mentioned in the chapter, can you suggest that have functions that would be useful in bringing home the importance of state government?

9. Is a mock state legislature a good device with which to interest the students in the legislative problems of state government? What phases could be best handled by this method?

10. What reports, publications and state documents are issued by your state which would be useful in the study of state functions and government?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Childs, Richard S., *Short Ballot Principles* (Houghton, Mifflin Company, Boston, 1911).

Bryce, James, *American Commonwealth* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1907).

Volume I, Part II, "The State Governments."

Beard, Charles A., *Readings in American Government and Politics* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1913).

Part III, "State Governments."

Reed, Thomas H., *Form and Functions of American Government* (World Book Company, Yonkers, N. Y., 1916).

Part III, "State Government."

Smith, John F., *Our Neighborhood* (The John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia, 1918).

Mathews, John M., *Principles of American State Administration* (Appleton, New York, 1917).

Hart, Albert B., *Actual Government* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1908).

Part III, "State Government in Action."

Chapter X, "General Welfare."

Munro, W. B., *The Government of the United States* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1919).

Chapter XXVII, "The Place of the State in the Nation."

Chapter XXVIII, "The State Constitutions."

Chapter XXIX, "The State Legislature."

Chapter XXXI, "State Administration."

Chapter XXXII, "State Finance."

Chapter XXXIV, "The State Courts."

Chapter XXXV, "Direct Legislation and Recall."

Chapter XXXVI, "The Reconstruction of State Government."

Young, James T., *The New American Government and Its Work* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1915).

Chapter XVI, "The State Government. The Constitution."

"The State, Continued. The Executive, Legislative and Courts."

Chapter XVIII, "The State and Its Work. Business Protection and Regulation."

Chapter XIX, "The State, Continued. Labor."

Chapter XX, "The State, Continued. The State and Education."

Chapter XXI, "The State, Continued. Health, Charities and Correction."
Chapter XXII, "The State, Continued. Highways and Finances."
Chapter XXIII, "Constitutional Protection of Business and Personal Rights, Safeguards of Individuals and Corporations."
Chapter XXIV, "Constitutional Protection, Continued. The Police Power."
Chapter XXV, "Constitutional Protection, Continued. Taxation."

Beard, C. A., *American Government and Politics* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1914).
Part III, "State Government."

Holcombe, A. N., *State Government in the United States* (Macmillan Company, New York).

Reinsch, P. S., *Readings on American State Government* (Ginn & Co., Boston, 1911).

Dealey, J. Q., *Growth of American State Constitutions* (Ginn & Co., Boston, 1915).

Where to write for further information:

United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.
State Board of Health.
City Board of Health.
Local Health Officers.
American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
American Public Health Association, 755 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.
American Association for Labor Legislation (for Health in Factories), 131 East Twenty-third Street, New York City.
American Prison Association, Secretary-Commissioner of Charities and Correction, Trenton, N. J.
National Conference of Charities and Correction, 315 Plymouth Court, Chicago, Ill.

CHAPTER X

FEDERAL FUNCTIONS AND GOVERNMENT

THE spectacular aspects of the federal government, together with its functions of war and foreign policy, have given its study a zest and interest that most teachers have not failed to seize. With the idea of the federal government, one instinctively tends to identify the interesting struggles of presidential elections, or its more dramatic exploits of martial glory. It is in connection with the federal government mainly that one experiences the thrills of patriotic fervor. Its history leads us inevitably to the thought of war. It suggests at once the battles of Concord and Lexington, the heroism of Valley Forge, the gallantry of Gettysburg and Chickamauga, the brilliant accomplishments of San Juan and Manila Bay and the deathless valor of Château Thierry and Belleau Wood.

No imagination is required to bring home to youthful consciousness the tragedy and importance of these historic struggles. The emotional response is immediate and profound. It is under the stimuli of such dramatic incidents that our nation's youth, from generation to generation, have learned the lessons of military duty. It is here that they have learned the glory of martial sacrifice. The patriotic and self-regarding sentiments have been so molded and developed, they have become so intimate and vital in youthful consciousness that to-day the average man prefers death to the disgrace and loss of self-respect that would follow a neglect of military duty. And this is splendid. It is necessary to the life of a nation in a war-ruled world. But it

has its tragic aspects. So self-evident and obvious is the call of militant patriotism, so irresistible is its appeal, so exhilarating and magnificent is the feeling that accompanies the response to it, that all other forms of patriotic effort and civic duty have been ignored.

As previously suggested, our people will watch the progress of mob law in America, with its annual toll of brutally murdered victims, with incredible equanimity. We can even contemplate the failure of civil government and the temporary inauguration of military rule, in the course of industrial conflict, with an indifference that is astonishing. But like outrages in neighboring republics, if they happen to fall upon American citizens, will rightfully arouse the wrath of an impatient public. A citizen may be butchered by a lawless mob in America, and it will receive but scant attention in the nation's press. But let this same man cross the border and do the same act, and receive the same treatment at alien hands, and our entire nation will be aroused.

And yet for America, with her superior advantages and her highly-developed institutions, to tolerate such a crime is a greater offense against humanity and civilization, than the similar conduct of a less fortunate and weaker neighbor. I have no word of apology for Mexico. I have no word of censure for those who urge that the influence of this great republic should be used in every *proper and lawful way* to protect our citizens against the lawlessness of others. What I desire to urge is that a patriotism that is directed against the evil-doing of others and ignores the delinquencies of ourselves; that is aroused by the violation of our national honor by foreigners, but is indifferent to its spoliation by those at home; that can sacrifice unselfishly and die nobly to protect the lives of Americans from alien foes, but can watch their destruction by domestic negligence with relative indifference—such a patriotism, noble and in-

valuable as it surely is, is not adequate to the needs of to-day, nor in harmony with the profoundest ideals and aspirations of our democracy.

As I write, the nation faces a famine of most threatening proportions. The coal miners and the operators have been unable to agree. The miners have struck. The operators have offered a wage increase which it is contended will cover the increase in the cost of living. The miners denied the justice of the offer and refused to return to work. Under the terms of the Lever Act, an injunction had been issued against the strike, but with the formal withdrawal of the strike order, the miners did not return. In the meanwhile the situation has become desperate. Factories are forced to close and men are left without employment. Local supplies of coal are rapidly decreasing, and millions of poor, who buy their coal in small quantities, are not only facing idleness with the close of factories, but cold and cheerless homes. But a few weeks more of these conditions and actual famine and hunger will reap their harvest of death and desolation.

Why must these things be? Must our government admit its impotence in the face of such a crisis? Is our democracy incompetent to grapple with the situation? Must the nation that amazed the world with its organizing genius, its resistless spirit and its incomparable military accomplishments against foreign foes, admit its incompetence in dealing with domestic problems? Doubtless, in time, the emergency will be met. Some way we will "muddle through," and the country will be spared the worst of the perils that seem now to confront us. But in the meanwhile great suffering will have occurred. This will be accepted with equanimity, and the country will settle down again, none the wiser or more efficient, for its experience.

What is wrong? Why was the present situation allowed

to develop, until the crisis was upon us? Why have the government and the public been content with a situation that made possible, yes, inevitable, just the kind of struggle through which we now are passing? This goes to the very root of the problem. The answer is found in the public indifference to the issues that are involved, an indifference that does not disappear until the public begins to feel the pinch of want. If our citizens were equipped with a dynamic, patriotic sentiment that responds as quickly to the menace of domestic ills as it did to the threats of foreign foes, the present crisis, in its present form, never would have occurred.

Such a patriotic sentiment would have demanded prompt and adequate attention and consideration, both to the demands of labor and the interests of capital, not merely in a tardy spirit of self-defense, but in a spirit of justice and fair play. Such a sentiment might have demanded an impartial investigation, a fair hearing, and a just and proper settlement, before the conflict had reached the stage of irreconcilable bitterness. Neither side would dare refuse a settlement so arranged. Behind it would be organized the resistless power of public sentiment, as virile, as dynamic and as overwhelming as the sentiment that organized our resources and triumphed over our foes. However much either side might wish to avoid the settlement, it would scarcely dare to defy a public sentiment so powerful and impelling.

This, again, raises the question of whether such a sentiment may be developed. Are war and foreign affairs the only objects around which we can organize the sentiment of patriotism? Is it only when injustice is done by foreign foes that humanity will yield its most vigorous response? Is it only the heroism of war, the tragedy of battle, or the stimulus of martial conflict that can afford an

adequate response? Perhaps the tragedies of peace, injuries by internal foes, and appeals for domestic justice may not produce an emotional response so effectively as war. We have not yet the experience upon which to base a satisfactory answer. Certain it is that in general it never has been done. It is equally certain that it has been rarely tried. The thing for which I plead is to give it a searching and thorough trial. Its potential importance to democracy, and its vital necessity to the strength and future of our nation, surely afford ample warrant for the effort.

Whether or not the patriotism of peace may be made as virile and effective as the patriotism of war, there can be but little doubt that great and needed improvement can be achieved. In the brief analysis of some of the social instincts and emotions attempted in Chapter II, we found nothing to indicate that the tragic and human aspects of our domestic life would not afford the basis of an adequate appeal, if it were set forth in its vital naked significance. Nor does there seem to be any inherent reason why the efferent aspect of the instinctive organization could not be trained to respond in terms of civic achievement as well as in terms of military duty.

The problem, then, concretely presented by the study of the federal government and functions, as well as by the study of all other phases of civics, is one of so analyzing and describing the functions of the federal government, that its deeply human and dramatic aspects will make a deep and profound appeal to the social instincts. The thrill of joy that comes from a generous response to emotional excitement, when aroused in a noble cause, must be brought home with a vivid sense of its reality. The relations between the individual and the functions of government, the ways and means of making his ideals and his beliefs a vital force in the performance of those functions, must be made

clear, specific and intelligible, in order that the emotional power may not be wasted, but become articulate and effective. And this requires, not only the development and training of a rich emotional response, in both its afferent and efferent aspects, but the intellectual capacity of analysis, a passionate love of truth, a keenly developed instinct of curiosity, and an evolutionary point of view that sees in government the human agencies through which the divine destinies of humanity are ultimately to be achieved. For the most splendid emotional life conceivable becomes impotent if not vicious when misdirected by ignorance, bigotry or selfishness, or when it does not find its ultimate expression in constructive service.

With this restatement of our general problem, we are ready to try its solution in relation to the opportunities afforded by the federal government. The first question that would naturally present itself is, why have a federal government? Why were not the state governments sufficient? Why is not the imposition of the national government a useless burden, an extravagant expense, an unnecessary complication, and a very material interference with the independence and sovereignty of the states? These questions, while their answers may be obvious to the teacher, present some very real difficulties, and involve some very fundamental principles, with which every pupil should be familiar. And unless they are presented to him in this way, they may never be adequately comprehended. The general question of the reasons for the establishment of a federal government have been already dealt with, with sufficient fulness in previous chapters. The conception of government as a means to an end, the value of cooperation between states as well as between individuals, the principle of federalism, the idea that a state in surrendering certain important and vital rights may thereby obtain greater security for its

most important interests, are all fundamental ideas which can be brought home with vividness and conviction, when the causes for the formation of the union are carefully traced and their nature analyzed. And yet there are many prominent men to-day whose public utterances amply demonstrate a fundamental ignorance of these simple and elementary principles. They perhaps may be cognizant of them, but they play no part in their intellectual life.

The understanding of these principles and this important part of our history is a matter of considerable practical importance. One of the obvious tendencies of the day is to give over more and more functions to the federal government at the cost of the state government. Many think this a very dangerous custom. Undoubtedly it may be carried too far. But how shall this question be determined? Some people, disgusted with the inability of the state governments to enforce the law, seek to throw the burden upon the more efficient federal government, rather than by trying to bring the state government to the same degree of efficiency. This is both unstatesmanlike and cowardly. Remembering that government is a means to an end, the only solution to the problem is to determine in each case, whether the question is by its nature more suitable to a single body of regulations uniform and fixed throughout the nation, without regard to local differences in conditions or public opinion, or whether its adequate treatment would necessarily depend upon conditions that differed materially among the several states. Obviously this question will only be intelligently met after a most painstaking survey of the problem, and an analysis of the material factors and conditions in the different states.

And yet when the question comes to-day, as it does occasionally, most people and statesmen divide, not upon the fundamental question I have indicated, but upon the pe-

dantic theory that they believe in "state rights" or in the centralization of power. A few years ago it was suggested that all corporations engaged in interstate commerce be compelled to take out a federal license or a federal charter. In the public discussion that followed, there was very little said that had any possible connection with the real merits of the question, most people lining up in accordance with whether they inherited a prejudice for the formula of "states' rights" or of a strong centralized government. Thus we see again the tyranny of an established phrase. We see great public questions turn upon their compliance with trite unmeaning concepts. We see progress again sacrificed to the narrowness, the bigotry and the stupidity of the static mind. If our knowledge of our government and its theories had been obtained through the functional approach, if our understanding of the relative functions of the state and federal government, as worked out and developed by the fathers, had been secured through the careful analysis of the needs, conditions and functions of the two, it can not be doubted that such problems would be approached more in the spirit of reality than in the present attitude of prejudice and dogmatism.

The intelligent teaching of the federal government would involve the solution of the problem of the division of powers between the state and federal government. This would require a careful analysis of the economic and political conditions that then prevailed, and a tracing of the methods and intellectual struggle through which the framers of our fundamental law sought to solve the problem for their day and generation. No student could go through the records of those stirring and heroic times without having the principles involved indelibly impressed upon his consciousness. To do less than this is to squander a priceless opportunity.

Moreover, the student who is directed through this fas-

cinating and wealthy field of constitutional and political history, is prepared to grasp the real meaning and significance of the issues of nullification and secession that culminated in the Civil War. The student who has traced that great conflict through all its phases in the constitutional convention, who has traced its discussion in the light of the terrible and destructive conditions prevailing under the Articles of Confederation, will not fail to comprehend fully the grim menace of secession. He will not be misled by the issue of slavery, but will understand that the very life of popular government was at stake.

Another fundamental conception of contemporary importance, which is dramatically illustrated by the history of the constitutional convention, is the practical value and nature of cooperative undertakings in which a political body may sacrifice a portion of its sovereignty in order to obtain a larger degree of security. The sovereignty of the states was a conception that threatened the whole enterprise of the constitutional convention and its work. It had been this theory that made the government under the Articles of Confederation a dismal failure. As observed in a previous chapter, the final adoption of the Constitution was finally secured, not as an act of national altruism, but as a necessary means of security for the freedom of the state. The fathers were practical men. By an analysis of conditions they found that certain interests the states held in common. They found that the protection of these interests could be better provided jointly, than individually. These matters they delegated to the national government, retaining all others for the states. It is true it involved grave departures from the rights and prerogatives of the states. But it is equally true that in the surrender of these interests they found a peace and freedom that was infinitely more secure.

To a very large extent these are the same principles involved in the proposed league of nations. And yet how much of the popular discussion has been in terms of fundamental principles? Many of its enemies have gone but little further than to assert the obvious fact that the league of nations will impose some restrictions upon the sovereign will of the United States. A man prominent in public life, a member of the Senate, has declared in public address that he could never vote for "any scheme that would impose upon the sovereign will of America, any degree of legal restraint." The unfortunate thing is that similar statements have been loudly applauded in popular audience, and received wide editorial approval among the press. And yet nothing could be more misleading nor pernicious. Every principle of international law which America has helped to form, and which she has sought to defend in battle, imposes a legal restraint upon our national will. Every treaty that we have entered, every international engagement to which we are a party, imposes some restraints. It is one of the glories of our nation that we have consistently accepted these restraints as legitimate and binding. And the most damning evidence against the Imperial German Government has been her unwillingness to recognize any legal restraint upon her "sovereign will." The very essence of Prussianism is found in its insistence that the national will shall suffer no restraint. I do not mean to imply that the press and people who use or approve the argument suggested are guilty of Prussianism, but that in their thoughtlessness they have seized a phrase because it had the rhythmic cadence and heroics that would serve their needs, without examining its significance, or ascertaining its pertinency.

Likewise some of the defenders of the league of nations, instead of resorting to constructive statesmanship, based their case upon the easy-going assumptions of a sentimental

internationalism. They simply assumed that all humanity was united in common interests, and that the world state or any other form of international organization was a necessary step in the right direction. They regarded nationalism as an inherent peril, no longer of legitimate value. They blissfully ignored the fact that intelligent nationalism might be a tremendously effective social force, and the very foundation upon which any international organization must be builded. A man's intelligent devotion to his wife and family does not prevent him from being a good citizen of his country. He need not be equally attentive and devoted to all wives in order to show the spirit of democracy, and a lack of narrow selfishness. In fact, the more devoted he is to his own family, the more he is likely to be devoted to the nation that protects it.

Likewise, in order to be the broadest kind of a humanitarian with a world outlook, and eager to serve humanity, one need not sacrifice the dynamic forces of intelligent nationalism nor forget the sound maxim that "charity begins at home." The internationalism that lives upon a sentimental interest in all humanity, at the cost of one's devotion to the country where he lives, is neither practical nor ennobling. Any successful scheme of international organization must rest upon the enlightened self-interest of the nations that compose it. Its strength will depend upon the strength of these nations and its capacity to serve them. If these nations are not enjoying a wholesome, vigorous and intelligent nationalism how, then, can they provide the basis for a league of nations that will endure?

As long as the discussion is carried on in the terms of these glittering generalities against impairing sovereignty or in favor of internationalism, no substantial progress toward the constructive solution of the problem can be secured. If we approach it as the best minds in the consti-

tutional convention grappled with it, we shall find the basis of intelligent discussion. They began with strict ideas of state sovereignty. But experience had taught them that the several states had certain interests in common; that these interests could be better served by the common effort, acting through an independent government that represented all; and, that, while the loss of state sovereignty over the specific things entrusted to the general government was unfortunate, it was far more than offset by the added security obtained. Thus the federal government was created, not in an effort to discard state governments, but in order the better to protect them.

Applying this method of procedure to the question presented by the league of nations, we come to the following questions: Do the great nations of the world have certain interests in common? Can these interests be better served through such an international organization as the league of nations? Is the value of such service to the nation sufficient to offset the restraints upon national action that are assumed? It is obvious that the answer to these questions goes to the basis of the matter. That there are some interests we have in common with the other nations of the world, where the advantages of joint control obviously offset the loss of freedom of national action, is amply demonstrated by the adherence of America to such international arrangements as the Universal Postal Union, Universal Telegraph Union, the various Hague conventions, and the Algiciras Act. Are the matters which we propose to leave to the league of nations of this character? Are the new liabilities that we assume, and the loss of liberty of action in certain matters that we suffer, compensated for by the additional security and services that we secure? It is inevitable that there should be all degrees of opinion. Those who sincerely and intelligently advocate reservations do so because they

believe that the particular things they desire to reserve from the jurisdiction of the league, are either not such matters of common interest as could be better protected by joint action than by individual endeavor, or that the machinery devised is not adequate to the burdens assumed, or that the restraints and liabilities assumed in regard to certain things are greater than the expected benefits.

When public discussion and investigation becomes centered upon these specific problems, then there is hope for genuine progress toward their ultimate solution. This does not mean that the great project is to be robbed of its appeal to the idealistic. However selfish may be the motives that bring nations together in the common effort to solve the great problems of the world, their efforts toward an achievement of such tremendous import to humanity present an ennobling and inspiring spectacle. The enlightened selfishness of intelligent nationalism that prompts the movement for greater cooperation and less destructive competition among the nations of the world, is one of the most beneficent influences of to-day. Its selfishness is of the same kind that leads intelligent men to support the cause of organized society, and that led the thirteen belligerent and jealous colonies to create a powerful and enduring nation. It is rooted in a profound conception of the realities of life and in the fundamental understanding that restraint is essential to cooperation, whether in the home, the nation, or the world, and that cooperation is indispensable to progress.

If the study of the creation of the Federal Constitution can be made another opportunity to drive home, with resistless logic, an understanding of the real nature, purpose and function of government and law; if it can be made the occasion to re-emphasize the fact that the restraints of law are but the requisites of cooperative effort, and that the

test of such effort is to be found in the results actually achieved, a great step will have been taken in preparing our youth for the civic duties that lie ahead. If these conceptions can be illustrated by application to the problems of the day, they gain in reality and interest to the student as he gains in ability to utilize them in the practical problems that confront him.

Coming now to the functions of the federal government, the one that most persons think of, is that of national defense. It is in this connection that most persons have had their attention drawn to the federal government, and it is in response to the call of the nation for purposes of defense, that patriotic sacrifice has reached its greatest heights. I do not want to belittle this splendid sacrifice. The generous ardor with which the young men of America responded to the call of arms is one of the most sublime spectacles that history can afford. I glory in the matchless record of gallantry, heroism and self-sacrifice. I glory in the proud, heroic and gigantic achievements of our people in the hour of need. The wave of patriotic sentiment that swept our country and made us one people with one purpose, and mobilized behind that purpose the spiritual and material resources of the land, was the most powerful, resistless force that America has known. And its importance to the cause of the nation and humanity was as great as its resistless power.

This sentiment of militant patriotism we must continue to nourish and develop. The point I want to emphasize again and again is that such a sentiment alone is not enough. There has been a tendency on the part of some who have felt the inadequacy of such a sentiment, to question its importance and to impugn its fundamental value. Such a point of view will not bear critical analysis. We need all

of the militant patriotism that we can develop. Let none of it be sacrificed! What we do need is to supplement it with an equally virile patriotism of peace. What we need to do is to show that the conflicts waged by government against injustice, poverty, disease, accidents and ignorance, are fraught with a vital significance to mankind, and that questions of national honor are broader than the problems of diplomacy and involve the just defense of justice and decency at home as well as the defense of our interests abroad. The military functions of the government should not be ignored, therefore, but should be used to develop the sentiment of militant patriotism and to show the need of a similar sentiment, directed at the problems of peace.

Closely allied to the functions of defense is the matter of foreign policy, where the appeal to the heroic may be almost equally effective because of its close relation to the problem of defense. That America is destined to play a larger part in the destinies of the world, no one will deny. We may regret it. We may wish to retain our traditional isolation, but we can not. Our commerce is found on every sea. Our shipping goes into every port. Every nation is to-day a competitor for the markets of the world. If a nation loses its fair share of commerce, its greatness will begin to disappear. It is, therefore, a struggle for life or death. In this mighty struggle we must play our part. We have declared that we have a definite interest in the "open door" in China. We have declared that we have a vital interest in the freedom of American republics from external aggression. We have acquired islands on the far side of the Pacific. Because of a controversy between Austria and Serbia which could not be peaceably adjusted, events followed which forced America into the greatest war in history. In the face of these facts, our talk of isolation becomes little

more than misleading and alluring fiction. To this extent the subject of foreign policy and diplomacy becomes a matter of just concern.

But the ignorance of the American public regarding world politics and questions of foreign policy is proverbial. Popular audiences will declare their willingness to sacrifice their lives in defense of the Monroe Doctrine and yet they could neither accurately state its principles nor construct an argument in its defense. It becomes necessary, therefore, in the training of citizenship to arouse enlightened interest and intelligent appreciation of these important problems. Why have a foreign policy at all? Why have the Monroe Doctrine? Why not abandon it as some have urged? What good has it accomplished? These and similar problems should be set the students in order that their interest may be stimulated, and they can comprehend the real necessity of a definite policy. Perhaps a good method of approach would be the question of neighborhood courtesy and good manners. It is easy to see why it is wise for each person in a community to have a fixed habit or policy of politeness and consideration for his neighbors. If one's neighbor is very ill next door, one has the right to make all the noise he desires in his own home, as long as he does not create a nuisance, although it means the distress and injury of the sick. One may refuse to speak to his acquaintances or to return civil and kindly greetings, without violating any legal right. One may refuse to clean up the unsightly condition of his yard, provided it be not dangerous or unhealthy, even though it be an eye-sore to the whole community, and still be within the law. But it is very rarely that we find a person who follows such a policy. If he did he would be constantly developing friction and misunderstandings, would find people unwilling to cooperate with him, and would make himself the object of general hostility

and dislike. Most intelligent people, as a matter of policy and decency, exercise a reasonable regard for the welfare of their neighbors, although not required to do so as a matter of law.

They follow this policy because it is pleasant, profitable, and avoids much unpleasantness and friction. They do not do anything that affects their neighbors that they would not want their neighbors to do. Nor do they ask any consideration of their neighbors that they themselves would not freely grant. In a community where most of the people follow this policy, everybody profits by it.

These matters of policy and habit are to the community what foreign policies of the nations are to the civilization of the world. The latter are infinitely more complicated and complex, but the underlying principles are much the same. Thus we begin to see the answer to the question of the necessity of a foreign policy. Upon that will depend to a large extent the issues of war and peace, or of friendship or hostility, among the nations of the world. When Germany began to carry out a foreign policy which considered no interests but her own, she embroiled the whole world in war. Realizing that with such a policy she was a menace to all, many nations made common cause against her. It is important, therefore, that we should have a public opinion, based upon the clearest conviction of its righteousness and importance, which would demand that the foreign policy of America never should depart from the fundamental principles of justice and fair dealing with all the nations of the world, nor fail to exercise at all times a scrupulous regard for their legitimate interests and rights.

But while these general principles are basic and must always be preserved, they are not enough. The interests of national defense require not only that our relations with other nations should be just and reasonable, that we be

ready to resist an attack from foreign foes, but also that in times of peace we insist that nations should not so disturb the status quo in regard to established international boundaries or political dominions, as to constitute a menace to our future peace and safety, or to afford to another power some new strategic basis for a possible future attack against the United States. The theory of such a policy is expressed in the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. In the interest of future safety, therefore, America should have such a policy and be ready to defend it.

It was in compliance with such principles that the Monroe Doctrine was adopted. When the so-called Holy Alliance was planning to re-subject the Latin-American republics whose independence had been recognized by the United States, to the political dominion of Spain, President Monroe declared that such action would be considered as "dangerous to our peace and safety" and as the "manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." The reasons for this doctrine were obvious. The South American republics, because of their democratic ideals as well as their relative military weakness, would never menace the United States. On the other hand, to have powerful European empires, who had declared their hostility to democracy and freedom, become firmly entrenched upon neighboring soil, where they would possess the basis for a strategic attack against the United States, and bring to this hemisphere the disastrous quarrels and intrigues of European politics, would obviously jeopardize the peace and safety of the United States. The same reasoning justified the later extension of the Doctrine to include the prohibition of a foreign power gaining territory in the Americas, even though acquired by peaceful session.

The problem may then be set of determining what pro-

tection, if any, this policy has afforded to America. This is an important question for students to consider, since most of the support of the Monroe Doctrine is not based upon an understanding of its usefulness, but merely upon feelings of national pride. If there had been no Monroe Doctrine, and Germany, free to colonize in Brazil and the Caribbean, had firmly established herself there and acquired a satisfactory basis for military operations against the United States, we would have found ourselves in a much more serious predicament as a consequence of the European War. Under such conditions, with the different European belligerents entrenched on American soil, Germany in Brazil, and France in Mexico, for instance, the outbreak in Europe would have instantly spread to the European colonies in this hemisphere, and have menaced the interests of America in a much more immediate and fundamental way.

But does this Doctrine square with those ideals of fair dealing and good neighborliness which should be the basis of our international relations? It has frequently been denounced as an arbitrary interference with the rights of other nations, and therefore an unnecessary cause of international friction. No doubt other nations have opposed it from time to time and have sought to evade it. But are such nations just and reasonable in their point of view? Are they willing to grant the same kind of concessions that they ask? Would Germany permit us to buy Denmark and there erect and fortify a territory of the United States? Would Germany consent to England or France peacefully acquiring permanent possession of Rotterdam or Antwerp? Would the European powers quietly acquiesce if America were to acquire Sicily and organize it as part of our national domain? Would the powers of Europe consent to Germany acquiring Constantinople, even though it be lawfully and peacefully done? The answer is obvious in every case, and

for the same fundamental reason that we could not be expected to permit foreign powers to establish new dominions in the Americas. Any nation that would insist upon our permitting them so to do, could not be considered friendly to the United States. Would it not be better, therefore, to oppose them then, than to postpone the conflict until that power could fight from the vantage ground that we had allowed her to attain?

Former Secretary of State Root argues convincingly in behalf of the Monroe Doctrine as a reasonable and intelligent measure of self-defense. "The most common exercise of the right of self-protection outside of a state's own territory and in time of peace is the interposition of objection to the occupation of territory, of points of strategic military or maritime advantage, or to indirect accomplishment of this effect by dynastic arrangement. For example, the objection of England in 1911 to the occupation of a naval station by Germany on the Atlantic Coast of Morocco; the objection of the European Powers generally to the vast force of Russia extending its territory to the Mediterranean; the revision of the Treaty of San Stefano by the Treaty of Berlin; the establishment of buffer states; the objection to the succession of a German prince to the throne of Spain; the many forms of the Eastern Question; the centuries of struggle to preserve the balance of power in Europe—all depend upon the very same principle which underlies the Monroe Doctrine; that is to say, upon the right of every sovereign state to protect itself by preventing a condition of affairs in which it will be too late to protect itself."

From the foregoing it should be made clear to the student that the Monroe Doctrine is not in violation of those fundamental conceptions of fair dealing and regard for the rights and welfare of others, that should form the basis of our foreign relations. It would seem clear that any state that

would insist upon its violation must be regarded as an enemy and that it is the part of reasonable foresight and prudence to resist that power then and there rather than to delay until it may be too late.

The Monroe Doctrine, thus conceived and understood as a reasonable and efficient means for the national defense, has been amply justified by almost a century of practical experience. On the other hand, improper schemes and unworthy aims have been only too frequently camouflaged under the protecting influence of its name. The people have been too willing to support any policy that invoked the authority of Monroe. In this condition there is obvious danger. The Monroe Doctrine has become a term with which the demagogue may conjure. An appeal to this basic principle always finds an immediate response. As long as the appeal is to the real principles of intelligent self-defense that underlie the Doctrine, it is a national asset of tremendous worth. But when the appeal is not germane to those fundamental principles, and invokes the policy of Monroe only to mislead the public to the support of an unworthy aim, it becomes an actual menace. Most of the intelligent criticism against the Doctrine has really been directed against its possible abuse.

Former Secretary Root, while defending with great power the real principles that underlie the Doctrine, has made a telling plea against its occasional abuse. "A false conception of what the Monroe Doctrine is, of what it demands and what it justifies, of its scope and of its limits, has invaded the public press and affected public opinion within the past few years. Grandiose schemes of national expansion invoke the Monroe Doctrine. Interested motives to compel Central or South American countries to do or refrain from doing something by which individual Americans may profit invoke the Monroe Doctrine. Clamors for national glory

from minds too shallow to grasp at the same time a sense of national duty invoke the Monroe Doctrine. The intolerance which demands that control over the conduct and the opinions of other peoples which is the essence of tyranny invokes the Monroe Doctrine. Thoughtless people who see no difference between lawful right and physical power assume that the Monroe Doctrine is a warrant for interference in the internal affairs of all weaker nations in the New World. Against this supposititious doctrine many protests both in the United States and in South America have been made, and justly made. To the real Monroe Doctrine these protests have no application."

Whether this great Doctrine is to be an asset or a menace, depends upon whether the public opinion that supports it is intelligent, alert and critical, or whether it be ignorant, prejudiced or intolerant. If the public view it as a means to worthy ends, and if they will support it only when invoked in the nation's legitimate defense, it will become an instrument of incalculable worth. On the other hand, the public's failure to grasp its real significance may lead us into difficulties, bring the Doctrine into disrepute, and rob us of its protecting power.

To-day America stands in a critical situation. The destruction of her isolation is obvious and plain. Some interest in the affairs of Europe can not be denied, for it was an Austrian-Serbian controversy that finally involved us in a great and costly war. We can not foresee when another minor outbreak may precipitate a world conflict in which we may again be compelled to play a part. The wounds of the recent conflict will not quickly heal. The nations of Europe, eager to recoup themselves from the drain of four long years of war, will compete with renewed bitterness for the trade and markets of the world. They will look with increased eagerness to the resources of South

America, where the establishment of political dominion would afford alluring opportunities for commercial monopoly and exclusive privilege. A league of nations has been suggested as the means by which the nations of the world may jointly grapple with these mighty problems. What course shall America pursue? In what direction will she find her greatest security? Where can she render her largest usefulness? Whatever course we take must lead through untried paths and across uncharted seas. The very destiny of our nation is at stake. Our future will depend upon the courage, the intelligence, the sanity and the devotion which the American people bring to bear upon the solution of these portentous problems. Civic training that ignores these problems is therefore inadequate and incomplete.

Another function of the federal government which may be profitably utilized to demonstrate its importance, and enlist a deep and abiding interest in its behalf, is the power to organize and govern the territorial possessions of the United States. Some of the greatest crimes against civilization have taken place in connection with colonial policies, and it is not uncommon to associate the possession of colonies with political tyranny and hostility to democracy. With the annexation of Hawaiian Islands in 1898, and the acquisition of Philippines and Porto Rica through the fortunes of war, the problems of colonization were squarely presented to the United States. Because of the popular apprehension against the abuses of colonization, which apparently many thought to be inherent in the system, there was great opposition to our retention of the territory and a national campaign was waged in 1900 over the issue of "imperialism."

Something of the difficulty and importance of the problem may be gained from an examination of some of the figures

regarding the Philippines. In the acquisition of this territory, we came into possession of 3,141 islands, covering 127,000 square miles of territory, and with a population of 7,635,000, of whom 461,000 were described as wild. The destiny of these peoples was thus placed into our keeping. More than that, America was to be closely regarded by the whole world to see whether, in the control and government of colonial territory, we would depart from those principles of freedom and democracy which we had so consistently defended and espoused. Would the Philippines be exploited or developed? Would the government there established be primarily for our benefit or theirs? Would we seek to prepare the natives for self-government or for vassalage? In our own colonial exploits, would we be guilty of the wrongs we had so freely condemned in others? These questions aroused deep concern among thoughtful Americans and require attention now. America, in the acquisition of foreign territory, was given an opportunity to demonstrate her faith in the theory that governments exist for the service and benefit of the governed.

In the colonial record that America has achieved there is ground for just and lasting pride. Mistakes have been made, but they have generally been mistakes of the head, rather than mistakes of the heart. True to our fundamental theory, that the basis of effective government must rest in the education of the people and their preparation for the tasks of life, one of our first concerns in the Philippines was the development of a system of popular education, in which industrial training received much attention. In 1912 there were 3,364 primary, 283 intermediate, and 38 secondary public schools, with an average monthly enrollment of 395,075 pupils.

In addition to this educational program, equally comprehensive plans were inaugurated for the protection of the

public health. The health situation in the islands was very bad. Much of the alleged inefficiency of native labor was found to be due to such conditions. A successful campaign against smallpox was conducted throughout the islands. By an efficient marine quarantine cholera has been absolutely eliminated. The lepers have been segregated, and the average number of new cases reduced from seven hundred annually to three hundred. At present a campaign is being pressed against tuberculosis, the greatest single cause of death in the islands.

With these general improvements have gone others, such as the development of an adequate system of highways and roads, all of which have contributed to a remarkable degree of progress in the Philippines. In all of this the American people have taken interest and pride. When the question of Philippine independence comes into domestic politics from time to time, it is truly significant that both sides defend their particular policy, not on the ground that it is to the selfish interest of the United States, but on the ground that it is to the best interests of the Philippines. If national policy is ever dictated solely by devotion to traditional principles of justice and humanity, this would seem to be a case in point. What it has meant to the happiness, prosperity and well-being of the millions of Filipinos it would be difficult to exaggerate. With this record of achievement, every boy and girl can be given an honest thrill of pride and generous emotion. They can see anew something of the sacred trust that is left to the hands of government. Their interest in the government is enlisted because they find that its functions are pregnant with possibilities that appeal to their imagination and the generous instincts of youth. It is not necessary that there should go with this feeling of pride a false sense of complacency. If the matter is skilfully presented, it will not appeal to the pupils as a com-

pleted task but only a worthy beginning, which vividly forecasts the marvelous possibilities of generous achievement, and which invites their sustained interest and support.

These are but a few of the important functions of the federal government which illustrate its value and importance. To these may be added its contributions to the cause of public health, its efforts in behalf of the conservation of natural resources, its wonderful work in developing the agricultural possibilities of the country, its conduct of the postal system, the building and operation of the Panama Canal, and the regulation of commerce between the states and with foreign countries. In the exercise of the latter powers, it has prevented the instruments of interstate commerce from being used for purposes that are immoral and indecent. It has prevented the sale and shipment through interstate commerce of fraudulently adulterated foods and drugs. It has prohibited interstate monopolies and trusts that would arbitrarily control the market and levy unjust tribute upon the public. All of these functions that touch life at so many different points, are dependent for their proper exercise upon the ability, fidelity and patriotism of the men we send to Washington. In the selection of these men is determined the destiny of our nation. To bring this fact home, through the functional approach, to every pupil, to enlist his instinctive interest in the proper performance of the task, and to train his instinctive reactions along intelligent and effective lines, is the mission of that teacher who believes that dynamic Americanism is a vital force that has a practical service to perform.

The student is now prepared for a consideration of the whole framework of government as the organized agency through which these functions are to be performed. Now he is ready to understand and comprehend its necessity, its importance and its functions. It is now a human insti-

tution and not a maze of technical and philosophical conceptions. With this approach he does not see government from any other angle than as a means to an end, a cooperative device for the accomplishment of definite and important aims.

But what about the source of this government and Constitution? Experience showed its framers what functions it would have to perform. Where did they get their ideas as to what kind of government would best perform them? Did they arrive at their conclusions from abstract reasoning? Did they have any experiences that would help them? These are problems that will prove fascinating and instructive. Obviously they had learned something from their experience under the Articles of Confederation. They had learned something, doubtless, from experiences garnered in the governments of their various states. For about two hundred years there had been governmental experiments in the New World. There were the first charters of governments granted to the first colonists, which were framed by the officers and ministers of the British Crown, the first one of which was Sir Walter Raleigh's charter of 1584. These first charters were drafted along the line of English trading companies, rather than of political institutions. The second class of sources was the constitutions adopted by the colonists themselves, generally with the authority of the Crown, but with little or no dictation from the Crown. The third class of sources was the constitutions adopted by the colonies after the Declaration of Independence. The fourth class of sources was the experiences and governments under the Continental Congresses and under the Articles of Confederation.

It is impossible here to trace out the processes of evolution by which the various phases of the Federal Constitution, as finally adopted, were evolved. But that process should

be indicated and illustrated by at least one or two examples. Emphasis should be laid upon the fact that there were American experiences for two hundred years prior to the Constitution, and that to a large extent, the Constitution, like all other documents that have endured, contains a mosaic or composite picture of the experiences and aspirations of the people who adopted it. If it is desired to go into the governmental principles that underlie our government and Constitution, there is no more thorough and effective way than to trace the particular provision of the Constitution that is involved through the experience that produced it, and the masterly debates of the constitutional convention that analyzed and perfected it. Some teachers have found that a constitutional convention, formed by the members of the class, and debating the various provisions of the Constitution, relying upon the history of the period and the records of the convention for their material, is a most stimulating and effective way of bringing home to the consciousness of the pupil, the fundamental principles that are involved.

Those who get such a view of the Constitution and the vital forces that produced it, will come away with a deeper appreciation of the tremendous problems confronted by the fathers, and of the sanity, courage and devotion with which their solution was effected. No one can follow the portentous struggles of the constitutional convention without a profound appreciation of the masterful intellects that grappled with the tremendous problems, the indomitable courage with which were stemmed the tides of impatience, bigotry, ignorance and despair, and of the unfaltering devotion to the cause of an enduring union, which characterized the mighty leaders of that historic body. These men were not perfect. The Constitution was not the work of omnipotent wisdom. It contains some of the imperfections of human hands. But in the light of prevailing circum-

stances it presents one of the greatest achievements of statecraft that the world has ever seen. We want the youth of the land to honor the achievement for what it was. We want them to honor those traits of sanity, courage and devotion that gave us a constitution and that made of us a nation. We want this done, not in the spirit of sentimental hero worship, but in the spirit of keen, accurate and discriminating appreciation of the great things that were achieved. From the virile qualities of our indomitable pioneers we want our youth to gain sanity, courage and inspiration for the tasks that some day will be theirs.

We thus find illustrated in the federal government and its varied functions, the same fundamental principles of law, authority and government providing a basis for the cooperative effort that are essential to the conditions of modern life. As the rules of the family and the existence of domestic authority were essential to effective family life, so are they to the community, the state and the nation. There was a community of interests wider than the family that made community organization indispensable to modern life. That community of interests, being wider than the locality, required the larger unit of the state for the satisfaction of its various needs. The fathers also discovered that there was a community of interests between the states that could not safely be ignored, and national government and authority were established. Intelligent and forward-looking statesmen are now considering to what extent there may be such a community of interests between the great nations of the world, and how far such community of interests requires international organization and authority for its adequate protection.

Again I fear that it may be thought that there is too much emphasis upon the fundamental ideas of law, authority and government, as the basis of the modern cooperative efforts

that are essential to our civilization. But if there is one danger to our institutions that I apprehend above all others, with the exception of popular indifference to the public weal, it is that in the stress and strain of some great industrial crisis, through which we may be called on to pass, our people will temporarily forget that it is only through just laws, efficient government and established authority that democracy may be made secure. In the conflicts between capital and labor and in similar periods of unrest, the only bulwark of democracy that is secure, is a just and adequate system of law that will afford a fair standard for the regulation and adjustment of the joint efforts of capital and labor, an impartial and efficient government to apply that standard, and the authority of a unified nation to see that it shall be enforced.

If we postpone the task of perfecting our legal standards, of developing a just theory of distribution, or of mobilizing the public opinion of the nation behind a program of justice, law and authority, until the evil is upon us and a conflict has developed, it may then be too late to act. But if the youth of the land can be trained to an appreciation of the necessity of a just system of law, an efficient and impartial government, and the righteous settlement of these problems as they arise, democracy will be secure. Against such a bulwark the forces of unrest, ignorance and revolt will beat in vain.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. Is there any inherent difficulty that makes impossible the development of a patriotism of peace that will be as effective as the patriotism of war?

2. We have created a sentiment of military patriotism so definite that in the hour of national peril men instinctively respond with the offer of military service. Is it possible to create a sentiment of patriotism so dynamic and well trained that in time of domestic

needs men will instinctively respond with the appropriate conduct? How is this sentiment to be created?

3. How may we develop a respect for law and order, without developing a static mind that will oppose all change, regardless of its need? Illustrate from the study of the federal government and functions.

4. In teaching the history and formation of the Federal Constitution, what main purposes would you hope to accomplish?

5. What evils would result, if the public regarded the Constitution as the inspired product of divine wisdom?

6. In what ways does the study of the state governments and functions prepare the way for the study of the federal government and functions?

7. In what ways does the study of the evolution and formation of the Federal Constitution throw light upon the problems involved in forming a league of nations?

8. What evils may result from popular ignorance and loose thinking regarding our foreign policy? How do you propose to combat those evils in your teaching?

9. What do you think of a mock constitutional convention as a means of studying the principles of the federal government?

10. Outline a general plan for the study of the federal government and functions, indicating the order in which you would take up the various parts of the work and the details of each part that you think most important for your purposes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bryce, James, *American Commonwealth* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1907).
Volume I, "The National Government."

Beard, C. A., *Readings in American Government and Politics* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1913).
Part II, "The Federal Government."

Reed, Thomas H., *Form and Functions of American Government* (World Book Company, Yonkers, N. Y., 1916).
Part V, "Government of the United States."
Part VI, "The Functions of Government."

Hall, Arnold B., *Monroe Doctrine and the World War* (A. C. McClurg, Chicago, Ill., 1920).
Chapter VIII, "World War and the League of Nations."
Chapter IX, "The Monroe Doctrine of the Future."

Kimball, E., *The National Government of the United States* (Ginn & Co., Boston, Mass., 1920).

Reinsch, Paul S., *Readings on American Federal Government* (Ginn & Co., Boston, Mass., 1909).

Fairlie, John A., *The National Administration of the United States of America* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1909).

Hart, Albert B., *Actual Government* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1908).

Parts V to IX.

Hill, J. P., *The Federal Executive* (Houghton, Mifflin Company, Boston, Mass., 1917).

Duggan, Stephen P., *The League of Nations, the Principle and the Practice* (Atlantic Monthly Press, Boston, 1919).

Munro, W. B., *Government of the United States* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1919).

Chapter VII, "The President."

Chapter VIII, "Presidential Powers and Functions."

Chapter IX, "The Cabinet and National Administration."

Chapter X, "The Senate. Its Organization."

Chapter XI, "The Senate. Its Functions."

Chapter XII, "The House of Representatives. Its Composition."

Chapter XIII, "The House of Representatives. Organization and Procedure."

Chapter XIV, "The General Powers of Congress."

Also Chapters XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI on "The General Powers of Congress."

Young, James T., *The New American Government and Its Work* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1915).

Chapter I, "The Introduction."

Chapter II, "The President."

Chapter III, "The House of Representatives."

Chapter IV, "The Senate."

Chapter V, "The Powers of Congress. Taxation and Finance."

Chapter VI, "The Powers of Congress. The Regulation of Commerce."

Chapter VII, "The Powers of Congress. The Sherman Act."

Chapter VIII, "The Powers of Congress. Publicity. The Trade Commission and the Clayton Act."

Chapter IX, "The Powers of Congress. Federal Police Power Over Interstate Commerce."
Chapter X, "The Powers of Congress. Their Relation to State Powers Over Commerce."
Chapter XI, "The Powers of Congress. The Postal Power."
Chapter XII, "The Powers of Congress. The War Power."
Chapter XIII, "The Powers of Congress. Control over the Territories and Other Powers."
Chapter XIV, "The National Conservation Policy."
Chapter XV, "The Federal Judiciary."

Where to write for further information:

United States War Department, Washington, D. C.
National Security League, 31 Pine Street, New York City.
League to Enforce Peace, 22 West Nineteenth Street, New York City.
World Peace Foundation, 40 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, Mass.
United States Department of Commerce (Questions relating to foreign trade).
Pan American Union (For information regarding Latin America).
United States Department of State (foreign affairs).
The National Voters' League, Washington, D. C. (For information regarding Congress.)

CHAPTER XI

FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION OF POLITICAL PARTIES

IN A RECENT magazine occurred a vivid description of the organization of an attack in modern war. Many miles to the rear of the front-line trenches was pictured the commanding officer in charge, confronted with military maps, giving in minutest detail the topography of the battle-field, the location of the troops and the arrangement of the artillery. Connecting the headquarters of the general in charge with the subordinate officers who were to execute his plans, were all the varied methods of communication that modern invention could devise. In front of headquarters were located the great guns of longest range, trained to play upon the lines of the enemy ten to fifteen miles beyond. A little farther on were located the guns of smaller caliber, and then the shrapnel guns, and then finally, in the front-line trenches, the private soldier with his rifle. The writer described the marvelous skill and detail with which the general and his staff planned every step of the attack. He described the terrible artillery assaults that preceded, the fearful barrage that was laid down to protect the advance, and finally the desperate encounters and struggle of the privates as they fought their way to victory. The dramatic account brought out in bold relief one fundamental and significant fact, that, in the last analysis, it was the private soldier who won the victory. The greatest general the world has ever known, the mightiest artillery that has ever been assembled, the most destructive gas that science has invented, all would have failed but for the dis-

cipline, courage and sense of individual responsibility of the private.

Had the private reasoned that he was only one among thousands and of no importance, had he sought to escape his personal accountability in the mere mass of numbers, had he left the responsibility for failure or success upon officers and comrades, defeat and not victory would have been his lot. This simple fact illustrates a vital need in civic training. Military discipline and training brought home to every soldier a keen sense of personal responsibility. It was accomplished by driving home, with telling vividness, the importance of his humble task until victory or defeat or life or death were identified in his consciousness with duty or neglect. When it is recalled that this discipline was accomplished in a few months, and with boys gathered at random from every walk in life, it becomes significant. The secret seems to lie in the intensity of interest aroused by the serious nature of the task, and in making clear the line of duty and the overwhelming importance of its performance.

I have attempted to show in the preceding chapters how the tragic nature of civic problems may be utilized to arouse an intensity of interest that would become a real dynamic force. But this force will be ineffective unless with it goes a clear understanding of the line of duty to be followed, and a sense of individual responsibility that can not be evaded in the magnitude of the task or lost in the great mass of countless citizens. As the efficiency of the soldier is obtained by drilling him in his specific tasks, and impressing upon him the practicability and importance of his part, even though he be but one among thousands, so the pupil must be drilled and instructed in the practical performance of civic duty and impressed with the fundamental importance of his individual activity, so that he will not neglect

his duty, either through a sense of impotence or a feeling of indifference. He must be made to feel that in the eternal struggle of democracy for decency and justice, he is a private in the front-line trenches, and that his part of the struggle must be aggressively and worthily performed.

When one is intellectually equipped to grapple intelligently with public problems; when he is instinctively responsive to their significance and importance; when he knows enough about the government to determine accurately where to apply the pressure of his influence, even then he may be impotent, through failure to comprehend how that pressure may be applied. Even though his judgment be splendid, his sense of personal responsibility keen, and his desire to serve be strong, he can accomplish naught, unless he can bring his splendid talents to influence the sources of official power. This is not always easy nor is the way always clear. One of the greatest causes of popular indifference to political affairs, is the popular feeling of impotence. Among the most educated and cultured folk, as well as among the more ignorant, this feeling finds continual expression. "What is the use?" has become an alibi for failure to take an interest in civic affairs, that is entirely too common for the public good.

This problem of democracy was foreseen by Edmond Burke, who suggested that the infinitesimal degree of personal responsibility that each one would bear for public wrongs and blunders, would make him feel unaccountable personally for the results, however tragic they might be. Add to this the further consideration that many people lack the imagination, patience and understanding to make what voice they have effective, and the forces of discouragement become tremendous. Indifference seems to be the inevitable result. No one will take a deep or sustained interest in public problems unless he feels that his efforts are

effective. He will not respond to the call of civic duty, if his endeavors are to be abortive.

One of the essential problems of civic training, therefore, is to show how one's interest and devotion to the public weal may be made an effective force in the control of governmental power. When one realizes that he is but one among millions of voters, escape from the feeling of personal responsibility is frequently both easy and alluring. To meet this situation, there must be organized a dynamic sentiment of patriotism so powerful and profound that it will sustain a continued and determined effort. There must exist an intelligent appreciation of the problems involved, a detailed knowledge of how one's efforts are to be so intelligently directed that they will be practical, and a clear understanding that through such efforts progress will be sure, though frequently very slow. Ordinarily the only progress that is possible or desirable, must of necessity be slow. Civilization can not be made over in a day. Fundamental problems can not be solved by instantaneous solutions. And yet demagogues have promised so much, so many times, that superficial people, because the impossible was never done, have abandoned hope of progress. This difficulty will largely disappear as the evolutionary point of view becomes more thoroughly established and the people become accustomed to seeking progress through evolutionary instead of revolutionary programs.

This leaves for our consideration the question of teaching the youth how to make their interest and devotion to the public weal a practical affair. This involves some of the following problems: How can one become an effective force for better government? How can one give aid and support to administrative or legislative measures that one believes to be for the public good? What practical ways are open to the average citizen to improve the efficiency of the

government, as an instrument for the satisfaction of human needs? It is obvious that civic training is not complete until this has been accomplished. The relation of the citizen to his government and the ways of his possible participation therein, are fundamental matters, if dynamic Americanism is to be more than a mere academic theory. If it is to yield results in better government, in the development of a more perfect democracy, and in the solution of the public's problems, it must be translated into an accomplished fact. Dynamic Americanism, if it is to be practical, must function in terms of civic achievement.

In taking up the specific problems above mentioned, many helpful suggestions will undoubtedly occur. A method of making these suggestions practical and realistic, is to bring some particular matter before the class, have them discuss it, and then consider how they can contribute to the accomplishment of the definite aim desired. For instance, if there is an ordinance pending in the city council, an important statute in the legislature, an interesting measure before Congress, or some kind of administrative decision by the executive, bring one of these before the class, and consider how the various members of the public can proceed to see that the proper views prevail. Letters from constituents to members of the bodies involved, will be one of the methods suggested, and is the one most commonly employed. To this the great objection will be made that one letter will accomplish nothing. This can be said of the individual voter in every election. It can be said of the private citizen in regard to every form of patriotic duty. If this objection be permitted to prevail, it is the negation of democracy itself, for in the last analysis, the action of democracy is the action of its individual members. If the privates in the front-line trenches had adopted this fatal fallacy, all the generals and military genius that the Allies could

have produced, all the artillery that they could concentrate upon the battle fronts, all the daring and brilliant air service that devotion and ingenuity could have contrived, would have come to naught. Not a trench could have been taken, the foe would never have been defeated, and the victory never could have been won, had the private soldier adopted this fatalistic point of view. As already noted, it was only by the heroism, devotion and self-sacrifice of the individual private that progress was achieved and victory secured.

What was true of the military campaigns in Europe was equally true of the problems that we had to solve at home. The food controller and his staff of experts could work out the finest plans, they could devise the most ingenious substitutes for the needed foods, they could work out elaborate and comprehensive programs of conservation, but it would be useless, unless the individual citizens throughout the land were ready and willing to comply. In the last analysis, it was the willingness of the private citizen to deny himself for the common good that gave us victory. If every man had sought relief from patriotic duty on the ground that what one man might do would come to naught, we would have come to a disastrous defeat.

Another example of a different kind, of what can be accomplished by individual effort is afforded by the struggle in the United States Senate over the ratification of the peace treaty and the league of nations. A private citizen of the city of New York, who had taken a deep interest in the league of nations and had made a careful study of the issues that were involved, began a campaign of letter-writing in behalf of his ideas. He wrote to the members of the Senate, to the prominent party leaders, and to his fellow citizens throughout the country, urging his convictions with strength and power. So clearly did he state his views, and

so convincing and sane were his proposals, and so practical were his suggestions, that the course of the treaty in the Senate was very visibly affected by the efforts of a private citizen who had determination, public spirit and common sense.

The importance of one's taking his responsibility seriously, and seeking to have a voice in the control of government, is accentuated by the fact that in many public issues, there is a determined organized minority fighting against the real interests of the majority, and the minority frequently wins through the indifference of the public. It is very popular, on such occasions, to shout about invisible government and autocratic power, but the plain unvarnished facts are that the minority won through the acquiescence of the majority. A former governor of one of our states once told me of an intense political struggle in which he had been engaged, and which involved the liquor question. There was no doubt but that the great majority of the people of that state were in favor of the drys, and it was on this side that the governor had aligned himself. The situation was intense. Partisan spirit was keen and bitter. The wets fought with the deadly precision of an organization that was trained and disciplined.

The governor asked his secretary to keep separate all the communications of those supporting his stand from those opposing it. He wanted to weigh the evidence. Opposing his position were telegrams from every section of the state, from every political party and from people in every walk in life. They threatened, argued and pleaded. Men who were political leaders in the community wrote, demanding that he change his position or that they would appear at the next state convention, with the delegation from their counties pledged against the governor. Men called up on long dis-

tance to say that they would come to the next convention as delegates against him, unless he changed his views. On the other hand, the governor did not get a single letter from any man promising to organize a delegation in his behalf at the next convention, if he would win the fight. No man called on the long distance to say that he would come to the next convention as a delegate to fight in the governor's support, in case he proved faithful to the end. He received very few telegrams approving his stand and only a very small percentage of the letters received supported his position. Almost single-handed and alone, against such pressure as few men ever have to meet, this governor fought the battle for the majority and won. If there are evil influences affecting our political life, one may rest assured that they are active and at work. If just and enlightened laws conflict with corrupt or selfish interests, these interests will find a way to make their voice effective. Unless the private individuals, who have no interests save those of patriotism and love of justice, can fight with equal spirit and determination, wrong must frequently prevail. And if it does not prevail, it will be because of the daring courage of some public leader, like the governor mentioned above, who can withstand the pressure of the assault and protect the public from the evils of their own neglect. But no man with red blood and a sense of justice should seek a selfish safety in the unsupported power of a strong and fearless leader.

Many other ways of bringing private influence to bear in shaping the conduct of government will doubtless suggest themselves, such as group action and resolutions by civic clubs, chambers of commerce, and other groups who interest themselves in public problems. Joint debates and public discussion may also play an important part. To the alert and interested, many means of making their voices heard in

the councils of the government may be found, if they can be brought to realize the importance of individual accountability, and that such means are practical and effective.

It is in this connection that we come to the question of political parties, the part they play in the life of our government, and the proper relations of the citizen to the party. There seem to be few topics more misunderstood, where so much "bunk" passes for reason, and prejudice so completely supplants facts, than the subject of political parties, and yet there is no one aspect of our political life that is so fundamental to our governmental progress and success. In the past few years it has been the fashion to denounce political parties, machines and bosses. One state went so far as to consider the abolition of political parties by law. If things went wrong, the public business was neglected and public problems were unsolved, it was the fault of parties. Decent and even intelligent men frequently sought alibis from a guilty conscience, by asserting that politics was too corrupt, and that honest men must hold themselves aloof. It was seriously argued, by those opposed to women's suffrage, that it should not be adopted for the reason that party politics was so fundamentally corrupt that women's morals would be placed in jeopardy. Demagogues have assured a too eager and credulous public, that for all these ills the public is not to blame, but it should be laid at the door of parties, bosses and machines.

With these facts in view, it becomes highly important that any training in civics should include a thorough understanding of the party system. If it is to blame for all our ills, it is time that we should attack it, and if it is not, it is time that we cease fighting windmills and get down to solid facts. Beginning with the problem method, we should set the pupils to the task of determining why political parties were organized. Who organized them? What functions

do they perform? Could we abolish political parties? These and many similar questions would soon direct the students to the discovery that one of the first purposes of a party, and the reason for its organization, was to provide a method of nominating candidates for public office. When the fathers adopted our Federal and early State Constitutions, they provided that certain officers should be elected by popular vote, but they made no provision for the nomination of the candidates to be elected. Unless candidates are nominated and announce certain principles for which they stand, so that the public may choose between men and principles, how can the public control the government?

This difficulty may not appear at first, but a few questions and illustrations will suffice. When in the fourth grade of the public school I recall an incident that will make it clear. The school authorities decided the pupils should march in the memorial day parade to the cemetery, that the school should march by classes, and that each class should elect a captain to march at the head of the class. The teacher asked the pupils, without giving them an opportunity to talk it over, to vote by secret ballot for a captain. Out of about thirty votes, one boy got five and was elected, most boys getting the one vote they had cast for themselves. The boy who was elected was easily the most unpopular boy in the class, and we always suspected that he got the five votes by promising the four boys around him to vote for each of them if they would vote for him, and then voting for himself. No one could say that the election represented the public opinion of the class. Had there been nominations, so that the class would have been given a choice between a smaller number of candidates, a candidate could have been elected by a majority of the class instead of by a very small minority. Nominations are absolutely necessary if public opinion is to prevail, and without that there can be no popular govern-

ment. Suppose we should attempt to elect a president of the United States without the aid of nominating conventions. There would probably be as many "prominent candidates" as there are states in the Union. Each commonwealth would come forth with its "favorite son" and the man selected might come to the presidency of the United States with no other support, and with no other point of view than that of his native state. Such conditions would be intolerable.

But with political parties representing the people of like political opinions and tendencies from the several states, sending their representatives to a great political convention, where the claims of all the "favorite sons" are thrashed out and a man nominated that can command the votes of a majority of all the representatives of his party, the public is given a choice between two or three candidates of national reputation, and through the choice of one of them, public opinion can intelligently prevail.

But this is not all. A few searching questions will disclose the fact that the public must not only select officers, but they must approve certain principles, if they are to control the government. If the people merely elect officers without knowing the things for which they stand, and without an opportunity to express an opinion upon any principles or theories of government, or upon any program of action to guide the officers in the performance of their duty, how can the government be a government by the people? Popular government means one in which public opinion prevails. But how can it prevail unless an opportunity is given to the public to approve or reject certain programs for governmental action? Recognizing this fact, it did not take the people long to realize that if they wanted to control the government in the interests of the theories that they held, they must organize for that definite task. People who

believed in a set of governmental theories, got together, selected their leaders as the candidates for public office, adopted a platform of the principles for which they stood, and to which their candidate was pledged, and placed these before the public for their approval. The election of their candidates meant that the government would be operated along the lines suggested by the platform of principles. For convenience they found it necessary to adopt a name for their organization, and a distinctive emblem to indicate which of the various candidates for public office were pledged to their principles. This was a political party. The people of the country divided into two large parties, with a number of smaller ones. It is these parties that nominate candidates for offices and draw up the platforms upon which the public votes to-day. The only instrumentality that we have so far been able to invent, by which public opinion can prevail throughout a large territory like a state or the nation, is the political party. It is, therefore, indispensable to the life of a democracy.

Nor is this all of the important work performed by the various parties. It soon became evident that if those holding a certain line of political beliefs, such as those favoring a protective tariff, desired victory, they could only win their point by convincing the majority of the voters of the country that the system of protective tariff was desirable. The tariff problem is a complicated question. It requires a great deal of study, the analysis of a great many statistics, and an understanding of fundamental economic theory. Obviously this could not be done by the average citizen without a great deal of assistance. The parties, realizing this, have proceeded to develop programs of popular education. Tons of literature, in which the problems are stated in simple terms, the statistics analyzed in easy forms, and the arguments advanced in such simple style that they can be comprehended

with the minimum of difficulty, are printed and circulated to the voters of the entire nation. In addition, speakers are employed to engage in public discussion, and occasionally joint debates between opposing candidates are staged. Advertising space is purchased in newspapers and on bulletin boards, and every conceivable device resorted to, to bring the candidates of the party and the platform upon which they stand, to the attention of the country. Party newspapers are frequently established or endorsed as party organs, and add their resources to the publicity efforts of the campaign. This requires vast sums of money and elaborate organizations, covering the entire country, and reaching from every precinct to the national committee of the various parties.

It may be objected that much of this popular education, in which the party engages, is not helpful, because so partisan and unfair. Undoubtedly there is more than a grain of truth in the assertion; nevertheless many people are dependent upon the activity of political parties for much of their political education, and it is this fact that makes the party a tremendously important factor in public affairs. Perhaps one of the most significant examples of how such methods may influence public opinion is evidenced by the campaign of 1896, when the silver question was the issue between the two contending parties. Shrewd political observers generally agree that the decision would have been different had the election been held six weeks earlier, thereby implying that the campaign of education among the voters, on behalf of the gold standard, was particularly effective. This is not the place to discuss whether that result was good or bad, so far as the issues were concerned, but it is significant that there could be such a change in public opinion as a result of a political campaign. Any organiza-

tion that has that much influence with the voters of the land, is deserving our special study and consideration.

Thus we find our modern political parties with their intricate and elaborate organization, like other political institutions, to be a product of evolution. They have come into being to meet certain specific needs, *viz.*, the nomination of candidates, the promulgation of political issues, and the conduct of political campaigns with their programs of popular education. The parties have evolved in form and organization, as experience has shown more clearly the necessity of these functions and the better methods of performing them. In the early days candidates were nominated by legislative and congressional caucuses. Candidates for state office were nominated by the party members of the legislature, and candidates for the presidency were nominated by the party members of Congress. Thus the Federalist members of a state legislature nominated the Federalist candidates for state office, and like procedure prevailed in Congress for the nomination of a Federalist candidate for Congress. It took some time for even this simple method to develop, and before then, nominations were made in any way possible, by the voluntary efforts of a few friends, through the suggestions of influential leaders, by mass meetings, and any other methods of attracting public attention that might be devised.

The legislative caucus, when once established, prevailed in one form or another until the development of the modern party organization which occurred during the thirties. The disappearance of the legislative caucus was due to certain inherent weaknesses which we need not here consider. The modern political party, which has changed radically in detail and method in recent years, still persists for the sole reason that it has a tremendous function to perform for which no better means have been devised.

In spite of these obvious facts, the popular and unthinking condemnation of political parties has continued. It is true that serious abuses have developed from time to time, in which party organizations have been guilty of immoral and criminal conduct. Undiscriminating criticism against parties *per se,* has blinded many to the important fact that it is only through parties that public opinion can be made articulate in the control of government. People have forgotten that political parties are nothing more or less than the people of the country, divided into groups according to political opinions, preferences or prejudices. Political parties as such are no more immoral than are the people politically immoral. If there is no hope for democracy because of the rottenness of political parties, then there is no hope for popular government, because of the rottenness of the people. If a man is too good to be associated with the evils of political parties, then he is too good to live in the same community with his fellow citizens, for it is the latter that compose the former. When one becomes so self-righteous that he holds himself aloof from practical politics because of their alleged abuses, then he is too good for this world and the wicked problems that it contains. Such an attitude of moral superiority is both selfish and cowardly.

Until some better means is devised of nominating candidates for public office, adopting platforms and conducting campaigns, political parties will be essential to our democracy. They are the necessary instruments of popular control. If they do not give us good candidates, or provide good platforms, or conduct wholesome campaigns, it is because those of us who compose the parties have not yet demanded it with sufficient force and in sufficient numbers. The remedy is to be found in more active participation in party affairs, and not in abandoning them to the mercy of the professional. If our parties have not kept pace with the

demands of modern life, the time has come for every citizen who believes in patriotic duty, to become an effective factor in some political organization, in order to make them effective instruments of democracy. If party management has been indifferent and incompetent, out of those very facts should come the challenge to enter their ranks in a determined struggle for their perfection. Political parties are not something separate and apart from the people, but are the creations and instruments of the people. They are the people politically organized. It is only through them and their perfection that constructive achievements can be accomplished. It is with these instruments that the public must contend against the forces of ignorance, indifference and reaction. With the realization of this fundamental fact, a constructive attitude toward parties becomes possible. The pupil must see in them not an object of despair, but the means of hope. He must realize that the path of civic duty leads through them and not away from them.

We are now ready to consider the detail of the party organization. After the necessity of its existence has been established, and its functions have been discussed, the student is now ready to comprehend the organization as it has been developed. This is not the place to discuss this matter in detail but only in general outline. The modern organization of political parties is made up of three hierarchies, a hierarchy of conventions or primaries, a hierarchy of committees, and a hierarchy of bosses or leaders. There is at the top, the national party convention, composed of delegates from the various states and congressional districts. This convention nominates candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency, elects the members of the national committees, and adopts the national platform for the party. Then there is a state convention that performs the same function for the party in the state, and which is

made up of delegates from the political divisions of the state. In some states, most of these functions are performed by direct primaries, instead of by the party conventions. Then there are the county conventions or primaries for performing the same general functions for the county. Of course there are also conventions or primaries for all of the other political subdivisions of the state, but those just mentioned are the backbone of the system.

The hierarchy of committees, parallels the hierarchy of conventions or primaries, from the national central committee, composed of one member from each state, and whose function it is to conduct the campaigns, arrange for conventions, raise the party funds and look out for the general interests of the party in national affairs, down to the state central committee, the county central committee and the township or precinct committeeman. The third hierarchy, the hierarchy of bosses or leaders, is the group of national leaders, state leaders or local leaders, whose capacity for organization and leadership has won for them the dominant influence in their respective groups.

Here perhaps it may be wise to make a suggestion about the nature of the boss. So much has been uttered and written in reckless condemnation of the political boss and the professional politician that the public have come to look upon them as enemies to society. The demagogue has found an alibi for the indifferent public in the evils of the political boss. The facts are that the people generally get just about the kind of government that they deserve. They pay no attention to it, until it gets hopelessly corrupt, then they awaken to a realization of the facts, and rather than accept the responsibility that is their own, they greedily seize the excuse that it is the work of the political boss. Quite frequently the facts are that the political bosses have been doing the best they could, but have been unable to get the sup-

port of the intelligent and respectable classes, and have been driven, as a matter of political necessity, to take the steps they have. This has led to a general and indiscriminate cry against the boss. His elimination from our political life has been demanded. But a moment's consideration will show the fallacy of the position. One might as well try to run a railroad company without a manager, a university without a president, a school without a superintendent or principal, or the nation without a chief executive as to have a great political organization without one or more dominant personalities at its head.

Every successful church has a few members who find a considerable portion of their pleasure in the service of the church. They are the ones who make most of the motions at business meetings, who serve on important committees, who are never too busy to do the work that is required. We call them the pillars of the church. Every lodge and fraternal organization which is efficient has its little group of men who do the great proportion of the work, determine its policies and identify its welfare with their own. Every successful civic club or organization has back of it a few guiding souls, whose imagination, initiative, devotion and industry, make possible its record of achievement, and we call them the public-spirited men of the community. It is true that there are some who do not give these men the praise that they deserve. There are always a few, in every organization, who sit in the scoffers' seat in the rear, who never make any motions, never have time to serve on any committees, never work out any programs, and never approve of what the others do. They sit in silence and "knock" afterward. "The same old 'bunch' running things" is the burden of their complaint. Why do not they run things? Because they are too lazy, indifferent, or mediocre, to take a part, while they jealously condemn those who do.

In every political party, in every community, there is a group of men who naturally take an interest in politics. They like the human aspects of the problem. They enjoy the leadership they are able to obtain here. They enjoy the political importance that it gives them as public men. With many men, politics is a religion, and they give to it the same passionate devotion that others give to their theology. They keep informed as to the political questions of the community. They serve on the party committees, or stand behind the scenes to plan and advise and scheme. They are the ones who seek out the "likely" candidates, arrange for the party primaries, when not provided for by law, and look after the interests of the party, the same as the pillars of the church bear the responsibility of its activities. In other words, the boss and politician is the man who makes the political matters of his community his personal interest and concern. Yet we honor the men who serve the church and speak of them as the "pillars," while we recklessly condemn those whose public spirit, temperament or ambitions have made them interested in politics to the point of assuming the political responsibility of the community. But some will respond that political bosses are narrow, partisan and dishonest. So, also, are pillars of the church occasionally. They frequently confuse means with ends, or become autocratic or narrowly sectarian or partisan. Occasionally they have been found to be dishonest. But without them the church can not exist. So, without the politicians, political parties and democracy would suffer much. How powerful and autocratic the boss will be depends on how indifferent the people are. His power increases in exact proportion with popular indifference. Also with popular indifference his necessity to popular government increases with corresponding ratio, for public affairs must be run, and if people will not run them, the bosses or politicians must.

Some one may object that I am confusing political bosses and political leaders. Much fine-spun theory might be developed in trying to work out distinction, but it would be of no practical value or importance. Whatever name they may go by, there will always be a group of dominant personalities back of every political organization. The important thing is to understand this fact and order one's political life and interests accordingly. There has been no more fruitful source of power for the demagogue than the attempted distinction between the leader and the boss. When nicely analyzed, the only practical distinction is that a boss belongs to your party and the leaders to mine.

The hierarchy of committees, conventions and politicians that compose your party organization is a political "machine" with all the sinister connotations that the word implies, while the same kind of arrangements in my party constitute our organization. Nowhere in modern politics is there such a splendid example of the tyranny of an established phrase. Nowhere in modern thinking has there been evidenced such servile following of ignorant and unreasoning prejudice. The most autocratic bosses that the country has seen have ridden to power by denouncing the opposition as boss ridden, and decrying the organization as a "machine." One of the most discouraging factors in the present political situation is the ease with which the public may be diverted from a sane and intelligent interest in the fundamental problems of public policy and efficient administration, by an appeal to this trite and hypocritical device. The unscrupulous and selfish interests in our public life will always thrive to just the extent that the people may be diverted from the real issues of public efficiency. It is under the protection of these false issues that the worst elements escape detection. It is behind the "smoke screens" of such fabricated issues that the most sinister influences ply their

trade. Nor is there any hope for permanent improvement until they can be driven into the open, and political campaigns fought out upon the fundamental issues of the social efficiency of the government.

It must not be supposed that I am implying that all men who appeal to this time-honored protest against the rule of bosses and machines represent sinister influences or corrupt motives. Such is not the case. However high a man's motives may be, if he runs for public office, he must make the appeal that wins, if he would accomplish the ends he has in view. Too frequently such an appeal seems to be the only method, because of the unwillingness of the people to respond to arguments more fundamental and profound. Nor must it be supposed that there are not good bosses and bad bosses. Just as I protest against the indiscriminate abuse of politicians, I oppose their indiscriminate defense. It is one thing to oppose a party because the men who control its policies may be unworthy of public confidence; it is another thing to oppose them because they have a "machine" and bosses, something that every party always has had and always will have.

The significant thing to remember and the fact that must be driven home with repeated emphasis, until it is comprehended by the student, is that political parties with their machinery and their bosses are part of the necessary equipment of democracy. They are a means to an end, *viz.*, the articulation of such public opinion as there is, into the accomplished facts of government. Like all other instruments of government they may be abused. Like all other forms of organization, people may forget that it is a means to an end, and look upon the party and party success as an end in itself, regardless of the public weal. Whether or not these instrumentalities render genuine service to the public, depends on the intelligent devotion and patriotism with which the

public use them. Democracy will not operate itself. Its success will depend on the public opinion which it reflects. The most that can be said for democratic forms of government is that they reflect public opinion accurately. It does not make public opinion. It does not solve problems. It does not grapple with the reactionary forces that bar the pathways of progress. Back of all of these forms and instrumentalities, therefore, there must be the intelligence and the sense of personal accountability, that can and will function through them, that will fight triumphantly with the forces of reaction, and find a just and righteous solution for the public problems.

Several years ago I was invited into a western state to speak before a large civic body, organized in the interests of political and social reform. Upon reaching my destination I was met by a committee, who made it very clear to me that what they most desired of me was a ringing denunciation of the state boss of the dominant party, and a savage attack upon the mayor of the city, to which personages these good people had attributed all the failures and evils of their state and local governments, respectively. I had to inform them that such was not my business. I called their attention to the fact that the mayor was already serving his third term as mayor of the city, having been three times elected by a plurality of the lawfully qualified electorate. It followed, therefore, that if he was such an outrageous character, that the persons against whom I should direct denunciation and scorn were the legally qualified electorate of the city. Moreover, the state boss whom they disliked, like all other state bosses, was absolutely harmless, except in so far as he could carry with him the people of the state. He had absolutely no power except in so far as he was able to get two-thirds of the members of his party convention, whose members had been elected by

the party members of the state, to nominate candidates that he could influence or control. But even after that, he could accomplish nothing and possessed no power, until he had secured the election of these candidates by the lawfully qualified electorate of the state. If he had power which he had abused, it was because the people of his party had given it to him in the convention, and because the people of the state had approved it at the ballot box. In fact this same boss has frequently remarked that the source of his power was his ability to give the people what they desired. All of which shows the great fundamental truth, that the people get just the kind of government that their intelligent interest in civic matters deserves.

Naturally the committee took exception to my position, which shoved a large portion of the blame upon the voters of the state and city, and robbed them of their cherished alibi. But as I pressed home the facts that a boss had no power over affairs of state except as he was able to influence those whom the voters had placed in power, and had continued in power, they staked out another line of defense. They said that the majority of the people of the city did not want the kind of government that they were enjoying. When asked why they had reelected the mayor to office twice, if the people of the city did not desire him and his administration, they replied that the voters insisted on voting their party ticket, regardless of the local issues, while the forces who wanted the mayor, the determined organized minority, switched from one party to another, and controlled the balance of power, between the parties, and thus controlled the politics of the city. Why, then, did not the good people of the city, organized into a determined organized majority, select capable political leaders, and elect their own officers of the city. The reason was that when they attempted to form such organizations, they would de-

velop factional fights, partisanship would creep in, and some would insist on allowing national and state political issues to dominate the local election, although there was no relation between the two. If the organization developed leaders of strength and power, many individuals would refuse them their support, because they were too much like political bosses whom they hated. When the majority agreed upon candidates and leaders, the minority, who were outvoted, frequently declined to follow the will of the majority, and their efforts came to naught.

This was a typical situation. The people who were interested in a decent administration could not agree among themselves. If outvoted by their fellow citizens, they would quit. Some were too bigoted to adjust their will to those of the majority. Others were too jealous to acquiesce in allowing their leaders to have the necessary power to make an effective fight. Still others thought more of their party name than they did of their city. Underlying it all was the great outstanding fact that the good citizens of the city were not devoted to the public weal with the same fidelity, the same practical judgment, and the same willingness to fight and endure, that characterized the forces of evil. Pride of intellect, petty jealousies, a narrowly partisan spirit, and love of ease, too easily triumphed over their spirit of patriotism and their civic righteousness. Direct primaries, party reforms, the denunciation of bosses, by themselves, will accomplish nothing. Not until the forces of decency and civic pride will develop a machinery and a group of bosses as intelligent, determined and powerful as the opposition, can they hope for permanent reform.

Civic training can not be practical or adequate without this understanding of the nature and necessity of party machinery and party bosses. They are the indispensable instrumentalities of popular control. The character of the

service that they will perform is determined by the character of the control that the public will apply. The remedy for the evils of party government is primarily and fundamentally more intelligence and patriotism among party members. Party reforms of structural nature may be very valuable. Legal regulation that will prevent certain well-known abuses will help materially. But the real problems of democracy to-day are constructive, not negative. To eliminate abuses is wise and salutary, but the life of democracy demands much more. It demands the solution of modern problems. It demands machinery and public opinion that is not only honest but intelligent. It demands programs of governmental action that are not only well-meaning but masterful and effective. It demands not only an emotional response in the time of emergency and urgent need, but a sustained, aggressive and determined Americanism that will thrill with the stern joy of conflict in the deadly struggle with the foes of justice and humanity.

With this understanding of the nature and functions of political parties, we are now ready to consider the relation of the citizen to the party. It is in this connection that we come to the most effective way in which the citizen is to make himself an effective factor in the processes of democracy. In the preceding chapters we have tried to show the importance of governmental functions. We have attempted to show that their tremendous human implication, their tragic significance, and their dramatic appeals are sufficiently potent to arouse the emotional interest of the child in the efficiency of the government that performs those functions. We have tried to show how, through this method, the basis of a public opinion could be laid that would function as patriotically and courageously behind these functions of peace as it has in behalf of the enterprises of war. But how will this public opinion find expression? How will

the individual be effective in the great struggle involving so many? In the early part of this chapter several methods have been suggested, but the most important one is through party membership and activity.

If the parties are the instruments through which public opinion becomes effective, then it follows that it is there that the individual's fullest opportunities are found. He should become a member of a party—not merely a passive member wearing the party label and accepting the party dictates, but an aggressive member, fighting the party's battles, helping to do its thinking, laboring for better candidates, and contending for better principles. Those who are too broad-minded for political parties, and too good for practical politics, are worse than valueless to a political democracy. It is true that no thinking and intelligent man will find any party whose principles exactly coincide with his. No man will find any list of party candidates who represent exactly his discriminating choice. Nor will any one find a church whose theology fits in entirely with his own, and yet churches are essential to the development of our religious life. Honest and intelligent compromise between conflicting points of view is the very genius of democracy, and those who can not become a factor in the compromising process, are too anarchistic to be effective members in the highly-organized society of to-day.

There are many things in party politics that are disappointing and discouraging. There are many things of which high-minded individuals can not approve. There are many principles enunciated, that are not always sound, or are not honestly intended. There is excessive partisanship which forgets that the only justification of the political party is the service of the country, and which is tempted to sacrifice public welfare to partisan advantage. The more one knows of party politics, the more illustrations of these tendencies

one is able to discover. But these are not the peculiar ills of political parties. These are not their exclusive possessions. These are the regular orthodox evils and frailties of human nature. They inhere in all things human. They find expression in every form of organized activity. The man who avoids his duty to political parties because of these evils is on the intellectual and moral par with the man who damns the church because of its human weaknesses, who "knocks" the efforts of civic organizations because their leaders are finite beings, who denounces the Red Cross because the management of its affairs has been placed into human hands, and who opposes every other form of organized progress because it is accompanied with some of the manifestation of human frailties. Such a person is looking for alibis from the duties of democracy, and is not in search of opportunities to serve. Or he may represent a certain phase of intellectual and moral snobbery that refuses to play a part, but with superb self-righteousness decries the efforts of those who do.

The defects of political parties, for this reason, should not be concealed. Neither should they be emphasized. The school-room is the last place in the world for the activities of the professional "muck raker" or his followers. An analysis of the organization and functions of the party, and its relations to the business of popular government, if properly presented from the evolutionary and functional point of view, will give to the average student a wholesome appreciation of the party system. The evils that exist are the same old evils of selfishness and greed, ignorance and indifference, narrowness and bigotry that are not the products of the party system, but that merely find expression here as they do in the whole domain of human effort. As far as these evils exist, they will constitute a challenge to his manhood and patriotism to offset their evil influence. If he

has acquired a dynamic interest in government he will see in the avenues of party activity an opportunity to make that interest effective. If he has developed a vision of what democracy should mean, he will find here the practical machinery through which that vision is to be achieved. If he has learned the great truth that he is his brother's keeper, it is here that he will find the chance to make good that obligation. If the educational process has developed in him the sentiment of dynamic Americanism, it is in the party struggle for higher ideals, nobler leaders and more efficient candidates, that this sentiment can become triumphant.

This does not mean that the citizen will become a party slave. It does not mean that he will surrender his judgment and conscience to the keeping of others. It means merely the recognition of the vital, fundamental fact that no one dare deny, that the public can not vote for better candidates, loftier principles and nobler leaders than those submitted by party action. For all practical purposes their choice is limited within these narrow lines. It thereby becomes the duty of every citizen to enter some political party, and there to consecrate his energy and his judgment in the efforts to make its platform, candidates and leaders the most efficient agencies for the public good that the people can achieve. It is through these efforts that personal interest in public welfare becomes effective. It is through these methods that the generous ardor of youth, the deep sense of personal accountability, and the intelligent understanding of modern problems, so essential to democratic success, are to be translated into terms of practical accomplishment.

If it be objected that in spite of one's best efforts, his party produces a program for popular approval which is inferior to that of its competitor, then as a loyal party member he is bound to vote for the inferior program, I must

emphatically dissent. It is true that there has been at times a popular conception that one must vote the ticket of his party if he has participated in its councils, yet such a conception is not based upon a scientific premise. It ignores the fact that a party is but a means to an end. It gets the cart before the horse. There is no sound public reason why the nation should be sacrificed to party aggrandizement. It follows, therefore, that when one has fought the best fight of which he may be capable in the party primaries and conventions, and the parties have submitted their respective claims to popular approval, that then the conscientious citizen will enter the ballot box, not as a partisan, but as an American, and will give the voice of his approval to such candidates and to such parties as he believes will best serve the public interest. In this method, the contending parties will be continually competing for the public confidence and support, and in the interests of partisan success they will be compelled to do their utmost for the public good.

As one considers the momentous problems of to-day and remembers that it is largely through the instrumentalities of party government that they must be solved, one may well wonder what the end will be. Out of the tragedy and sacrifice of war, there has come a feeling of unrest and discontent. In the emergency of the great conflict, the government dared not hesitate to pay extravagant prices and permit enormous profits, if by so doing additional speed could be secured, for every day that could be saved meant the saving of human life. Prices and wages were fixed by governmental decree. Extraordinary powers of every kind were exercised on every hand. The result is that many ignorant people think that there is unlimited wealth which the public may distribute at its wish, if they can but get control of the government. They have a naive, superstitious confi-

dence that the government can accomplish wonders if it only will. They are moved to ask for the impossible and to threaten revolt and violence if their demands should be refused. The great combinations of labor have been influenced by the radical and ignorant members in their midst, while some of the representatives of capital, forgetting the real significance of the struggle through which the nation has passed, and ignoring the basic fact that honest compromise is the basis of democratic achievement, have complicated the fundamental problem with their stubbornness and intolerance. The rapidly increasing cost of living and the suffering it brings but augments the forces of discontent. There are those who decry our institutions and clamor openly for revolt.

Out of these conditions comes a definite challenge to the party leadership and achievement. The public must be educated to the real nature of our economic problems. The laws governing collective bargaining must be developed so that exact justice may be done to either side. The conditions governing the distribution of wealth must be carefully considered, and made to correspond with our ideals of decency and justice. The laboring man and those dependent upon him must be safeguarded against the needless loss of life and limb. The arbitrary power of monopoly must be throttled. Profiteering must be effectively prohibited. The ideals of democracy, defended at such an infinite sacrifice of blood and treasure against external foes, must be equally protected against the enemy from within. Will the people of America meet the challenge? Will they demand from their parties, their leaders and their candidates, the just and constructive solutions that will endure? Will they seek refuge from the present ills in the horror, rapine and brutal impotence of revolution, or in the fearless facing of

these conditions and in courageous efforts to provide remedies that are adequate and just? Upon this fundamental issue rests the destiny of America.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. What ways can you suggest to combat the idea that since each voter is only one among thousands, therefore he need not take his duties seriously?

2. Explain the practical evils that result when people respond to a campaign directed against the bosses. How can education prevent those evils?

3. What is the practical importance of the student learning that political parties are the indispensable instruments of democracy?

4. How does the study of political parties present unusual opportunities for the development of the efferent part of the psychophysical disposition? Explain in detail.

5. Outline a plan for teaching political parties, indicating the order in which the different matters would be treated, the details under each, the method of approach, and the objects sought to be accomplished.

6. Can a man be an aggressive member of a political party without sacrificing his independence of thought and action? How?

7. How would you lead the students to see the necessity of compromise in an effective democracy?

8. How can the truth about government and political parties, in certain instances, be taught without degenerating into muck raking and discouraging individual interest and initiative?

9. How can you make clear the importance of political parties to your community?

10. How can students be interested in membership in political parties without becoming viciously partisan? Explain in detail.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Emery, Henry C., *Politician, Party and People* (Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1913).

Lowell, A. Lawrence, *Public Opinion and Popular Government* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1913).
Part II, "The Functions of Parties."

Bryce, James, *American Commonwealth* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1907).
Volume II, Part III, "The Party System."

Reed, Thomas Harrison, *Form and Functions of American Government* (World Book Company, Yonkers, N. Y., 1916).
Part II, "Parties and Elections."

Kimball, Everett, *The National Government of the United States* (Ginn & Co., Boston, Mass., 1920).
Chapter V, "Political Issues and Party History."
Chapter VI, "Party Organization."

Dealey, J. Q., *The Development of the State* (Silver, Burdett & Co., New York, 1909).
Chapter III, "Rights and Political Parties."

Ostrogorski, M., *Democracy and the Party System in the United States* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1910).

Ray, P. Orman, *An Introduction to Political Parties and Practical Politics* (Second Edition) (Scribner's, New York, 1917).

Jones, Chester L., *Readings on Parties and Elections* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1916).

Hart, Albert B., *Actual Government* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1908).
Part II, "The Will of the People."

Munro, W. B., *The Government of the United States* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1919).
Chapter XXII, "Political Parties in National Government. Their History and Functions."
Chapter XXIII, "Political Parties in National Government. Their Organization and Methods."

Young, James T., *The New American Government and Its Work* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1915).
Chapter XXVI, "The Party."

Hall, Arnold Bennett, *Practical Problems of Politics* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1920).

Where to write for further information:

Proportional Representation League, Secretary, Haverford, Pa.

National American Woman Suffrage Association, 505 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Secretary of State (For election laws).

County Clerk (For sample ballots).

State Central Committees and National Central Committees of the different political parties for campaign literature.

CHAPTER XII

THE BULWARK OF DEMOCRACY

AS OBSERVED in the preceding chapter, there has come out of the sorrow and suffering of war, a dangerous spirit of unrest. Weakened by the strain and stress of the great conflict, oppressed with the feeling of injustice and impotence, misguided by the wild impossible promises of the revolutionary, there has developed a spirit of radicalism that seems to menace our institutions. Motivated by fear of these forces, our government has resorted to the deportation of offending aliens who plot against our government. Other methods of repression are being advocated and occasionally employed. There is danger in these methods of defense. Nothing worse could happen than for the public to rely entirely upon such means of protection. For they are negative remedies at best, and, moreover, are inconsistent with our traditional ideals of political liberty. They remove those whom the contagion has affected, but are powerless to prevent its spread. They may perhaps serve well in a great emergency, but they offer no adequate protection for the future.

Such measures will be doubly harmful if they give us a false sense of security or blind us to the constructive remedies that are at hand. If the contagion is to be arrested in its spread, and prevented in the future, it can only be accomplished by the innoculation of the public with the fundamental concepts of liberty and democracy. If revolutionary radicalism threatens our peace and safety to-day, it is because our institutions and ideals have not been adequately

understood and loved by those who compose the public. In the life of popular government all is necessarily staked upon the nature of the public opinion that functions through it. If that public opinion is not grounded in a fundamental comprehension and appreciation of the ideals, theories and principles of democracy, its foundations are shaky and insecure. It may endure through the ordinary vicissitudes of national development, but, subject it to the stress and strain of a great war, when intellects and judgments are blinded by prejudice, fear and passion, and dissolution is imminent. In such emergencies the only effective bulwark of democracy is a virile sentiment of dynamic Americanism, directed and controlled by a public opinion that is intelligent, courageous and sincere. Moreover, such opinion must be grounded in the deep and abiding conviction of the soundness and justice of American ideals.

In these days of stress, the situation is complicated by the existence of many evils and unsolved problems that, in times of peace and plenty, seemed to the superficial to be innocent enough, but which are greatly accentuated by the evil circumstances of to-day, and afford to the unthinking and the reckless, a plausible basis for their futile policy of revolt. Our laxity in dealing with the problems presented by the conflicts between capital and labor, affords an excellent example. Most of the suffering and privation that this conflict has caused to the nation might have been prevented, had we struggled with the problems as they first appeared, seeking to do justice to both sides, and avoiding the fatal policy of drift and indifference, which has generally continued until the controversy has reached the dimensions of a national tragedy.

A spirit of constructive patriotism would have attacked these problems as they developed, and thus avoided many of the aggravating factors in the present conditions of unrest.

Moreover, such a patriotic sentiment, accompanied by an intelligent public opinion, devoted to the ideals and purposes of our democracy, would make America a most uninviting field for revolutionary propaganda. Entrenched behind such defenses, our institutions would have little to fear from the hostilities of the enemies within our gates. But with vital problems left unsolved, with the horrors of unemployment undisturbed, with profiteering apparently unrestrained, with the lamentable housing conditions that exist in many cities, and with our public opinion uninformed and unconvinced regarding the nature and genius of our institutions, we provide alluring possibilities for those who would plot our ruin.

I am not one of those who believes our institutions are in immediate peril. But while our national existence is not endangered, our domestic peace and prosperity are threatened, and the efficiency and justice of our democracy are impaired. In such a period of unrest, public opinion can not operate efficiently and justly upon the problems of the day. Fear, hatred and jealousy jeopardize the spirit of national unity, bias the popular judgment, and add new points of friction. It becomes imperative, therefore, in the interest of a more efficient democracy, to eliminate these basic ills.

The first step must be the prompt solution of our public problems, as rapidly as they occur. The public must be trained to apply to these problems the basic ideals of our democracy and to demand from our government the translation of these ideals into the accomplished facts of constructive statesmanship. We can not afford to ignore industrial problems that form the basis of domestic conflicts, until it is forced upon public attention by the tragedy of industrial paralysis. If an injustice is being done to labor, or the legitimate rights of the employer are being menaced, the public must be trained to respond immediately, and to demand the correction of the evil. Moreover, our public

officers must be made to feel that back of them lies a virile, determined public opinion that opposes the rule of arbitrary might in industrial conflict, whether wielded by capital or by labor, but insists that, like other domestic controversies, they must be solved by the rule of law, articulating the basic principles of industrial justice, and enforced with courage and impartiality. This will not be an easy task to essay. It can not be done at once. It will require years of study, experimentation and development. But it never will be done until demanded by a dynamic, intelligent and sustained opinion of the public.

What is true here is true of the other problems that are calling for attention, but which we need not here enumerate. This means, in the last analysis, that domestic peace and tranquillity can be adequately assured only when there can be created a dominant sentiment of constructive patriotism to insure the just and prompt solution of domestic problems. In the preceding chapters I have tried to indicate how this sentiment can be created. We have seen how the sentiment of military patriotism has been developed, and what it has meant to the nation in its conflict with foreign foes. We have seen how the study of the community, the state and the nation can have a dramatic and impelling appeal to the social instincts of the normal boy and girl, if we will only teach these subjects as they are, with all their tragic setting and their vital, human significance. We have seen how, by opening up new afferent inlets into their instinctive dispositions, the bare skeleton of our social and political organization became clothed in the flesh and blood of human interest. Likewise, by training the efferent part of the psycho-physical disposition until the felt impulse to action, arising from the stimulation of the instinct, is directed into useful channels of civic action, we have seen how one may soon learn to refresh his spiritual and altruistic self with

the thrill of joy that comes from noble service splendidly performed, and to seek his happiness in its further quest.

By pursuing these methods throughout the school curriculum, until the receiving of stimuli through the new afferent inlets and the exercise of the resulting felt impulse to action in an intelligent and effective way, have become habitual, there is crystallized a sentiment of dynamic Americanism that will insure a quick and virile response to public need.

This splendid sentiment, with all the emotional power of youth to give it force, can be safeguarded against ignorant abuse, and intelligently directed toward effective and useful remedies, by training the intellectual habits of the pupil, inculcating a love of truth, an evolutionary point of view toward the problems of life, and by developing the instinct of curiosity until an aggressive, critical and analytical attitude toward public problems becomes habitual. It has been the purpose of this volume to suggest helpful methods by which all this could be accomplished, and to demonstrate its necessity as the basis of an intelligent, virile and altruistic public opinion, without which democracy can not endure.

The creation of this sentiment and the development of the emotional and intellectual resources of the child is not enough. As a by-product of this training, there should be developed certain basic convictions regarding the fundamentals of democracy. The experience of democratic experiments and the dictates of common sense, indicate that there are a few basic principles of democracy that are apparently essential to its success. These should be so thoroughly grounded in the thought and life of the child that he will not be tempted to depart from them except after the most careful scrutiny, and upon the clearest evidence. Two dangers arise at this point, which we must be careful to avoid. One is confusing individual opinion over controversial mat-

ters and details with fundamental principles. There are very few of the latter and to assume that one's opinions are fundamental and amply vindicated by the experiences of the race, without the most painstaking study, reflection and analysis, is errant bigotry of the most pernicious type.

The other danger is the tendency to dogmatize. The more obvious and axiomatic a principle seems to be, and therefore the more teachable it is, the less we tend to teach, and the more we tend to dogmatize. We do not need a public opinion based upon blindly accepted dogmas. What we need is a passionate devotion to vital principle, as an effective means to a worthy end, and based upon an adequate estimate of its inherent worth. The latter is a result of education, the former a product of dogmatism. In the latter inhere all the evils of bigotry and the static mind; in the former, we have the strength that comes from character and conviction.

By many it will be argued that the teaching of these principles is unnecessary, if not vicious. We are told that if these principles are sound that the public will learn them from experience, and if not sound, that they will be misled. But why condemn each decade and generation to the same pitfalls and mistakes, in order that they may learn in the school of experience what might be better taught in the formal process of education. In commerce we seek to generalize so accurately upon the experience of the past that we can teach the business man of to-morrow to avoid the pitfalls of yesterday. Medical education seeks to save the physician and his patients of the future from the vital mistakes of the past. If we insist that medicine and business should profit by the experience of the race, why deny the same boon to the struggling democracies of the world? If it be argued that democracy learns only by experience, it may be answered that the same is true of business, medicine and sci-

ence. But that does not mean that the student of medicine must rediscover for himself, through the wasteful and tedious methods of unguided accident and experience, the theories of pathology and the facts of bacteriology. Nor should it mean that each generation, under the stress and strain of its peculiar problems, should rediscover through accident and experiment, unguided by the experience of the race, the value of such concepts as religious liberty or the freedom of the press.

As this chapter is being written, the public press carries the news that five members of a state legislature have been expelled from the assembly because of their political beliefs. It is not alleged that there was fraud in their election, or that there was legal incapacity for office, but merely that they were Socialists. I hold no brief for socialism, but I do contend that such an action evidences a wanton disregard of the spirit of toleration and the principles of political liberty. How much better it would have been had these legislators learned in their youth, from the history of the past, something of the value of political liberty, than for them to rediscover it to-day, through this wanton breach of American ideals!

Among the basic principles that would seem to be essential to the life of a democracy, and which ought to be explained and taught until their apparent worth to society makes them become a part of the child's philosophy—a well-grounded conviction of his life—there are four that I desire here to discuss. They have all incidentally received more or less consideration in the preceding chapters, but I want to restate them here for the sake of special emphasis and orderly arrangement. The first principle to be discussed is the principle of national unity. No form of popular government can succeed where the people are divided into groups of irreconcilables, neither being willing to accept a

popular mandate, nor to effect an honest compromise. In such a state there can be no government by the consent of the governed, but only a government by force. It required four long years of civil war, with an immense sacrifice of blood and treasure, before America learned the value of this fundamental concept. Nor would the Civil War alone have accomplished this important end, had it not been followed by a frank acceptance of the results, and a growing spirit of mutual toleration and respect. It is for this reason that those who wave the "bloody shirt" and seek to capitalize the waning prejudices of sectionalism, deserve only condemnation and contempt. Such appeals retard and endanger the spirit of unity.

The government in the southern states during the carpetbag rule is another excellent example. The whites were irreconcilable under the domination of the negro vote, which was finally overthrown by methods of questionable legality. Moreover, the governments of these states suffer to this day as a result of irreconcilable groups and the absence of political unity. Austria-Hungary could never have established an enduring republic, because of the utter absence of the spirit and ideals of national unity. The inability of the north and south of Ireland to agree upon fundamental questions of domestic policy and of home rule, and the unwillingness of either side to compromise, or of the minority to accept the mandate of the majority, illustrates the paramount importance of a unity of national ideals. The French republic is continually weakened by the presence, in its body politic, of a group of irreconcilable royalists, who decline to acquiesce in the will of the majority, on the question of democratic government.

The strength of America in the recent war was largely the result of common devotion to the ideals our people believed to be involved. The strength of America in the future

will likewise depend upon the unity of ideals and aspirations that will motivate our people. If we can train our citizens to the appreciation of the fundamental ideals of America, to avoid the spirit of intolerance and bigotry, and to approach great problems in the spirit of honest compromise, we will be laying the foundations of national strength. The present industrial crisis, if allowed to develop in its bitterness and heat until our people become more interested in the triumph of their group than in the national ideals of justice, will become a very real and immediate menace to the public peace. Against such possible contingencies we must train our youth to the value and importance of our national ideals, in order that there may be developed a devotion to the public weal that will make impossible such a fundamental clash between the classes.

How well this can be accomplished will depend to some extent upon our ability to develop a broad spirit of toleration. Should the majority fail to show a fair consideration for the legitimate rights of the minority, and proceed to their ruthless violation or disregard, it would not take long until national unity would disappear. For example, should the majority of the people, by constitutional amendment or otherwise, seek to deny the rights of religious liberty to the minority, or deny them legitimate freedom of discussion, it is inconceivable that the minority would peacefully and voluntarily acquiesce. Innumerable examples might be cited in support of this same principle. National unity, therefore, can only be achieved when the people are educated to the support of, and belief in, the same great fundamental principles of politics and justice, when they can view their conflicting interests in the spirit of democratic compromise, and when there is established as a national trait a broad and genuine spirit of toleration, and an absence of errant bigotry. The spirit of compromise is of the very essence of a suc-

cessful democracy and the spirit of toleration is essential to the growth of liberty and the enjoyment of freedom.

The school can render no greater service to the public than in impregnating in the mind of the nation's youth the vital importance of these matters. The opportunities for so doing are abundant. The life and efficiency of every organized group, club, church, or community is dependent largely upon these factors for its success. Let two irreconcilable factions develop in a club, church or society, and its usefulness for the time being is at an end. Let discord and bitterness enter the home, and its charm and utility are vitally impaired. Nor is this all. These qualities are not only of great social value to the nation, but of great practical value to the individual. Upon the possession of these faculties depends one's ability to get on with his fellow men, to win their confidence and respect, and to cooperate effectively with his associates.

We have seen the importance of these faculties tragically illustrated in the practical politics of the nation. We have seen the determined, organized minority, representing the most sinister influences of the nation, winning victory after victory because they were agreed upon fundamentals; they knew the value of common effort, and they operated with essential unity. Their opponents lacked the unity, the team work and the capacity to cooperate. They needed to get down to fundamentals, to accept them as the basis of their unity, to be tolerant as to details. Until the forces of righteousness can learn these elemental values the forces of wickedness will prevail.

The second principle to be discussed is the theory that orderly development and evolution is the most efficient means of progress. This means an intelligent devotion to, and confidence in, law and order as opposed to illegal and revolutionary methods. I do not mean a blind submission to

established power, but the conscious spirit of self-restraint born of the conviction that lawful means will insure the largest measure of success. If this spirit of intelligent self-restraint and devotion to the principle of orderly development can become a basic conviction of our people, we will have erected a mighty barrier against the dangers of recklessness and revolt.

In the preceding chapters the methods of teaching the value of law and order have been repeatedly discussed. Splendid opportunities are afforded in the study of all the departments of government, in the history of the community, and in the experiences of the home. When our public opinion is thoroughly impregnated with this idea and it has become a settled and firm conviction of our people, then another bulwark of democracy will have been achieved.

The third principle in which public opinion should be deeply grounded until it has become a profound conviction of our people is the basic and sacred importance of liberty. In America an appeal for liberty and its proper appreciation may, at first, seem superfluous. In fact, it is doubtless the existence of this very feeling that is at fault. We all render lip service to the cause of liberty. We all respond with splendid patriotic thrills to its eloquent acclaim. We all assume that liberty is an established institution, and need not be studied or referred to except in recognition or in praise. We, in America, have come to take it all for granted and to forget the great price that has been paid by those who have gone before. We forget that with every new generation, there arises new evils that menace its vitality. In the work of patriotic education incident to the great war it was at first difficult to get the public to see that in that great struggle the issue of liberty was involved. They seemed to think that liberty and freedom in this enlightened age could no longer be imperiled. They seemed to have for-

gotten that the struggle for liberty is an eternal one. They had forgotten that the aspiration for liberty has been the pillar of cloud by day and of light by night that has inspired the teeming millions of the world, through all the vicissitudes of their upward struggle.

So accustomed were they to certain liberties that they never stopped to question the source from which they came or the means by which they were protected. The freedom and opportunity of the child of humble birth to acquire an education and to get into any field of business, political or professional endeavor, unfettered by limitations of caste, family or law, is so commonplace in America that they forgot that like opportunities were not enjoyed to the same fulness or extent in most of the great nations of the world. They likewise forgot that as the pressure of population becomes greater, our economic life more differentiated, and the pioneer character of our civilization disappears, there will arise tendencies toward the economic stratification of society which silently, slowly and almost imperceptibly will curtail or threaten these liberties and opportunities that we now enjoy.

The only adequate safeguard against such future ills is an alert and intelligent public opinion, thoroughly and eternally committed to the principles of liberty and motivated with a passionate devotion to their defense. This conception of the importance of liberty will not come automatically. It will not be created by occasional rhetoric or the celebration of national holidays. It will come only with the patient, careful and thorough instruction of the nation's youth. This should be one of the central themes in all study of history and civics. There are few periods, epochs or subjects in these lines of study that will not afford opportunities of bringing home, in new and dramatic form, the marvelous importance of liberty, the incessant struggle that must al-

ways go on in its behalf, and its basic importance to human welfare. The child must have this brought home to him time and time again, until it is no longer a mere formally accepted dogma of American politics, but a vital conviction of his life, an inherent part of his moral and intellectual equipment.

Out of such a conception must come not only the right and duty to defend one's liberties, but also the duty to respect the like liberties of others. It is a common mistake in democracies to dwell upon their rights and gently but surely to ignore their duties. There is not so much danger that our people will too easily acquiesce in the loss of liberties as that some of our people may forget to recognize and respect the liberty of others. Well-meaning reformers, in their eagerness to remedy obvious evils, have been moved to the advocacy of measures subversive of liberty, and savoring strongly of tyrannical control. A very distinguished student of the housing problem, in his anxiety to see that the housing statutes were rigidly enforced, proposed a system of state inspection in which public inspectors would have authority to enter and inspect the homes of those living in the tenements, at any hour of day or night. It was proposed that such inspection should be made frequently and at all hours of the twenty-four. Such a bureaucratic system of espionage, carried into the private life of the home, shows a lack of perspective and a dangerous willingness to violate a very fundamental principle of free government. I have only admiration for those who are giving their time and energy to dealing with the difficulties presented by the housing problems of our cities, but I insist that a due regard for the fundamental rights of democracy would find some other method of enforcement more consistent with a decent regard for individual liberty.

In dealing with the colored race, and with alien residents,

we have shown a disposition at times to resort to acts of tyranny and to outrage private rights in a brutal and savage way. In 1889 the council of a western city passed an ordinance creating a Chinese district and providing that all Chinese must, within sixty days, move their business and homes to the district specified, or away from the city and county, and providing punishment for those who failed to move within the allotted time. This act applied to over twenty thousand of the Chinese race, some of whom were American citizens, and some of whom had owned their homes and businesses for thirty to forty years. Under the terms of this ordinance these persons were compelled to leave these places within sixty days and to move to a designated and restricted place, where they would be forced to pay whatever might be exacted of them by the real estate speculators who had them at their mercy. There was no alternative. It was not contended that these people were criminal, but only that they were of Chinese descent. The ordinance sounds more like a brutal decree of the Turkish government dealing with the helpless Armenians, than a municipal ordinance in a great democracy. Any city that could impose such an ordinance, or any public opinion that could view it with equanimity, has no real conviction as to the principles of liberty. Fortunately, we have a Constitution that prohibits such acts of majority tyranny, and under that Constitution the courts held the ordinance to be void. But it was only the wisdom of the framers of the constitutional provision that saved the situation.

Like ordinances have been passed dealing with the colored population, while other laws discriminating against them, both as to their personal and political rights, have been not infrequently invoked. The prevalence of terrorism and mob violence, in many cases involving members of the negro race, affords still other examples of where popular passion,

race prejudice, or other factors have proved to be greater than our respect for law and our veneration for liberty. To deny to one accused of crime, the constitutional rights of a fair impartial trial by a jury of his peers, and to leave him to the mercies of an infuriated mob, is not only an act of savage barbarism, but the grossest violation of one's most sacred right of life and liberty. And yet these things occur and they occur in almost every state in the Union. I do not wish to ignore the difficulties presented by the negro problem, nor do I wish to offer any suggestion for its solution, but I do wish to submit that the violation of the plainest conceptions of liberty and constitutional government, not only affords no constructive solution to this intricate problem, but that it does dull the popular ideas of liberty, and to that extent it jeopardizes the very foundations of our democracy. The existence of these evils demonstrates the imperative need of a clearer conception of the meaning of liberty, and a deeper devotion to its defense.

The examples above indicated will afford striking illustrations to the students of the present need of a devotion to liberty and the serious consequences of its loss. We need to think of liberty and freedom in the terms of modern life. We need to study it as a basic concept of efficient democracy. We need to vitalize it by applying it in the light of the realities of to-day. For only out of this process will come an adequate understanding of its importance and a sincere devotion to its ideal.

In developing such a conviction as the common possession of our people, we are at the same time laying the foundation for a better spirit of national unity. As previously observed, the basis of such a spirit must be found in a common devotion to common ideals that are fundamental and basic. Nothing can do this better than by making the cause of liberty and freedom, in a real and vital sense, the com-

mon cause of our nation. Its appeal to the imagination and the emotions is marvelous, while its predominant place in the nation's history makes it peculiarly appropriate. Moreover, it becomes an additional barrier against those forces of bigotry, prejudice and recklessness that occasionally threaten our domestic peace. The spirit of unity is not likely to suffer greatly unless complicated by some tyrannous violation of the legitimate liberty of a minority. And that becomes less likely to just the extent that a deep and abiding conviction of the essential importance of liberty permeates the body politic.

Take for instance the difficult question of the freedom of speech. When the public becomes aroused as in times of war, it is too easy for the great majority, with the best of intentions, to destroy ruthlessly the rights of the minority. In times of stress and strain such as the present, there is an element in the country crying for the suppression of those who argue for revolution, and against our forms of government. No greater mistake could be made than to rely upon such repression for the national safety. Our safety must rest in the sound judgment and the sane convictions of our people, and not in their silent but ignorant acquiescence. We must develop a form of government and a type of democracy that will flourish amidst the babel of revolutionary tongues or we are lost. Give to the minority their full freedom of expression, and the decisions of the majority become more safe, more intelligent, and more just, and the minority becomes more ready to acquiesce in the mandates of the majority. But deny to the minority the rights of free and fair discussion, and the rule of the majority becomes less generous, less well considered, and less intelligent, while the minority are driven to irreconcilable sullenness or revolt. Freedom of discussion is the best safety valve for the pent-up anger of minorities.

A prominent student of German politics and government has recently observed that had the German people enjoyed but one liberty denied them, the great war and the wicked philosophy that prompted it never would have happened. That liberty was the liberty of discussion. He stated that there were thinkers in Germany who took a liberal attitude toward the question of imperialism, expansion and world affairs, but the moment one of them would secure a following, he was denied the medium of expression. The moment the peace societies began to apply their theories to German politics, they met with effective opposition. The great majority of the people of Germany were educated in a system of public schools where the ideas taught were subject to the most vigorous supervision, and the people trained to a philosophy of force and the doctrine of the superman, which made them the fit instruments of imperialistic ambition. This, together with an absence of freedom of discussion, by which those who saw the mistake of their national philosophy might be prevented from converting others, made the ruling class the supreme arbiters over the destinies of their people. No more dramatic illustration of the evils resulting from the suppression of freedom of discussion could be desired. What we need in America is not the national unity that is "made in Germany," through dogmatism dictated by autocratic power, but a sense of unity and strength that comes from a common conviction as to the value of liberty, a conviction that springs from the free life and thought of a virile and independent race.

In opposing suppressive measures against those who argue in favor of revolt, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I have no sympathy with those who would capitalize the ignorance, the cupidity and the prejudice of the people and who seek to lead them through the perilous and barren wastes of revolution, in the search of a new régime existing

only in the realms of their imagination. Whether such leaders are found among the soap-box orators or the parlor bolshevists of the intellectually elite, they deserve only condemnation and distrust. But no free people can afford to rob them of their liberty of speech so long as it bears no direct relation to lawless violence. For a people that is careless of violating liberty in one case will be more careless in the next. The security of our liberty, in the last analysis, is dependent on the firm convictions of our people. If that conviction be shaken, or its observance be ignored, our freedom is insecure.

The fourth great principle of democracy that ought to be inculcated in the minds of our people, is the theory of democratic duty. As indicated in a preceding chapter, one of the worst evils of our democratic philosophy is that it is generally expressed in terms of the rights of the individual. Accordingly, there has developed in connection with it, a negative rather than a positive theory of political ethics. So long as we avoid the positive invasion of the rights of the individual, our consciences tend to be calm and satisfied. Through our indifference we may be denying life and health to thousands whom it is the mission of democracy to serve, but we never mind. Millions of our citizens have lived in contentment and ease with detailed knowledge of the evils of child labor and never raised a protesting hand. Millions are aware that every year scores of our citizens lose their lives through the lawlessness of mobs, and yet they scarcely rise to protest, although they alone can prevent these awful crimes.

Our whole theory of democracy and government is at fault. We regard government and democracy as something separate and independent from ourselves, against which we can claim the most exacting rights, but to which we owe nothing save obedience and taxes. The facts are, that mod-

ern government is nothing but a cooperative enterprise in which the people unite for the joint solution of those problems which they can not solve alone. For every right there is a corresponding duty resting not only upon the government, but upon the people who function through the government, and whose cooperative enterprise it is. If a child has a right to normal childhood, education and physical fitness for the duties and conflicts of life, then it becomes the sacred duty of the people to see that their government gives and protects such rights. If it be admitted that one has a right to be tried by due process of law before forfeiting his life as a penalty for an alleged offense, then it becomes the duty of the citizen to see that such basic rights are granted, and when indifferent citizens tolerate the rule of mobs, the mark of Cain belongs upon their brows. If one is entitled to a just and expeditious settlement of such disputes as arise in our courts of justice, then it becomes the duty of the individual so to use his political power as to secure this worthy end. No one can admit the existence of a right in a democratic nation, without accepting a corresponding duty regarding its fulfillment. That duty arises from the very nature of democracy, and yet it has not found an abiding place among the convictions of our people.

The eagerness of the average voter to find illusive alibis for corruption and inefficiency in government, is abundant evidence of this fact. Corruption, ignorance in public office, terrible and costly inefficiency, the ravages of industrial disease, the annual toll of the "white man's plague"—these and countless other tragedies of to-day are witnessed by the public in a complacent ease which emphatically negatives any adequate sense of personal accountability or blame. Much of the preceding chapters has been devoted to analyzing these situations, and to suggesting means of bringing home, in the individual case, a sense of personal responsi-

bility. From these and the many other illustrations that the study of our local and national life affords, this sense of personal blame must be driven home, time and time again, accompanied with an adequate explanation of the cooperative nature of democracy, until it becomes habitual, and, by continued repetition, is translated into the thought, the character and the convictions of the child. All of these illustrations will contain rich possibilities of appeal to instinctive and emotional life, and the response to these, when intelligently directed, will give to the child that generous joy and spiritual exaltation that comes to those who serve in a noble and worthy cause. With the development of this conviction, the citizen is ethically equipped to play a worthy part in the life of our democracy.

In a recent meeting of advanced university students, a spirited debate developed between the conservatives and the radicals regarding certain domestic policies and institutions. The radicals challenged every institution, every fundamental principle of the Republic, and the very essentials of constitutional government itself. The conservatives came valiantly to the defense, but they were miserably defeated at every point in the argument. No sooner would one of them take a stand than he would find himself forced into an embarrassing alternative or dilemma from which he seemed powerless to extricate himself. Subsequent experience showed that many converts had been won to the cause of radicalism, or had lost their confidence in the value of existing institutions. This was not due to the fact that the radicals were always right. It was not due to the fact that the evidence and logic were on their side. It was not due to the invincible character of their position which was frequently impossible, and occasionally absolutely negatived by the most obvious facts of history. The difficulty was that the defenders of American institutions and ideals were

not prepared for their defense. It was painfully evident that many of them had never before given a moment's consideration to their basic implications. They had accepted them as correct. They had taken them as a matter of course. To them American ideals and principles did not represent deeply-rooted conviction, slowly crystallized through years of careful thought and study, but the lightly-accepted dogmas of tradition or prejudice. They were not aware that back of them lay the accumulated experiences of the ages. They did not see in them the great principles of human progress that had been evolved through centuries of trial and error, of costly bloodshed, and of bitter conflict.

Their opponents were clever, ingenious and remorseless. Thrilled with the joy of the iconoclast, stimulated by the spirit of adventure and discovery and unrestrained by the judgment of maturity or an adequate background of historical knowledge, they found the paths of radicalism alluringly heroic and refreshingly new and virile. Of inquiring or contentious temperament, they found them intellectually interesting and forensically productive. Consequently they were prepared to defend their views and to win a victory by the intellectual default of their opponents.

The illustration is typical. It explains the growth of radicalism among the intellectually inclined. It explains the great influences frequently wielded by the radicals who are so few in number. Its moral is clear. Radicalism is dangerous in a democracy only when the people are uninstructed in its basic theories and uncommitted to its ideals. Such seeds of discontent will come to fruitage only when cast upon soil prepared by ignorance and nurtured by justifiable discontent. But let the people be grounded in the fundamental theories of democracy, let them be drawn together in that spirit of national unity that comes from a community of convictions and ideals, let them be committed to the policy

of self-restraint and orderly progress as the most effective method of achievement, let them worship at the shrine of liberty with sincerity and devotion, and finally, let them accept the doctrine of personal accountability for governmental performance, and the nation need fear but little.

A distinguished citizen from England, in a recent address to an American audience, related the incident of a grave mistake made by the British prime minister in a recent emergency. It looked for a time as if the results would be disastrous. But with almost unerring instinct, the British people refused to follow their leader, popular and successful as he had been, in this particular affair, and the disaster was averted. They were so well grounded in their convictions, so deeply attached to certain basic ideals that when their leader, mistaken under the stress of the moment, went astray, they refused to follow.

I believe it to be the mission of the schools and the ideal of Americanism, to create a public opinion so intelligent in its understanding of democracy, so deeply devoted to the ideals of America, and so firmly impregnated with the principles of liberty, that though we suffer from mistaken leadership, though we be attacked by foreign powers, though we be subjected to the strain of famine, pestilence or industrial panic, though we be fought by domestic foes, that America will emerge triumphant because of the justice, the courage, the ideals and the character of her people. It is in the possession of these national and basic traits that we will find the true bulwark of democracy.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS

1. Explain the evils of suppressing the views of political minorities, unless absolutely indispensable to the public safety.
2. Explain the organic relation between a national conviction as to the value of liberty and the spirit of national unity.

3. What additional instances of majority tyranny in the United States can you suggest?

4. How can you lead the child to discover, in terms of his own experience, the importance of national unity?

5. How can you lead the child to discover, in terms of his own experience, the value of liberty in modern life?

6. How can you develop these fundamental convictions without at the same time developing bigotry? Distinguish between bigotry and conviction.

7. How can you lead the student to discover, in terms of his own experience, the importance of a constructive theory of political ethics, and to recognize the duties as well as the rights of democracy?

8. Most of us have accepted, as dogmas or prejudices, the basic ideals of democracy. How can we change these into convictions?

9. What is the practical importance of changing them into convictions?

10. Can there be a vital course in Americanism, separate and apart from the study of the life, the communities, the governments and the ideals of America?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dealey, J. Q., *The Development of the State* (Silver, Burdett & Co., New York, 1909).
Chapter XV, "Modern Democracy."

McCall, S. W., *The Liberty of Citizenship* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1915).

Hall, Arnold Bennett, *Practical Problems of Politics* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1920).
Chapters I to III.

Lowell, A. Lawrence, *Public Opinion and Popular Government* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1913).
Chapter I, "Public Opinion Must Be Public."
Chapter II, "Public Opinion Must Be Opinion."
Chapter III, "Conditions Essential for Public Opinion."

Root, Elihu, *The Citizens' Part in Government* (Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1916).

Bryce, James, *The Hindrances to Good Citizenship* (Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1910).

Cooley, C. H., *Social Organization* (Scribner's, New York, 1912).
Chapter XII, "The Theory of Public Opinion."

Garner, J. W., *Introduction to Political Science* (American Book Company, New York, 1910).
Chapter II, "The Nature of the State."
Chapter III, "Essential Element of the State."

Hall's (Arnold B.) Fishback (W. P.) *Elementary Law* (Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis, Ind., 1915).
Chapter V, "Social Utility of the Law."

Muir, Ramsay, *Nationalism and Internationalism* (Houghton, Mifflin Company, Boston, Mass., 1917).
Pages 13-37, "Law and Liberty."

Sloane, W. M., *The Powers and Aims of Western Democracy* (Scribner's, New York, 1919).
Pages 77-154, 275-322.

THE END