

A  
0  
0  
0  
6  
8  
9  
8  
4  
2  
3

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



# SAFE GUARDING AMERICAN IDEALS

---

HARRY F. ATWOOD



*presented to the*

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO

*by*

Mrs. John C. A. Watkins

---







# Safeguarding American Ideals

*A Brief Study*  
*of*  
*Our Heritage*  
*Our Negligence*  
*Our Responsibility*

*"Civilization is a contract between the great dead, the living and the unborn."*

*—Edmund Burke.*





# Safeguarding American Ideals

By

HARRY F. ATWOOD

Author of "Back to the Republic,"  
"Keep God in American History."



Published by  
LAIRD & LEE, INC.  
Chicago, Ill.

Copyright 1921  
by  
HARRY F. ATWOOD

First Edition Printed August, 1921

Dedicated with profound gratitude to the men and women who laid the foundation for the finest civilization of history and provided opportunity for us to render the most splendid service the world has ever known.



## PREFACE

---

**T**HE purpose of this book is to set forth briefly and clearly those fundamental Ideals which have made us a great and substantial people.

The reason for writing the book is a conviction that during recent years we have been drifting from the moorings and wandering away from the corner stones that marked our sterling character and stable progress.

It is written in the hope that it may sound a warning note to stop, look and listen—to heed the still, small voice of conscience and learn from the lessons of experience which history teaches so clearly.

It is an invitation to come and reason together concerning the great heritage that has been bequeathed to us; to consider seriously whether we are willing to depart further therefrom and continue substituting therefor the whirlpools of class consciousness and the quicksands of chaos.

It is not an alarm against the Reds or the bomb throwers. It is an appeal to the American born,

American naturalized, American educated people of this country who need awakening to the tremendous and crucial problems of government and industry that confront us.

Those who are sitting back complacently and attributing the present situation solely to the effect of the world war, should study carefully the conditions that prevailed in this country in 1914. It will reveal the fact that there was general depression and confusion at that time.

The war gave us a good market, set people to work and stimulated business. Now we are confronted with problems very similar to those that appeared before the war.

A careful survey of the tendency during the last twenty years to drift from representative government toward direct action; from individual property rights toward socialistic and paternalistic ideas, will also throw much light on the cause of the chaotic conditions that prevail at this time.

With home-wrecking and divorce on the increase; with our schools devoted too much to fads and fallacies at the expense of truth; with the doors of many churches closed; with city councils and State legislatures enacting socialistic legislation; with our Congress responsible for the Adamson bill and other class legislation and our

higher courts handing down decisions approving legislation which impairs the obligation of contract and assaults individual property rights; with the agencies and expenses of government multiplying with disturbing rapidity; it is high time for us to consider the sources and analyze the causes of turbulence and confusion and to realize that American ideals are not visionary departures from the tried and true, as has been so generally regarded of late years, but rather adherence and devotion to those eternal verities that should endure.

High standards of individual and institutional character made America great. The perpetuity of America is dependent upon the maintenance of those high standards.





# CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTENSIVE INDUSTRY . . . . .	15
II. THE MORAL HOME . . . . .	21
III. THE PATRIOTIC SCHOOL . . . . .	27
IV. THE SPIRITUAL CHURCH . . . . .	35
V. OUR FEDERAL CONSTITUTION . . . . .	43
VI. REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT . . . . .	57
VII. INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS . . . . .	67
VIII. INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM IN INDUSTRY . . . . .	77
IX. AVOIDANCE OF CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS . . . . .	91
X. REVERENCE FOR LAW . . . . .	99
XI. UNSELFISH NATIONALISM . . . . .	109
XII. LOYALTY TO THE FLAG . . . . .	115
CONCLUSION . . . . .	121



# Safeguarding American Ideals

---

## CHAPTER I

### INTENSIVE INDUSTRY

**WHAT** the people of this country and the entire world need is a revival of devotion to duty through patient and painstaking industry.

We need to regrasp the wholesome truth that work is God's medium of happiness; that the secret of real happiness is to do one's job well, and that it does not make much difference what the job is.

The builders of this Republic were the busiest and hardest working people of history, which is one of the chief causes why within a century this country became the leading nation of the world, and another evidence of the time-tried truism that genius is as closely akin to perspiration as to inspiration.

Added charm and dignity are given to industry as we contemplate how the builders of this

Republic toiled to clear the forests and till the soil and build homes and schools and churches and factories; how they worked and prayed until they had laid the foundation for the first and only successful government in history; how they applied their skill, inventing and building machines, and harnessing steam and electricity, until we became the greatest industrial nation in the world; how they made it easier to acquire the necessaries, and possible to enjoy more comforts and luxuries of life than had ever been known before in any place at any time.

One of the serious questions before this generation is, Are we assuming as wholesome and normal an attitude toward industry as was characteristic of those who taught us by example and precept the blessing of work, and left us a heritage unequalled in the annals of the human race?

“Idleness breeds mischief.”

One of the injunctions in the Fourth Commandment is, “Six days shalt thou labor.” There is abundant evidence that during recent years there has been too much disposition to substitute shrewdness, cleverness, reckless speculation, gambling, “blue sky” stock-jobbing schemes, rampant unionism, and patent medicine cure-all

legislation for clean, straight, constructive achievement through the processes of honest, individual endeavor and stable organized effort.

When Jesus Christ was twelve years old, he said to his mother: "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?"

Many of the great men of this country have been the sons of widowed mothers. It is quite possible and extremely probable that much of their greatness is due to the fact that early in life they were required to be about their fathers' business, in order to provide for the widowed mother and her family, thereby learning the lessons of assuming responsibility, exercising judgment, making decisions and acquiring the habits of industry.

It would have a wonderfully wholesome effect upon the people of this generation if they would take up the reading of biography, a study of the lives of the men and women who have made their impress upon progress. Inspiration has come to many through the reading of biography, because it reveals the fact that industry is the key to happiness, contentment and success.

We are concentrating too much on the question, **How much can we get?** and too little on the question, **How much can we serve?**—not realiz-

ing that ultimately, in the great plan of Divine Providence, the law of compensation will work as surely and accurately as the law of gravitation.

We of this Republic must rededicate ourselves to industry and preach the gospel of industry by example and precept to the people of foreign countries. They need to go back to work more than they need food or money. It is their only way out of chaos.

It should be the supreme purpose in every home and school and church, and on every farm and in every kind of business in this land, to make work more congenial, more interesting, more equitable and productive, and to start a spirit of service that shall radiate through every nook and corner of this good old planet.

“Work, For the Night Is Coming” is one of the grandest old songs ever set to music. The whole plan of creation and existence contemplates the necessity and joy of work. Nearly all food products are perishable; therefore we have constant work in tilling the soil, sowing the seed, nurturing the plants, harvesting the crops and preparing them for food.

Clothing wears out rapidly; therefore we must grow cotton and wool and hides and other products and do all the work necessary to provide

raiment for the human race. The precious metals are hidden deeply in the rocky bowels of the earth; therefore we must delve to find them and prepare them for use and for pleasure.

To provide means for travel, we must invent and construct vehicles of locomotion, build the roads, span the rivers and tunnel mountains. In commerce there must ever continue a repetition of production and distribution.

There is no royal road to learning. The great scholars, philosophers, poets, scientists, inventors, statesmen and theologians must diligently seek out the truth by intense and untiring application throughout the day and into the long, quiet hours of the night.

The dynamic St. Paul, in his message to the Corinthians, among other things said:

Watch ye, stand fast in the faith;  
Quit you like men; be strong.

In the Second Epistle to Timothy, as he neared the close of his industry on earth, he said:

But watch thou in all things; endure afflictions; do the work of an evangelist; make full proof of thy ministry.

For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.

I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith.

America is calling today for men and women to watch, to stand fast, to be strong, to keep the faith, and to work.

In the Gospel of Matthew, in one of His parables, we find Jesus Christ using the phrase "Son, go work today in my vineyard," and again in Matthew He said: "He that is greatest among you shall be your servant."

In the Gospel of St. John, Jesus said: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

Again in St. John He said: "I have glorified Thee on the earth, I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do."

The greatest heritage that fond parents can leave their children is a love for work and capacity for useful service. One of the glorious ideals that has made America great is good, old-fashioned, intensive industry.

*Labor, omnia vincit—laborare est orare:*

Labor conquereth all things—to labor is to pray.



## CHAPTER II

### THE MORAL HOME

**I**T WOULD greatly help to clarify our thinking on social, industrial, political and religious problems if the phrase "institutional demarcation" could be constantly borne in mind.

There are four institutions in this country: the home, the school, the church, and the government. Each has its proper functions to perform, but during recent years there has been a tendency to blame each of them for not performing the functions of the three others.

It would have a very healthy effect on the general situation if all individuals who undertake to inaugurate reforms to improve conditions, would begin by asking themselves the question: Is this a problem of the home, or the school, or the church, or the government? and determine that question carefully before procedure.

The home has to do with the care of the physical life, the school with the development of the mental, the church with the enrichment of the spiritual, and the function of the government is

to protect individuals in their right of person and right of property, in such manner as may be consistent with the best possible public welfare.

There is a tendency, however, to neglect the home and criticise the school for not doing what is properly the function of the home or the church, and to criticise the church for not performing what is properly the function of the home or the school.

There has been a very serious tendency during recent years to criticise and call upon the government to perform the functions of all four.

These four institutions are closely related and interwoven, and the proper functioning of each aids the effort of the three others; but they are separate and distinct, and each has its proper place in the development of the human plant, just as the four seasons of the year, which are closely related and interwoven, have each their proper functions to perform in the development of plant life.

The homes of the American people are the foundation stones on which the structure of the Republic rests. They are the fountains, the springs from whence must come the lifeblood of Americanism. The environment of the home determines in a very marked degree the character

of children that attend our schools, the quality of people that support our churches, and the type of citizens that maintain the government and develop and foster our industries.

The sanctity of the home rests upon the solemn vows of a monogamous marriage, which is more than a contract—it is a sacrament; one man and one woman, lawfully wedded, producing legitimate children, serving as a unit in society, providing for the orderly descent of property, the legitimacy of names, and for sharing the joys and sorrows of life for better or for worse.

The monogamous marriage is the golden mean between the dangerous extremes of polygamy on the one hand, and promiscuity on the other. It has been the pride of this Republic that the standard of sincerity in taking the marriage vows, and fidelity of adherence to those vows, has been very high.

One of the serious questions confronting this generation is, Are we lowering the standard of sincerity and fidelity to the marriage vow and substituting a laxness and looseness in the social fabric for the sanctity of the home? Is the social evil growing worse?

Every day the newspapers report polygamous, bigamous, and promiscuous activities on the part

of men and women who have been reared in good homes, who have been trained in our schools, who have attended our churches, and who have entered into the holy bonds of wedlock.

The steady increase in percentage of marriages which result in home wrecking and divorce, is one of the deadliest dangers confronting us.

The Rev. Charles Carver, Curate of Christ Episcopal Church, New Haven, Conn., recently produced a divorce drama and took a leading rôle on the stage himself to bring the attention of the people to the great divorce evil. In taking the step, he explained to a newspaper correspondent: "The idea we are trying to carry out is to plant in the public mind the increasing evil of the divorce system, which is making America the laughing-stock of the world and which is poisoning our national life at its source."

We cannot undermine the foundation of civilization without lowering the standard of civilization, and startling statistics show a downward trend. It is a fitting time, in this age of unrest and discontent and instability, for men and women, especially those who enjoy the comforts of life and the privileges of education and culture, to ask themselves what influence their reckless and criminal disregard of all that makes

home sacred must have on the virtue and attitude of the rising generation.

We need a revival of the home spirit and higher appreciation of its genuine value.

This is a good time for the young people to read and ponder the Fifth Commandment, and for the older people to read and interpret in their daily lives the Tenth Commandment, and for all of them to sing together, over and over again, "Home, Sweet Home," "The Old Oaken Bucket," and "The Swanee River."

The laws governing divorce should be more stringent and uniform; the church should be more strict and insistent; the courts should be more specific and severe, and the people should develop a higher morale in order to bring about a lessening of the divorce evil and an ever increasing moral atmosphere in the home.

"Charity begins at home," and right influences radiate from the family circle. Home is the institution upon which the welfare of other institutions rests.

There would be a heartening thrill of hope for the future of this Republic and the world, if it could be known that immediately all of the people would give one hour of serious thought to the need of their homes, and make a solemn resolve

that they would exert every possible influence toward making them what they ought to be.

We have greatly added to the physical beauty of homes through improved engineering, architecture and landscape gardening. We have greatly added to the comfort of homes through better plumbing, sanitation and interior decoration.

Are we improving the character of the people who dwell in the homes? "Only from the tree which is sound cometh sound fruit." A moral home in a cottage is a greater bulwark to this Republic than an immoral home in a palace.

Improving the influence and raising higher the social and moral standards of the home will go far toward elevating all other ideals. Let us stand fast for that sterling American ideal,—the character, the sanctity, and the purity of the moral home.

## CHAPTER III

### THE PATRIOTIC SCHOOL

**I**T IS a wonderful story that tells of the effort and determination manifested in the building and establishment of schools and colleges, and the tremendous energy with which our forebears strove for education.

The romance of the sacrifices of fathers and mothers in moderate and oftentimes straitened circumstances, to provide their children with better opportunities for education than they themselves had enjoyed, is one of the finest chapters in American history.

Mothers have taken in washing to help defray the expenses of their sons in college. They have done the housework alone in order that their daughters might have opportunity for education. Fathers have toiled alone on the farms and in the factories when the help of their children was needed, in order that their offspring might receive educational privileges to better fit them for taking advantage of opportunities for service.

Men and women of wealth have endowed

libraries and hospitals, colleges and universities and other institutions to broaden the field of opportunity for useful knowledge.

Religious denominations have erected and maintained centers of learning. Public officials have lavished the money of taxpayers upon public schools and State universities, for the purpose of providing a more intelligent and useful citizenship.

We are rich indeed in school buildings and campuses, gymnasiums, dormitories and libraries and laboratories and experimental stations.

We have made great progress during recent years in architecture, engineering, medicine, surgery, invention, mechanics, agriculture and science.

One of the very serious questions for the people of this generation is, Does the influence of our schools make for the maintenance and improvement of American ideals, or are they running too much to fads and fallacies, at the expense of truth? Does the influence of our schools tend to develop great mothers and fathers and preachers and teachers and authors and statesmen to expound and uphold the fundamentals that have made us the world's greatest people, or are we falling a little below the standard set for us by former generations in this regard?



There are comparatively few who will contend that there has ever been written a good history of the United States of America. We hear much of the organization of liberal societies, much talk of socialism and paternalism, much advocacy of the substitution of direct for representative government, and much discussion of class consciousness in our schools.

Has there ever been a United States history written that makes it clear to the average student that the people of this country made a flat and pitiful failure of government until 1787, when the Constitution was written, and that during the period of history from the time we wrote the Constitution until we occupied the leading place among the nations of the world, that there was little discussion of direct government, but much of representative government; little discussion of socialism or paternalism, but much discussion of individual property rights; little talk of class consciousness and labor unionism, but much of individual freedom in industry and proportionate reward for individual initiative and achievement; little talk of the red flag, but much devotion to the Stars and Stripes; little talk of a democracy, but much talk of the Republic?

There are comparatively few people who will

insist that there has ever been written a textbook on civics or civil government that makes clear to the average student the form of government that was established here under the Constitution.

There is much talk of democracy in our schools, and yet there is not a democratic thing in the Constitution of the United States, nor the faintest hint of a suggestion that anything under the Constitution would ever be done in a democratic way, even in the creation of the Constitution itself, or its adoption, or its amendment, or its plan of administration, and we still require our public officials to take an oath to uphold, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, and that is the only thing they are sworn to do.

The Constitution provided for a representative government, and the founders called it a Republic. It guarantees to each of the States a republican form of government. Those who are talking democracy in our schools should turn to the *Federalist*, the greatest governmental discussion in the libraries of the world, and ask themselves what Madison means in *Federalist* number X, by the following language:

“Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention, have ever been found incompatible with personal

security or the rights of property, and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths. . . . A Republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect and promises the cure for which we are seeking. . . . The two great points of difference between a democracy and a republic are . . . Hence it clearly appears that the same advantage which a republic has over a democracy . . .” And again in *Federalist* number XIV: “It seems to owe its rise and prevalence chiefly to the confounding of a republic with a democracy and applying to the former reasons drawn from the nature of the latter. The true distinction between these forms was also adverted to on a former occasion. . . .”

Was Madison merely playing with words when he wrote the above language into the *Federalist* at a time when the destiny of his country hung in the balance, or was he clearing up a tremendously important distinction on which the world quite generally has been disastrously confused during recent years?

While addressing an audience of more than 5,000 students in one of our large State universities recently, I asked all of those who had ever

read the Constitution of the United States to raise their hands, and there was a showing of less than thirty per cent. Think of it! Less than one-third of a large group of students, who had received from twelve to sixteen years' education at the expense of the State, had ever read the Constitution of the United States! Is it any wonder that there is much confusion in governmental discussion?

So long as the expense of the public schools and State universities is paid by the government, one object at least should be to turn out well-informed and patriotic citizens, and the best possible way to do that is to give them an understanding of the meaning of the Constitution and a high regard for its wise provisions.

The purpose underlying the establishment of public schools was a patriotic one. It was regarded as a good investment for the future of this Republic to give the children opportunity at public expense to secure a better understanding of this government in order that they might become more intelligent and patriotic citizens.

That also was very largely the purpose of privately endowed educational institutions prior to the establishment of public schools, and to a

considerable degree the purpose of donations for education given by philanthropists of recent years.

Teachers in the public schools should be impressed with the fact that their salaries are paid at public expense for the promotion of the public welfare.

Every child who accepts educational training at the expense of the government should be impressed with the fact that an obligation has been incurred which can be discharged only through a lifetime of intelligent and loyal devotion to the duties of citizenship.

It would be a great thing for this Republic, if all of the educators and school teachers would consider seriously the question as to whether or not the institutions with which they are identified are radiating a wholesome influence for the best brand of Americanism, and, if not, to highly resolve that they will do so.

What we find in the schools today will permeate the life of the country tomorrow. A high standard of citizenship is all important.

Foreign countries are drifting and suffering through lack of stability in government. They are looking to this country for example and guidance. The times are pregnant with great possi-

bilities for constructive work along governmental lines in our educational institutions.

Many of the splendid men and women who are devoting their lives to educational work could greatly broaden their influence for good through a better understanding of the history of this country and a greater knowledge of the form of government established here under the Constitution of the United States.

In my judgment, the most defective portion of our thinking and teaching in the schools is that phase of education which pertains to civics, economics, and history. Civilization is fairly crying for a better understanding of the past as a guide for the future.

Let us point the way through the enlightening influence of that great American ideal, the patriotic school.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE SPIRITUAL CHURCH

**A**LL through our history there has run, like a golden thread, a deeply religious strain. More than any other country we have been a religious and God-loving people.

The founders of this Republic provided for the greatest possible freedom to individuals to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. They provided a complete separation of church and state, and made a Constitutional provision that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States.

In the early days they were a church building, church supporting and church going people. They heeded well the first injunction of the Fourth Commandment to "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." They builded churches in every village and town and city, and church steeples rose in the valleys and on the hillsides. American history and literature fairly glow with evidences of reverence and worship.

The Mayflower Compact begins: "In the name of God, Amen. And having undertaken, for the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith . . ."

In the Declaration of Independence we find such phrases as "Appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, and for the support of this Declaration with a firm reliance on Divine Providence."

After five weeks of futile effort in the Constitutional Convention, when in the midst of a heated discussion they were about to adjourn and abandon the great purpose for which they had met, Benjamin Franklin rose and, addressing George Washington, said among other things:

"In this situation of this assembly, groping, as it were, in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understandings? . . .

"I have lived, sir, a long time; and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in



the Sacred Writings, that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. . . ."

George Washington closed his great address in the Constitutional Convention with the words: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hands of God."

John Marshall, speaking of the status of a judge, said: "Is it not to the last degree important that he should be rendered perfectly and completely independent, with nothing to influence and control him but God and his conscience?"

Daniel Webster said: "The ends I aim at shall be my country's, my God's, and Truth's."

Lincoln said: "My concern is not so much whether God is on our side. My great concern is to be on God's side, for God is always right."

Garfield said: "God reigns and the government at Washington still lives."

Hundreds of similar illustrations can be gleaned from our glorious past, many of which are given in my little book, "Keep God in American History," and all evidencing the remarkable

devotion to those priceless things for which the churches stood.

In most families it was the hope of fond parents that their most promising son would be called to the ministry. According to their standards, to preach the gospel was greater than worldly fame or vast wealth.

A very serious question for the people of this generation is, Whither is the church tending? Where are the great pastors of former days? Whence shall come our spiritual awakening and inspiration if we continue closing the doors of our churches and reducing the percentage of attendance of our people upon divine worship?

There would be a feeling of greater confidence in the immediate future if it were known that everybody physically able would attend church next Sunday, if only to approach our heavenly Father for a moment of earnest and silent prayer; or, that everybody in this country of sufficient age to do so would commit to memory:

“The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament sheweth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no place nor language where their voice is not heard.”

“The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures. . . . He re-

storeth my soul. . . . Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I shall fear no evil, for Thou art with me. Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me."

"For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he."

"Honor thy father and thy mother."

"Be not deceived; God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

"For every man shall bear his own burden."

"To every man according to his work."

"Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also unto them."

"Ye must be born again."

We will make greater headway on the road to progress through saving civilization with the old Bible than by trying to salvage civilization with a new Bible.

What effect would it have on the immediate future if all the men, women and children could be gathered into the churches for several Sundays, and would sing together the beautiful songs:

"How gentle God's commands,  
How kind His precepts are."

"Lead, Kindly Light,  
Amid the encircling gloom."

“Rock of Ages, cleft for me,  
Let me hide myself in Thee.”

“Jesus, Lover of my soul,  
Let me to Thy bosom fly.”

“Nearer, my God, to Thee.”

“O God, our strength in ages past,  
Our hope for years to come.”

“Onward, Christian soldiers,  
Marching as to war.”

“Mine eyes have seen the glory  
Of the coming of the Lord.”

The strength and solidity and sweetness of those splendid tunes and the wondrous words of those sacred songs would stir to better things the hearts of even those who are criminally inclined.

The following is a news item appearing in a Chicago daily paper:

“There is lack of theological students, young men to be preachers. Five thousand pulpits are vacant, and ten thousand will be empty soon.”

At the fourteenth annual convention of the Northern Baptists, held at Des Moines, Iowa, Dr. Frank W. Padelford is quoted as saying:

“There is serious danger of raising up a generation of men and women who know nothing of the ideals or sanctions of religion. The situation needs to be faced seriously and immediately. Not only is the attendance in our seminaries at a low point, but there are few ministerial students in our colleges. Not for a long time has the number been so small. Institutions that have usually had large groups of ministerial students have at present scarcely any at all.”

District Attorney Lewis of Kings County, New York, in an address in Brooklyn, said:

“The fact that only 573 children out of 1,373 in the New York public schools have more than a bowing acquaintance with the Ten Commandments has a very definite connection with the fact that two-thirds of those who commit crimes against the State of New York are between sixteen and twenty-one years of age. It is surprising to know how few of the boys and girls of today understand the Ten Commandments. They are the rules of conduct which should and must be known. . . . If crime is to be diminished, the adult population must take greater interest in the growing children. All parents should be watchful of their children and see that they receive the necessary preliminary training in the

schools, and insist that at least one day in each week the child should be in some religious school, getting the benefit of God's teaching. Too little is known of the Bible."

Would not a feeling of almost black despair come over our people if it were known that next Sunday all of the churches would be closed, that there would be no ministers preaching the gospel in our pulpits and no teachers leading our children into the light of truth in the Sunday schools, no singing of hymns of praise and supplication to the God of Nations, but instead, that all would be playing golf or baseball or tennis or motoring or attending a picnic or a theatre, or would have been up so late Saturday night dancing or playing poker or dissipating that they would have to sleep all day Sunday to recuperate?

We cannot leave the support of our churches or the enrichment of our spiritual life "to George." He will not do it, and he could not attend to it if he would. It is a personal matter. God Almighty and Jesus Christ are individualists. They have fixed individual responsibility and individual reward very definitely and accurately.

In perpetuating America we must hold fast to that very essential American ideal, a militant, aggressive, and ever expanding spiritual church.

## CHAPTER V

### OUR FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

**T**HE greatest heritage that has fallen to any single people in history is our Federal Constitution. Its making was the greatest human achievement since Creation, and it marked the greatest event in the history of the world, save only the Birth of Christ.

In this age of perplexing problems and chaotic conditions there is nothing that one can do with so great profit, to gain a clear concept of cause and remedy, as to go back and read the history of this country for a few years before the Constitution was written and a few years after it was written.

If you will do that you will find that the splendid people of those early days with their religious fervor, their marked intelligence and noble aspirations were in a good deal the same condition as Russia is now in many ways. Before the Constitution was written, the mob drove our Congress from Philadelphia into New Jersey, Shay's Rebellion assaulted the courthouses in the

State of Massachusetts, money was worth two and one-half cents on the dollar, and we had no credit anywhere. Grave concern was on every side and many of the people wanted to abandon any further effort and turn back voluntarily to the monarchies of Europe.

In that black night of chaos and darkness and despair, fifty-five men met in Philadelphia and wrote the Constitution; and almost immediately, for the first time in the history of the world, governmentally, light began to come out of darkness, order began to come out of chaos. Within ten years thoughtful men and women everywhere in the world were asking the question: "What was it that those men did that for the first time in the history of the world made a place a land of liberty and opportunity for mankind?" It held the world in an attitude of awe and reverence and respect for more than a century, and it is the only governmental document that has stood the test of time.

During the hundred years following its adoption and the founding of this Republic we made more human progress, material, mental and moral, than the world had known in all time. During that hundred years we were the most normal people in our homes, in our schools, in our churches and in our industry that history records.



We developed more statesmen on American soil during that hundred years, while adhering more closely to representative government, than have been developed by all other governments of the world.

When that outstanding world statesman, William Pitt, who at twenty-four years of age was prime minister of England, read our Constitution, he exclaimed: "It will be the wonder and admiration of all future generations and the model of all future constitutions." It is to the everlasting disgrace of every State in this Union that they have not modeled their State Constitutions more nearly after the plan of the Federal Constitution; and it is a reflection on the intelligence of every foreign country that they did not translate our Constitution into their own language and make it the plan of their form of government.

It was to the science of government all that the ten digits were to mathematics, the alphabet to language, and the scale to music. It wisely provides that all senators and representatives, members of the State legislature and all executive and judicial officers both of the United States and of the several States shall be bound by oath to support the Constitution.

During recent years there has been a woeful lack of understanding of the meaning of that oath, or an indifference toward it that borders on contempt, on the part of a very large proportion of our public officials, and this fact far more than most people realize accounts for the troublous times in which we find ourselves.

It is impossible here to cover an analysis of the Constitution, as I did in my book "Back to the Republic," but in succeeding chapters an effort will be made to make clear some of the priceless things it provided and some of the blessings that followed as a result of its marvelous wisdom and far-sighted statesmanship, indicating the tremendous importance and the far-reaching results and possibilities of that great document.

This is a fitting time for calm and careful reflection as to whether we will stand firm for Constitutional adherence or drift still farther on the wild waves of statutory amendments. Before the Constitution was written, the pendulum of government throughout the centuries had swung back and forth from the monarch to the mob. It provided a middle ground between the two extremes of autocracy on the one hand and democracy on the other, the golden mean between hereditary and direct government.

It is that sterling quality and great virtue of the Constitution that is too little understood and appreciated by those who advocate departures and amendments.

Daniel Webster, who immortalized his name as "the great expounder of the Constitution," made it quite clear when he said:

"The experience of all ages will bear me out in saying that alterations of political systems are always attended with a greater or less degree of danger. They ought therefore never to be undertaken unless the evil complained of be really felt and the prospect of a remedy clearly seen. The politician that undertakes to improve a Constitution with as little thought as a farmer sets about mending his plow is no master of his trade. If the Constitution be a systematic one, if it be a free one, its parts are so necessarily connected that an alteration in one will work an alteration in all and this cobbler, however pure and honest his intention, will in the end find that what came to his hands a fair, lovely fabric, goes from them a miserable piece of patchwork. . . . The true definition of despotism is government without law. It may exist in the hands of many as well as one. Rebellions are despotisms; factions are despotisms; loose democracies are despotisms.

These are a thousand times more dreadful than the concentration of all power in the hands of a single tyrant. The despotism of one man is like the thunderbolt which falls here and there, scorching and consuming the individual on whom it lights, but popular commotion, the despotism of the mob, is like an earthquake, which in one moment swallows up everything. It is the excellence of our government that it is placed in a proper medium between these two extremes, that it is equally distant from mobs and from thrones."

Alexander Hamilton, the towering genius and master mind of the Constitutional Convention, also drove the point home with tremendous force when he said to the Convention:

"The members most tenacious of republicanism are as loud as any in declaring against the vices of democracy. . . . Give all power to the many, they will oppress the few. Give all power to the few, they will oppress the many. Both therefore ought to have the power that each may defend itself against the other. . . . We are forming a Republican government. Real liberty is never found in despotism or the extremes of democracy. . . . If we incline too much to democracy, we shall soon shoot into a monarchy."

Gouverneur Morris, who was responsible for

the style and finish of the Constitution, while delivering the oration at the funeral of Alexander Hamilton, said among other things:

“It seemed as if God had called him suddenly into existence that he might assist to save a world. . . . Washington sought for splendid talents, for extensive information, and above all he sought for sterling and incorruptible integrity. All these he found in Hamilton.”

A study of the teachings and convictions of Alexander Hamilton would be very helpful to all who are desirous of a better understanding of the science of government. He foresaw the grave danger that we might drift from representative toward direct government and warned strongly against it.

It would have a far-reaching influence for good if the American people and the people of other countries who are seeking a way out of almost insurmountable difficulties could be persuaded to study the Constitution and read the discussion that led up to the meeting of the Constitutional Convention and the arguments that were advanced in the *Federalist* and elsewhere for its adoption.

That discussion during that period of our history sheds so much light on the dangers and pit-

falls to be avoided and the things to be sought for in changing from revolutionary tendencies to orderly processes that it would be intensely illuminating to the peoples of other countries and exceedingly helpful to the American people at this time when searching and testing questions are being asked as to cause and effect.

¶ We adhered quite closely to the plan of the Constitution during the hundred years following its adoption. On September 17, 1877, we observed, at Philadelphia, the centennial of the completion of the Constitution, which in my judgment, was next to the greatest meeting ever held on American soil. The distinguished men and women of this and foreign countries were invited to attend and a record of the proceedings and events was compiled in two volumes, known as "The Hundredth Anniversary of the Constitution," by Hampton L. Carson, and published by Lippincott & Company. It contains the best portraits available of the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention and brief and well written biographies, as well as the replies of distinguished people who accepted invitations or expressed their regrets, and other interesting and informative material pertaining to the history and worth of the Constitution of the United States.

The great William E. Gladstone, who served in the public life of England longer than has "Uncle Joe" Cannon in the public life of America, in cabling his regrets said: "I regret that I cannot come. As far as I can see, the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at one time by the brain and purpose of man."

In a resolution adopted in Philadelphia at the celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the Constitution, it was beautifully and appropriately recited that "The adoption of the Constitution is the most important event in the history of the American people, and the instrument itself the sublimest achievement of mankind. It has taught the world that liberty can exist without license and authority without tyranny. How completely the principles upon which it is based have met every national need and every national peril!"

So long as we adhered to the guidance of the wise provisions of the Constitution we made great progress in this country and wielded a wholesome influence on the other countries of the world, but during the latter part of the nineteenth century we began drifting away from the Constitution and taking up popular fallacies, such as the ini-

tiative, referendum, recall, boards, commissions, bureaus, excess legislation, class legislation, election of judges, the long ballot, etc.

We are reaping the results of unwise departures from the Constitution in ever increasing expenses and ever more and more confusion in governmental procedure.

In 1916 the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution suggested the wisdom of observing the anniversary of September 17, 1787, in commemoration of the event which gave birth to our Republic, and made possible the blessing of representative government for the first time in the history of the world.

A movement was started by the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution during that year; since then other patriotic organizations have followed the suggestion of the Sons of the American Revolution. In 1919 there were over six hundred meetings held throughout the country to commemorate the completion and signing of the Constitution.

A general observance of September 17, the anniversary of the birthday of our Constitution, would result in the consideration of many important questions, much sober reflection on the fundamentals of stable government, and a wholesome



influence on American citizenship; for our Constitution has not only blessed this country, but it has blessed the world, and it has within it the possibilities of extending liberty and orderly government throughout the world. A more general and thorough understanding of the Constitution is the best antidote for Bolshevism.

The following verses written by Col. Archibald Hopkins, one of the noblest men in this country, will be read with inspiration by the American people and should be memorized by the pupils in our public schools:

#### HYMN OF THE CONSTITUTION

With wisdom and with patient skill  
With learning and profoundest thought,  
With zealous, consecrated will  
Our patriotic fathers wrought.

They laid foundations deep and wide,  
They made their own immortal plan,  
And reared on lines before untried  
A home for freedom and for man.

They fortified each sacred right,  
They shielded all from fraud or wrong,  
They curbed the power of selfish might,  
And armed the weak against the strong.

Upon themselves they put restraint  
Lest hasty passion, given range,  
Should silence reason with complaint  
And bring some needless harmful change.

They made a Court, supreme, august,  
To curb the legislative might,  
Lest haste or greed or power unjust  
Curtail some fundamental right.

All autocratic power they barred;  
Democracy uncurbed they spurned.  
The faults of both, by schooling hard  
And history's teachings, they had learned.

They wisely chose the middle way,  
A government of balanced powers,  
Whose unobstructed interplay  
Secures the safety that is ours.

They dreamed no fond Utopian dream.  
They knew that time brings growth and change,  
And did not frame a rigid scheme  
Where growth and progress may not range.

All hasty change, they knew full well,  
With danger and destruction fraught,  
Would sound the Constitution's knell  
And bring their pains and toil to naught.

Through timid doubts, through many fears,  
Through war and fierce domestic strife,  
Down through the lapse of changing years,  
They guarded well the Nation's life.

Beneath the Constitution's shade,  
A boon and shield of priceless worth,  
We stand erect and unafraid,  
Unmatched in all the teeming earth.

The Constitution: still it stands  
August, majestic, loftly, lone;  
No fabric wrought by human hands  
Such strength and symmetry has shown.

The Constitution: there it towers,  
A beacon in a storm-tossed world;  
And peace will reign with all the Powers  
When they like banners have unfurled.

We love the men who gave it birth,  
We venerate its every clause;  
Benign protector of the hearth,  
Stern guardian of the country's laws.

To us belongs the pious task  
To ward from it fast gathering foes,  
Both those who lurk 'neath friendship's mask  
And those who deal it hostile blows;

To teach all dwellers in the land

Its meaning and its power to bless,

That our Republic safe may stand,

Through every threat'ning storm and stress.

Supernal wisdom's guiding ray

Sought by the founders on them fell;

God of our fathers, hear us pray;

Guard Thou our Constitution well.

Let us preserve and perpetuate that inspired  
American ideal, our Federal Constitution.

## CHAPTER VI

### REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

ONE of the outstanding facts and chief virtues of the Federal Constitution was that it provided for a strictly representative government, and it stipulated a guaranty of a representative government for each of the sovereign States.

There are just three ways of doing anything in any field of activity—too little, too much and just enough. There are just three kinds of government—, government which derives its power through heredity, which is the form of government known as an autocracy; a government in which the people speak and act directly, which is the form of government known as a democracy; and, a government in which the power is delegated to regularly selected representatives with authority to act and assume responsibility, which is the form of government known as a Republic.

There is as great a difference between a Republic and a democracy as there is between a Republic and an autocracy. An autocracy gives

too little participation by the people. A democracy gives too much participation by the people. A Republic, which provides for a wise exercise of the law of selection, deliberate action and orderly procedure, gives just enough participation by the people.

Hamilton and Madison, in their discussions in the *Federalist* and elsewhere, repeatedly make the distinction between a Republic and a democracy, and clearly show that the intent of the framers of the Constitution was to establish a strictly representative government, which is a Republic.

No one has yet been able to point out within the Constitution of the United States the faintest hint of a suggestion that it provided for direct action in any way, which is the method of democracy; and public officials are still required to take a solemn oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and that is the only thing they are sworn to do.

Notwithstanding all this, and much more that might be said to fortify the sanity and correctness of this point of view, there has been much reckless talk during recent years of making the world "safe for democracy." This country and others have been drifting toward democracy, but Russia was the first full-fledged volunteer and

her action was hailed by the newspapers and magazines and by socialistic authors and demagogical agitators as the realization of an idealistic dream.

As soon, however, as Russia began to display exactly the results which have characterized every democracy of history, the enthusiasts became apologists and coined the word bolshevism, which in derivation means the same as democracy.

Many of the difficulties which confront us to-day are due to the fact that for twenty years we have been drifting from representative toward direct government, and the mob-mindedness that has ensued has begun to permeate the home, the school, the church and industry.

Twenty-two of the States have enacted legislation providing for some form of the initiative, referendum, recall of public officials, or recall of judicial decisions, all of which mean the overthrow of representative and the substitution of direct government. Yet the members of the legislative bodies which enacted those statutes had all taken a solemn oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, which provides for a representative government and guarantees a representative form of government to all the States which compose the Union.

Of the twenty-two States guilty of these dangerous departures, fifteen are so-called Republican States and seven are so-called Democratic States; so it is quite clear that there has been little or no difference between political parties in this regard. The tendency has been general as well as dangerous.

We have been swinging from the sound statesmanship of representative government in a Republic toward the deceitful demagogism of the direct government of a democracy.

We were told repeatedly by the demagogues who advocated the substitution of direct primaries for the convention plan of making nominations that the results would bring great improvement. A brief experience has shown that it has greatly increased expenses, lessened the interest of the people, increased the number of scandals, and most important of all, it has given us a larger quota of demagogues and lowered the standard of public officials. Over and over again candidates have been nominated through direct primaries who would not have received serious consideration in a deliberative convention.

Experiments with the initiative, referendum and recall have been equally disappointing in matters of legislation and administration.



As an illustration of the difference in method between a Republic and a democracy, take the great game of baseball.

If, in the game of baseball they relied upon heredity for their players or managers or umpires, the game would soon degenerate, just as hereditary government does. The game is played according to rules that have been formulated, just as our government should be administered according to the plan of the Constitution.

When the umpire is chosen, he administers the game according to the rules. When he says "Ball," it is a ball, and when he says "Strike," it is a strike. When he says "Out," the player is out, and when he says "Safe," the player is safe.

Sometimes the umpire errs, and if he is wrong too often, the only sane remedy is to select another umpire who will make fewer mistakes. That is the method of representative government.

Suppose that in response to a protest from the bleachers, some demagogue of the type that this country has been cursed with for twenty years should step out and say: "Baseball is a game of the people, by the people and for the people." That would be true, but Lincoln did not say that was democracy. The word *democracy* is very conspicuous by its absence from Lincoln's vocabu-

lary, and he never advocated any measure of direct action.

But let the demagogue continue: "We have paid our admission; It is our game; We object to the ruling of the umpire; We should take a vote on it before the game continues." (Great Applause.)

In order to take a vote, it would be necessary to provide ballots, secure voting booths, appoint judges and clerks, a board of election commissioners, etc. It would take more time to vote on one ruling than it does to play a game. It would cost more than the gate receipts amounted to, and it would then be necessary to create taxing bodies to levy an income tax and an excess profits tax from the spectators.

Let your imagination picture to you how mob-mindedness would develop among the spectators; how someone would suggest the recall of one of the players in order that a friend among the substitutes might get into the game, and so forth and so forth.

Such procedure would ruin the game of baseball; yet for twenty years demagogues have been applauded, approved and elected to high office for bombarding this Republic with proposals for substituting that type of procedure for the repre-

sentative government established by the Constitution.

The building situation is in a very serious condition at present, partially as the result of democratizing industry; but suppose that, in addition to the present confusion, a plan should be adopted whereby after a decision to erect a building, engineers were chosen to take charge of its construction, and in conference there should be some difference of opinion as to what depth the foundation should have, and one of the engineers would suggest that the difficulty could be met by submitting the question to a vote of the people.

Is there anyone so dense as to suggest that method as an intelligent procedure? Yet that is exactly what we are doing along governmental lines,—drifting from our heritage of representative government toward direct action, and many of the splendid people of this country are laboring under the hallucination that it means progress toward an ideal, not realizing that these popular fallacies are as old as Methuselah, that they played their part in the downfall of Greece and Rome and other nations, and that they were discussed in the Constitutional Convention and were rejected by the wise men who wrote and signed the Constitution.

The trial of Christ is the outstanding spectacle of the danger of democracy. Thrice Pilate announced that he found no fault in Him. Herod found no fault in Him. But through direct action, and the recall of judicial decisions, they crucified Him.

The difference in procedure between a Republic and a democracy, is the difference between selecting an artist and undertaking to paint a picture by mass action; between selecting a doctor and undertaking to write a prescription by taking a vote of the people in the neighborhood; in other words, the difference between exercising the law of selection in choosing a representative to work out problems deliberately with information, or deciding questions impulsively and emotionally through mass action, with little or no information.

Substituting direct action for representative government tends to reduce public officials from true representatives to mob psychologists and crowd echoes.

True, there have been incompetent and unfaithful representatives, and doubtless will be, as no institution is perfectly administered, but the remedy lies not in the substitution of direct action but in a more careful exercise of the law of selec-

tion and a stricter adherence to representative government.

The monogamous marriage is the golden mean between polygamy and promiscuity in the realm of domestic relations, just as the Republic is the golden mean between autocracy and democracy in government.

There are few, however, who would contend that in the event of failure in the institution of monogamous marriage the remedy lies in substituting polygamy or promiscuity. Thoughtful people would insist rather that it lies in a more careful exercise of the law of selection and a stricter adherence to the marriage vow.

So long as people permit themselves to concede mentally that the substitution of direct for representative government is a desirable tendency, which is denied by every page of history and every result of experience, it is impossible for them to think clearly or accurately on problems pertaining to the home, the school, the church or industry.

It is that tragedy, more than any other one thing that accounts for the confused reasoning and superficial thinking during recent years. There is common agreement that something is the matter. But it is also quite generally conceded that in the multiplicity of discussions there is lit-

tle that clarifies or enlightens. The average earnest seeker after truth, as to cause and effect in government or industry, is still very much in the dark.

We should begin at once a campaign of education to carefully and consistently strip from our government all the popular fallacies of direct government which have been attached to it, and restore strictly representative government. We should also insist that some political party, even though it require the formation of a new Constitutional party, shall formulate and maintain a program for restoration of and adherence to that priceless American ideal, a strictly representative government.

## CHAPTER VII

### INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

**T**HE men who wrote the Constitution and founded this Republic established individual property rights more securely and fixed the title to property more absolutely than it had been done at any previous time. They strove to avoid the extremes of feudalism on the one hand, and all forms of socialism or communism on the other; and they sought also to avoid the dangers of government ownership, in so far as it was consistent with the public welfare.

The farsighted wisdom and sound reasoning of those men seems almost miraculous as we contemplate the difficulties that have arisen regarding property rights throughout all civilization.

Demagogues have been racing up and down this country for years asking the absurd questions: "Are we going to put the dollar above the man?" "Is property more sacred than humanity?"

Each question is an appeal to emotion, prejudice and stupidity. The men who founded this

Republic understood human nature in its relation to property sufficiently well to know that when individuals reach a state of mind where they will destroy property, the next step is violence to persons.

They sought to insure the safety of persons through making secure the rights of property. They knew that personal safety and property rights go together and that each is fundamentally essential to the other.

They sought to give the greatest amount of individual freedom consistent with the promotion of the public welfare, to encourage individual initiative and to provide equitable reward in proportion to services rendered.

They conceived the function of government to be to protect individuals in their right of person and right of property, and they deemed it unwise for the government to engage in any enterprise which could be managed better by individual effort.

They refrained from having the government engage in buying and selling, or dealing in profits and losses, or price fixing, but provided that the government should render gratuitously such service as seemed necessary to protect individuals in their right of person and right of property.



For that purpose, they deemed necessary military forces in Nation and State, a sheriff's office in each county and police forces in the cities, and fire departments in the central communities, the service in each instance to be gratuitous and the expense to be defrayed through taxation; also, in most cases, control of the water supply, that it might be kept pure for drinking purposes and be available for the supply of the fire department, and sufficient charge made to defray the cost of pumping and delivery.

They also provided for the construction by the government of such internal improvements as seemed consistent with the public welfare and for the encouragement of private enterprise, toward the end of building up the country.

They deemed it expedient, for the interchange of communication, that the government should have sufficient interest in the postal system to be in a position, when such an emergency as the Pullman strike arose, to see to it that the mails moved. The policy of the postal department, however, was to let as much of the service as possible to private contract. There were no parcels post deliveries and no postal savings banks. Such service could be handled better by express companies and regular banking institutions.

The phrase "better business in government and less government in business" was more than a meaningless declaration. They sought to prevent the government from loading down the public payrolls and to permit the handling of as little money as possible in public service—just sufficient to defray the expense of government.

Finally, it was considered advisable, for the purpose of developing a more enlightened and patriotic citizenship, to establish public school systems. Here again the service was gratuitous, no charge for tuition; total cost of the buildings, their maintenance, and expense of teachers and employees to be defrayed from public revenues. The purchase of textbooks until recently was very wisely left to those who were to enjoy the privilege of education at the expense of the government.

They sought, in so far as possible, to keep the government out of business. Under the very wise policy of adhering quite closely to individual property rights and avoiding the extremes of feudalism on the one hand, and of socialism or communism on the other hand, we developed within one hundred years the most remarkable and satisfactory industrial conditions ever known. True, they were not perfect, but the his-

tory of the entire world has furnished nothing with which to make even an interesting comparison.

Evils crept in gradually, and instead of weeding them out, through careful selection of constructive statesmen and the enactment and enforcement of adequate legislation, we began selecting demagogues for public office, who advocated and enacted socialistic and class legislation, until during recent years we have developed quite a crop of Coxeyites, Populists, I. W. W.s, socialists, reds, radicals, Non-Partisan Leaguers, and so-called progressives.

Those organizations are continuously proposing assaults upon individual property rights, and the danger seems gradually to be infecting legislation and judicial interpretation.

As one illustration of many that might be given of the growing disregard of property rights by individuals, legislative bodies and the courts, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision in the recent case of *Marcus Brown Holding Company, Inc., vs. Marcus Feldman, Benj. Schwartz, et al.*, that caused four members, including the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, in dissenting from the opinion, to say: "We are not disposed to a review of the

cases. We leave them in reference, as the opinion does, with the comment that our deduction from them is not that of the opinion. There is not a line in any of them that declares that the explicit and definite covenants of private individuals engaged in a private and personal matter are subject to impairment by a state law, and we submit, as we argued in the *Hirsh* case, that if the State have such power—if its power is superior to Article 1, Sec. 10, and the Fourteenth Amendment, it is superior to every other limitation upon every power expressed in the Constitution of the United States, commits rights of property to a State's unrestrained conceptions of its interests, and any question of them—remedy against them—is left in such obscurity as to be a denial of both. . . .

We are not disposed to further enlarge upon the case or attempt to reconcile the explicit declaration of the Constitution against the power of the State to impair the obligations of a contract or, under any pretense, to disregard the declaration. It is safer, saner, and more consonant with constitutional preëminence and its purpose to regard the declaration of the Constitution as paramount, and not to weaken it by refined dialectics, or bend it to some impulse or emergency." . . .

We have been gradually losing our sense of

individual property rights through reckless and destructive agitation, and putting the government into business. One of the very serious questions for this generation is, Are we going to continue this wild orgy toward destruction of individual property rights, or shall we restore the processes of orderly procedure and abandon the trend toward socialism and paternalism?

No one whom I have ever heard of or read of advocating the wild schemes of mass action as a substitute for individual conduct and responsibility makes any pretense of pointing out to us any time or place in history where such theories were successful or yielded results at all comparable to the conditions which we enjoyed in this country before we gave willing ear to the hypocritical demagogue who for personal profit or the political popularity of the moment was willing to appeal to passion and prejudice at the cost of reason.

Alarmists have tried to give us nervous prostration by talking of the concentration of wealth. They should read Christ's parable of the talents and remember that statistics prove that 95 per cent of the people who undertake to run a business on their own account fail, that most of the heads of business today began at the bottom rung

of the ladder, and that large wealth has scarcely remained in any family for more than three generations in this country.

All those who are gravely concerned about the concentration of wealth should read the very elucidating article written by George E. Roberts of the National City Bank of New York on "If We Divided All the Money, How Much Do You Think You Would Get?" It was published in the March, 1920, *American Magazine*, and reprinted in pamphlet form for distribution.

In this article Mr. Roberts, in addition to giving much valuable information and arriving at some very helpful and interesting conclusions, has also included the results of investigations made by Professor Willford I. King of the University of Wisconsin and Professor David Friday of the University of Michigan.

There is a lot of worry in running business, and there are a good many things that money cannot buy. The hardest working people in this country today are those who manage large industries and face the problems of raw material, finished product, payroll, production and distribution, supply and demand, employment difficulties, marketing fluctuations, etc.

A very small percentage of our people are suc-

cessful as musicians or artists or poets or movie stars or inventors or surgeons or statesmen or theologians, and that probably always will be true because it is very natural that it should be so.

There are many who advocate profit sharing, but most of them lose interest in the subject when confronted with the counter proposition that those who wish to share profits should first put themselves in a position to be able and willing to share losses. Losses in business are almost as certain to occur as taxes or death.

Abraham Lincoln stated clearly the proper attitude toward individual property rights when he said: "Property is the fruit of labor. Property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence it is a just encouragement to enterprise. Let not him that is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself; thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

This government as established under the Constitution is strong enough to curb abuses of monopoly of any kind, and to regulate the conduct of any individual or group of individuals in the interest of domestic tranquility and the pub-

lic welfare, so long as it assures individual property rights and insists upon individual responsibility for individual conduct. If history and experience prove anything, however, they prove that no government can be successfully administered which tries to "run" everything.

The former method develops a race of strong individuals; the latter, an inferior people.

Let us cling tenaciously to that steady American ideal, adherence to individual property rights.



## CHAPTER VIII

### INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM IN INDUSTRY

**F**REEDOM of the individual in industry is right now challenging the attention, the wisdom, the courage and the loyalty of the American people for perpetuity. It is being challenged by a group of agitators, some of whom do not understand the meaning of Americanism, and some of whom are utterly indifferent to the spirit of American institutions.

After the Constitution was adopted as the basis of government for this Republic, it became more and more evident to an ever increasing number of thinking people, that it was impossible for both a system of slavery and the spirit of the Constitution to exist permanently in the same territory.

At tremendous cost and awful sacrifice, the question was finally settled that "All persons held as slaves . . . are and henceforward shall be free." We are glad now that we have a Federal Union under one Constitution and one flag, with

a government which provides for individual freedom in industry.

That portion of the country where slavery was abolished—the splendid South—now gives evidence of the best response to the spirit of American institutions in the industrial crisis that threatens.

Aside from the condition of slavery that existed and was finally abolished, there was little or no thought but that all individuals in this country could work where they pleased, when they pleased, and for what they pleased, and be protected in their personal safety and property rights.

Whenever we concede that we cannot perpetuate that condition for posterity we are unworthy of the heritage that was bequeathed to us.

Groups of unscrupulous so-called labor leaders have been trying for years to inflict upon the industrial institutions of this country the policy of the closed shop, which means that employers shall employ only members of labor unions. Labor unions require their members to contribute a part of their earnings into a common fund, which runs into the millions of dollars annually.

So-called labor leaders are selected, and paid from this fund, to make it their business to dictate to employers whom they shall employ, what

they shall pay, and how many hours' work shall be done.

They insist that individuals who have been thrifty and intelligently industrious in developing a business shall have no voice in questions of employment in their own institutions, except to yield to the demands of these professional agitators. Many of the demands are so unfair and unreasonable as to threaten the ultimate ruination of business.

Quite a number of employers, through shortsightedness or cowardice or indifference to the spirit of American institutions, have yielded to the absurd demands that have been made by so-called labor leaders, until the situation in this country has become very serious. Employers who yield are worse than the agitators who make the demands, because through encouragement the walking delegate becomes more aggressive and makes it more difficult for other employers to resist.

Many employers, in a sense of justice and the spirit of Americanism, have retaliated by declaring for the open shop, which means that they shall have a voice in determining whom they will employ and under what conditions and for what consideration work shall be done, without regard to membership or non-membership in a labor union.

The open shop means a condition under which employers exercise their constitutional rights, and provision for employees to enjoy their constitutional rights if they so desire. It has well been called the American plan, the American way.

In my judgment, the employer who does not run an open shop is not a 100 per cent American, and the employee who tries to frustrate the existence of the open shop is not a 100 per cent American. Employers who have a regard for the future of this country and the welfare of their children, would better run open shop or close up shop entirely.

Another activity of the so-called labor leader is to lobby in Congress and State legislatures for class legislation, such as the Adamson bill, and for discriminatory legislation which provides that laws regulating combinations shall not apply to labor organizations, etc.

Members of Congress and of the State legislatures who yield to such un-American class-inciting methods, and enact such class legislation, are much worse than the makers of these unjust demands, because they have taken a solemn oath before Almighty God to uphold, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, which does not contemplate class consciousness.

The most criminal activity of so-called labor leaders is their procedure of approaching employers and contractors and making the bold, criminal demand that unless \$500, \$1,000, \$5,000, \$10,000, or whatever amount seems possible is paid over at once, they will call off the men from the job; that unless plumbing supplies or other materials are purchased here or there, the work will be stopped, and will not be resumed unless a bribe is forthcoming.

Revelations that are nauseating are being made daily as evidence reeking with crime and bribery is produced before bodies investigating conditions in the building trades. Such methods have so crippled the building industry that we are finding it difficult to shelter the people.

In a recent article in the *Chicago Tribune*, regarding hearings of the Dailey Committee on building conditions in Chicago, Mr. Albert R. Brunner, President of the Liquid Carbonic Company, is reported to have testified that a graft payment of \$1,200 was made to William Schardt, business agent of the carpenters' union in connection with the installation of a soda fountain, and that although the largest concern of its kind in the world, they had practically been driven out of business in the second largest city of the coun-

try, so far as the installation of soda fountains was concerned.

He also testified that a fellow by the name of McInerney had come on here from New York and tried to organize the marble workers, but had let it be known that if \$25,000 were paid him he would quit the city and leave the job an open shop.

Ivan O. Ackley, a former president of the Chicago Real Estate Board, is reported to have made the flat statement that every person who has constructed a building in Chicago in the last two years has paid tribute to business agents, and he gave specific instances.

The above is just a part of one day's hearing before the committee. Chicago is probably no worse than many other cities in this regard.

What a mass of destruction and crime would be revealed if the whole truth were known of the awful conditions that prevail in the single industry of the building trades! And the notorious work is by no means confined to that field of industry.

Is it any wonder that so many so-called labor leaders graduate from their criminal activities into the penitentiary?

In cases where corrupt employers or contract-

ors yield to the blackmailing hold-up demands of walking delegates or so-called labor leaders, and pay the criminal bribes demanded, the bribe is not divided with the members of the union who leave the work and lose their time and are deprived of their earnings pending the criminal transaction, nor is it put in a common fund with the dues.

Be it said, to the credit of the rank and file of labor unions, that while they unwittingly, through leaving the work, give the kind of support that is necessary to the completion of the corrupt transaction, they do not share in the tainted spoils of the unlawful system.

Another dangerous element in the policy of walking delegates and so-called labor leaders is the utter indifference and malicious contempt with which they regard a contract or an agreement. To say that they regard a contract or an agreement as a "mere scrap of paper" is putting it mildly.

The Constitution forbids the passage of any law impairing the obligation of contracts, but there is a very wide chasm between the policy of so-called labor leaders and the plan of the founders of this Republic.

The most inhuman activities of which walking

delegates and so-called labor leaders have been guilty are their threats that unless employers yield to certain demands, or the government complies with certain requests, union labor, through sympathetic strikes, will so tie up the transportation system that people in the United States may starve, or tie up the coal mines in such a way that people may freeze, or tie up the building situation in such a way that there will be a shortage of shelter.

The fact that the hardships may fall upon "women and children first" does not deter them.

If our own self-respect does not move us, regard for our children should impel us to put an abrupt stop to any further encouragement of such threatened atrocities.

The most contemptible practice in which so-called labor leaders and walking delegates engage is the manner in which they solicit members by calling non-union men "scabs," threatening the safety of their homes and trying by various means to force them into the union against their will. During the average strike their conduct along similar lines is even more despicable.

The most dangerous of all the activities of walking delegates and so-called labor leaders is the manner in which they have been getting union



men into the public service and organizing those that are already in the service of the government.

The Boston police strike was an illustration of the baneful effect of these pernicious activities. The periodical threat of the electrical workers to strike unless certain demands are complied with, and throw the city into darkness, leaving the people without light, is a sample of impending danger.

One of the greatest sayings of Jesus Christ was: "Ye cannot serve two masters." No one can faithfully serve Uncle Sam and be subject to the dictates of walking delegates and so-called labor leaders at the same time. A firm stand should at once be taken on this question by every true patriot.

In this Republic we want no slavery of employees and no servility of employers; either is contrary to the industrial relationships contemplated by American institutions.

Above all, Uncle Sam and Miss Columbia must not be subjected to such humiliation. If we permit it, we are unworthy of their protection.

Individuals have a right to organize in this country, and one could readily understand why employees might desire to effect an organization, the purpose of which would be to develop and in-

crease individual efficiency, or to bring about a condition under which the individuals would be more nearly rewarded in proportion as they develop capacity for service. But why an American, in this land of opportunity, should be willing to belong to or contribute to an organization which takes no account of efficiency, but insists that workmen should be paid alike, without regard to efficiency or production, is beyond understanding or comprehension.

Real Americans want to be paid what they are worth; they want their wages fixed by the kind of work they do, and not by a union card they are forced to carry against their will. And they want to pass that privilege on to their children.

Canvass the industries of this country, and you will find that the men who have risen from the bottom rung of the ladder to the top have wasted little time or money in following or supporting the whims of the walking delegate.

Less than 4 per cent of our population are identified with labor unions. Yet it is estimated that in 1911, in this country, union men paid over \$35,000,000 in dues, and lost over \$25,000,000 in wages through strikes. And it is estimated that in 1919 there were more than 3,000 strikes, with a loss of over 100,000,000 working days. Startling

statistics of a similar nature could be added and multiplied.

Probably less than 4 per cent of the members of labor unions have very much understanding of the inside workings of their organizations as carried on by walking delegates and so-called labor leaders.

My faith in the good intentions and average integrity of the men and women of this country, whether they be members of unions or not, is very strong. It is my honest judgment that if all members of labor unions knew of the methods pursued by walking delegates and so-called labor leaders to ruin business through the closed shop, to secure class legislation, to solicit bribes for selfish gain, to repudiate contracts and agreements, to deprive communities of food, fuel and shelter, to coerce the unwilling to become members of the union and to control the public service, 90 per cent of them would demand a very marked change of procedure.

Such atrocities can result only in despoiling the industries of this generation and in depriving our children of the enjoyment of such opportunities as had fallen to us.

Regardless of all that muckrakers and demagogues have said derogatory to the business men

of this country, the fact remains that, with some exceptions, they are splendid and useful citizens, and many of them are functioning more normally with their thinking processes regarding present day problems than any other group.

From a very careful observation of numerous industries, it is my conclusion that most employees have greater confidence in their employers than is generally supposed. It would clear up the situation surprisingly if the heads of every business in this country would call a meeting of all members of their business family and address them as follows:

“This institution is a unit in the industrial world, just as the home is a unit in the social world. Most of the difficulties in the home are due to outside influence and interference. Many of our difficulties have been the result of outside influence and interference. We may not know as much as some people about some things, but we ought to know more about running this business than outsiders, and we ought to settle our own problems among ourselves.

“From this time on this institution will be run as an open shop. Demands of walking delegates and so-called labor leaders will be ignored. Negotiations will be had only with those identified

with this concern. No bribes will be paid to quiet disturbances from the outside, even though it necessitates closing down the plant.

“Earnest effort will be made by the management, and co-operation is urged, to maintain comfortable, adaptable and healthful working conditions. We must all try to get closer together and farther away from outside influences.

“All just complaints, proper requests, and constructive suggestions will receive fair and careful consideration. Provision will be made for those who wish to purchase an interest in the business and share in the management as part owners. Those who desire to share profits must be in a position to share losses.

“Compensation will be based upon production, and quantity and quality of service. Promotions will be based upon merit and loyalty to this business and to the country. A deaf ear will be turned to all those proposing further attempts to democratize or Russianize this industry. The central idea of this institution must be service, and we must all strive to catch the spirit of the Golden Rule.”

My confidence in the good intentions and fair-mindedness of the rank and file of employees, including most members of the labor unions, per-

suades me that such an attitude on the part of employers would receive a hearty response from employees. Most of them would naturally say: "That would be about my attitude if I were running the business."

The best way is generally the simplest way. Let everybody who loves America, whether employer or employee, give firm insistence to the restoration and maintenance of that inspiring American ideal, individual freedom in industry.

## CHAPTER IX

### AVOIDANCE OF CLASS CONSCIOUS- NESS

ONE of the outstanding achievements of the men who wrote the Constitution and founded this Republic was their avoidance of class consciousness.

They established a condition of government and industry freer from class consciousness and class agitation than the world had known up to that time. No qualifications except age and residence were placed upon the Presidency of the United States or the Chief Justiceship of the Supreme Court, or any other public office within the confines of the Republic. There was not the faintest hint of a suggestion of class consciousness or class action in the Constitution.

Their plan provided that aspirants for public office would not be asked such questions as, Whence is your origin? From what family do you come? From what schools are you graduated? What degrees have been conferred upon you? How much wealth have you accumulated?

To what church do you belong? But rather the test should be: What sort of character have you acquired? How much capacity have you developed for useful public service? With how much understanding and loyalty can you take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States?

Oh, what a period of romance and ambition and fame and glory of achievement followed the adoption of that procedure! We made great theologians and evangelists and pulpit orators of boys from the humblest homes; we took Presidents and Senators and Judges from the ranks of farm boys and rail-splitters, tanner boys and mule drivers on the tow-path of a canal. We made college presidents of men who had worked their way through school; railroad presidents of section hands, bank presidents of boys who ran errands and also did the janitor work in the bank, captains of industry of men who worked in the factories.

What an inspiration to read the biographies of Hamilton, Franklin, Marshall, Webster, Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley; of Beecher, Phillips Brooks, Dwight L. Moody, Swing, Talmadge, Vincent, Conwell, Gunsaulus, Hillis; of Lowell, Longfellow, Whittier, Emerson, Hawthorne,



Irving, Holmes, Bryant, Whitman, Riley, Howells; of Amos Lawrence, Peter Cooper, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Jim Hill, Westinghouse, Edison, Armour, Swift, McCormick, Studebaker, Wanamaker, Field, Horlick, Leland, Reynolds, Gary, and others who, through the avoidance of class consciousness and by devotion to individual industry and duty, have helped so greatly to make the name of this Republic synonymous with the phrase "Land of Opportunity."

Mothers, soliloquizing as they rocked their babes in the cradle and sang lullabies, were happy with dreams of future greatness and service. Emigrants came to our shores from their native lands with a song of satisfaction in their hearts, because of the environment of individual incentive to be found here.

Alas! along toward the latter part of the last century, demagogues began stirring up class agitation and organized the Populist party to array the farmers against the people of the city. New York was called "the enemy's country," while Wall Street was spoken of with a slur. The Non-Partisan League is now striving to carry forward the malicious work.

Such phrases as "the common people," "masses and classes," "interests," "predatory rich," "un-

desirable citizens," "malefactors of great wealth," "Ananias clubs," "rent hogs," "profiteers," "labor and capital," have played a prominent part in the phraseology of the average public speaker or candidate for public office.

As a result of such class agitation and epithets of denunciation, discussion of public questions during recent years has been reduced quite generally to superficial appeals to passion, prejudice, emotion, hatred and the baser instincts.

There are good people and bad people on the farms and in the cities, and they need each other. No one has ever made a clear distinction between "the common people" and others, if there are such.

It would be a very interesting experiment for those who use the phrase "masses and classes" to start a card index and try to classify their own acquaintances under those two headings. The difficulties encountered might effect a cure of the use of that silly phrase.

This Republic was not intended for a class card-index country. A "rent hog" would probably be defined, in the last analysis, as an individual who, having property, is willing to rent it on such terms as prospective tenants bidding against one another are willing to pay.

When comparison of that silly, class inciting, demagogical agitation of recent years is made with the dignified discussions and debates of former years, it moves one to exclaim: "Oh, what a fall was there, my countrymen!"

During the early days of this Republic, we scarcely heard the phrase "labor and capital." We talked of employer and employee, and it was generally assumed that employees who were attending strictly to business might become employers, and that employers who were not would become employees, also that the interests of employer and employee are mutual.

One of the dark days in the history of this Republic was the day when the government provided for the establishment of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor, because it was an assumption on the part of our government that the interests of employer and employee are antagonistic, instead of mutual, or it would not have created the two separate departments. It was my judgment at the time of the separation that from that moment, and so long as the two departments existed, the breach between employer and employee would grow wider and wider.

It may be a coincidence and not the reason, but

it is a fact, nevertheless, that every twenty-four hours since the two departments were created, the breach between employer and employee has grown wider and wider and people have grown more class conscious and mob-minded.

One of the most wholesome things that could happen in this country would be to start a campaign of education in Washington that would bring about the merging of the Departments of Commerce and Labor into a single Department of Industry, with provision that every question considered by the government should be weighed upon its merits without regard to class.

Such action would serve as a healthy confession of our government that class conduct is an error, and proclaim a much needed message to the rest of the world, now bending and staggering under the heavy load of class consciousness.

What would you say to a proposal that we now divide the Department of Agriculture into a Department of Farmers and a Department of Hired Men, and place a farmer at the head of one department and a hired man at the head of the other? Under such conditions, would the departments pertaining to agriculture continue to work out, without bias, the problems of soil culture, seed selection, live-stock breeding, marketing.

etc., or would they begin to think in terms of employment and class consciousness? How would such a move differ from what has been done to industry?

From the pulpit, the platform, in the classroom, at conventions, at banquets or luncheons or in conversation, wherever public questions are discussed, we hear more and more use of the word "classes." Executives of the National and State governments are continually designating conferences to be attended by capital, labor and the public. At what time in the history of this country did those who labor or those who have capital cease to be a part of the public?

Another very interesting and confusing classification might be attempted upon the basis of Who is labor? Who is capital? and Who is the public? The attempt at such classification would be about as successful as the conferences that are held under the spell of class consciousness.

One of the very serious questions for this generation is, Shall we continue further on the road of class consciousness, which leads to mediocrity, envy and final decay, or shall we rekindle our individual self-respect, abandon every form and vestige of class thinking, class agitation, class consciousness, class legislation and class action,

and restore an era of good feeling, brotherly love, and greater devotion to the saving philosophy of the Golden Rule?

The pathway of history has been strewn with wrecks that warn against the danger of class consciousness and class activity. Russia is the latest example of the paralyzing results of class agitation. They talk of the bourgeoisie, the proletariat, the intelligentsia, the bolshevik, the menshevik, the I. W. W., the Socialist, and the rest, while they murder and pillage and destroy property and paralyze industry and violate law and overturn governments, torture patriots and outrage women, starve children and repudiate debts, and then beg for food and supplies in order that they may continue the damnable course of corruption and cruelty and destruction toward the awful abyss of darkness, despair, and death.

All true patriots should make this a solemn hour of decision to exert their every influence to curb any further trend in that dangerous direction, and to strive for a restoration of that noble American ideal, avoidance of class consciousness.

## CHAPTER X

### REVERENCE FOR LAW

**L**AW is a very broad and inclusive word. It comprehends within its scope discipline, manners, authority, thrift, established custom, constitutional provisions, statutory enactments, accepted judicial precedents, natural processes, international relationships, and the purposes of the Infinite.

In the earlier days of this Republic, much of the business was transacted by word of mouth; conveniences and methods for making binding agreements and facilitating exchange were less developed. Men prided themselves on the fact that their word was as good as their bond, their promise as good as their note.

So almost sacred did they regard contractual relationships that they wrote into the Constitution "No State shall . . . pass any law impairing the obligations of contracts." Their formula for thrift was "Spend less than you make; save up for the rainy day; be prepared for the hour of sickness or misfortune."

Quite generally the discipline in the home was almost severe. Respectful recognition was shown for the authority of parents and their directions were followed quite closely by the children.

Moral support of the parents was generally accorded to teachers in their training and discipline of the children at school. I shall never forget when my father said to me: "If you are punished at school, you will be punished again at home without delay." It seemed cruel then, but every time I think of it, I thank God for having given me a father who loved me well enough to say what it was so hard for him to say, and to do the thing which it was so hard for him to do, for he kept his promise with true New England severity. But I now realize that it hurt him more than it did me. His attitude was not the exception but the rule.

Ministers of the gospel and officials of the church were almost universally treated with a respect that bordered on reverence. Support of the church was regarded as one of the first obligations of life.

In the relationship of employer and employee there was usually a spirit of good fellowship, and at least the employee felt that a request or com-



plaint should be made direct to the employer and not through some outside agency, and that promotion or reward would come as a result of service well performed and not through coercion of outsiders not connected with the business.

So strong was the devotion of the builders of this Republic to the Constitution that it was provided that public officials should take an oath to support it. So high was their regard for the courts that they provided that judges should be appointed and that the judicial ermine should not be dragged into the heat and contentions and obligations of a political campaign.

I shall never forget how, when a boy, while attending a social gathering with my mother, a well poised and dignified gentleman entered the room and she said, with an inflection almost of awe in her tone: "That is Judge ——." I could sense in her voice a feeling of confidence that this man would interpret the law and apply it to the facts wisely and hold evenly and mercifully the scales of justice. Her expression was an illustration of the general attitude toward the judges and courts.

Frequently, in my youthful days, while mingling in a group of people, someone would offer violent criticism of some public official, and another would respond: "If you don't respect him,

respect the office. He is our —— (whatever official he happened to be) now. When his term of office expires you can exert your influence to replace him with a better man, but in the meantime respect the office.”

The law of supply and demand was carefully considered and given free play and enlivened through the encouragement of healthy competition. Such laws as were passed relating to the law of supply and demand were designed to prevent the putting up of artificial barriers to retard or obstruct the natural working of that law, to prevent monopoly, injurious combinations, etc.

The law of compensation was so thoroughly understood by the men who wrote the Constitution and founded this Republic, that they knew that rights are the result of duties well performed. They laid little stress upon divine rights, but much upon human duties and purposes.

The preamble of the Constitution contains no proclamation of rights, but it is the sublimest statement of purpose and duty with which I am familiar outside of the Bible.

There is no claim here that there was perfection of conduct on the part of our ancestors, or that there was no ground for improvement, but I do contend that they showed a greater reverence for

human and divine law than civilization had known, and thereby made the greatest progress which history records.

What about the situation during recent years? The recent wholesale cancellation of written contracts that swept the country from end to end, with the government taking the lead, is a partial answer. And what a mess it has made! Strange that it should have followed so closely the invention of the phrase "a mere scrap of paper."

How often do we hear the statement "My word is as good as my bond"? We frequently hear it said, on the other hand: "Well, I got by, all right; I put it over."

How carefully are we weighing the question of thrift? What about discipline and respect for the authority and direction of parents in the home? How final is the "No" of parents to children making request to be allowed to do things that are disapproved?

How much moral support are we giving teachers in the discipline of children in our schools? Whose side do we take when a difference occurs? What amount of encouragement are we giving teachers toward the development of well informed and patriotic citizens?

What about our respect bordering on reverence for ministers of the gospel and officials of the church? The popularity of "The Inside of the Cup," in fiction and movie, is a partial answer.

In nearly every moving picture play that I have seen, where a minister has been introduced as one of the characters, he is depicted as a sickly, silly, effeminate, awkward weakling, playing a ridiculous and absurd part.

Think of it! the making of that kind of impression upon the child mind regarding those who are ministers of the gospel, shepherds of the church congregations, those who preside at weddings and administer the sacred vows of marriage, who visit the sick, who pray with the unfortunate, and who speak the last word of praise and supplication at funerals over the departed dead! The tragedy is that such an exhibition is generally met with evidence of approval instead of with deserved resentment.

The above is not true in the representation of the priest upon the screen. Members of the Catholic Church would not tolerate such treatment of their spiritual leaders. Managers of moving picture shows should be made to understand that public sentiment resents the idea of ridiculing ministers of the gospel in photo plays.

It might be well also for those who have to do with church management and discipline to consider the fact that churches are flourishing today about in proportion as they adhere to a well organized representative government. Democracy has the same weakness in church government that it has in civil government.

Isn't it probable that too much leniency in the home, too little discipline in the school, indifference toward the church, share much responsibility for the ever growing army of young people who are constantly and increasingly joining the ranks of criminals?

The oath to uphold the Constitution is still administered to public officials, before permitting them to take office. It is a common occurrence, however, to hear candidates for public office promising support, in the event of their election, to measures or legislation that would violate the Constitution.

It is not at all unusual to hear public officials who have taken the oath to uphold the Constitution make with levity or swagger, such remarks as: "The Constitution is extinct; we have out-grown the Constitution; what is the Constitution between friends? to hell with the Constitution!"

What about respect for public officials? Dur-

ing recent years we have seen Presidents, Ex-Presidents, and candidates for President go up and down this country, like patent medicine vendors, hurling epithets of denunciation, impugning each other's motives, criticising conduct, charging corruption, and fairly questioning the loyalty of one another to the country.

Candidates for the United States Senate and Congress and for Governor and minor offices have followed the deplorable example. It is difficult to maintain respect for public officials who violate their oath, who are reckless in the appropriation and expenditure of public funds, or who convert public money which does not belong to them into their own pocket. It is to be expected that such offences will be discussed very frankly by the people.

The cartoons and editorials and newspaper articles and addresses from the platform in a recent judicial campaign to select twenty-one judges in Cook County, Illinois, were bad enough to arouse the envy of the Bolsheviki of Russia; and Chicago probably differs little from other cities in this regard.

What a pity that most of the States have substituted the absurd plan of electing judges for the wise method of appointing them!

The modern disregard for the law of supply and demand is evidenced by the numerous boards and commissions and bureaus and dictators that have been appointed to fix and determine prices. The awful results of their activities, and the confusion resulting from excessive legislation on the subject, need no comment.

A prominent minister in Chicago recently wrote an article which was published in one of the daily papers, in which he ridiculed with much levity and bad logic the possible existence of the God-given law of supply and demand. Such conduct on the part of too many ministers partially accounts for the growing indifference toward the church. Would it not have a very wholesome effect if the ministers in their pulpits would devote themselves more fully to preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ and the grand old truths of the Bible, and stop talking so much about industrial and governmental problems, of which most of them know so little?

Our appreciation and understanding of the law of compensation has been evidenced by a hungering appetite for more rights and a corresponding shirking of civic duty and responsibility. Performance of duties must ever be the forerunner of the enjoyment and security of rights.

The efforts of many of our best citizens to avoid jury service, the manner in which they disregard speed and traffic laws and try to avoid the penalty of violation, the tolerance and leniency shown criminals, the continuous enactment of so many laws that their enforcement is impossible, are all illustrations of the growing disregard and irreverence for law.

A very serious question for the people of this generation is, "What shall be our present and future attitude toward law, in its biggest and broadest sense?" Shall we continue the downward path or shall we call on the better angels of our nature, and dedicate ourselves to a renaissance of reverence for and obedience to law?

The whole world is waiting and longing for wise guidance toward law and order. Let us give earnest devotion to the restoration of that beneficent American ideal, reverence for law.



## CHAPTER XI

### UNSELFISH NATIONALISM

ONE of the gratifying aspects of our national life has been the safety with which our statesmen have been able to steer this Republic along the safe middle road of nationalism, avoiding the selfishness of isolation and the dangers of internationalism.

We have been so hospitable in welcoming the people of every land and clime, that this country has been called "the melting pot," "the haven of the oppressed."

Have we been trustful and hospitable to the point of indiscretion? Should we not, as patriots, be giving to the question of determining the character of those whom we welcome to our shores, the same serious consideration that we do as parents in deciding who will be welcome in our homes?

Those whom we welcome in the future will be the associates of our children. Care and good judgment in the enactment and enforcement of immigration laws is imperative. Charity and the duty of protection begin at home. It is time that

we should ascertain from those who are here whether their purpose is to support our institutions or to try to overthrow our form of government. A very searching examination should be given those whom we welcome in the future as to their attitude in this regard.

Since the Constitution is the basis of our government, and we still require public officials to take an oath to uphold it, should we not require foreigners before naturalization, which carries with it the privilege of voting, to have sufficient knowledge of the Constitution to understand that it provides for a strictly representative government, and that all phases of socialism or direct action of paternalism are contrary to the spirit of our government? A clearer understanding of that vital truth by many of our own people who are not foreigners would have a very healthy effect upon our unselfish nationalism.

Millions upon millions of words of discussion have been spoken and written upon internationalism during recent years, most of it confusing and superficial and dangerous. We should ever remember that thus far we have sailed upon a smoother sea in our international relationships and complications than any other great nation. We should ever bear in mind that those nations

which urge upon us entrance into such relationship have all had many tragic and costly and destructive experiences in international ups and downs through history.

Before taking any rash action we can all read with great benefit the words of warning and wisdom from the wise men who have guided safely in the past and contributed so much to our heritage.

In my judgment there is one thing concerning which little has been said, that should be done before we abandon the security of nationalism to embrace the subtle dangers of internationalism.

The United States should take the position that before it will put its signature and seal upon any international compact, the compact must contain a very clearly written clause which will provide that every nation which signs, agrees that it is now satisfied with its present boundary lines, and defines its boundary lines as a part of the compact, and also agrees that no future attempt will be made to extend those boundary lines by conquest.

This Republic is the most successful experiment of confederated activity of separate States that the history of government has known, and the States are held together under the greatest political document ever penned. But if there was

the slightest doubt among the several States as to the definiteness of their boundary lines, and there was a disposition on the part of some States to trespass across the boundaries of other States, we should soon be in a condition of alarm and confusion, if not bloody revolution.

How much more would that be true in the confederated activities of separate nations, unless there is first established absolute definiteness of boundary lines and a thorough understanding that no future effort will be made to extend those boundary lines by conquest.

If a stipulation providing for agreement of definiteness as to present and future boundary lines should lessen the ardor or dampen the enthusiasm of any nation now pressing for international arrangement, it would be well for the United States to ascertain that fact before becoming joint signers with such nation.

Partnerships are generally entered into with a pretty definite understanding as to just how much each partner owns. Corporations are generally formed with a pretty clear understanding as to how the stock will be distributed among members of the corporation. When that is not the case, the results are frequently disastrous.

In a world partnership or corporation the need

and desirability of a very clear understanding and binding agreement as to the definiteness of boundary lines would seem to be quite self-evident. The nations of the world are war weary, most of them bankrupt, and all of them in a very serious situation.

Would it not be a very good time to plan an era of arbitration, and where two or more nations lay claim to the same territory, try to fix the boundary lines through the introduction of evidence, as we adjust differences between individuals in regard to their title to property?

I, for one, would be willing to have Uncle Sam make this proposition to the rest of the world: We are willing to enter into an international arrangement, in which we agree to be satisfied with our present boundary lines, to define them, and to pledge that we will not try to extend them by conquest, provided all other nations will enter into the agreement on the same terms.

With all boundary lines defined and settled under such conditions, 90 per cent of the cause of wars would be removed and a discussion of reduction of armaments would be much more simple and satisfactory.

We have heard much talk of moral leadership during recent years, but for the most part we have

mistaken the utterance of empty phrases, glittering generalities, epithets of denunciation and hyperbolic perorations for moral leadership. No statesman has ever yet said to the world: "My country is ready to settle and define its boundary lines and agree that no effort will be made in the future to extend those boundary lines by conquest, provided other nations will enter into and abide by such a compact."

This Republic could make that proposal to other countries and thereby take and hold the moral leadership of the world. Until the boundary lines are settled and defined, let us not step over the precipice from the rock of safety and fall headlong into the meshes of internationalism, and until the boundary lines are settled and defined, with agreement that no effort shall be made to extend them by conquest, let us cling tenaciously to that anchor of safety, the protecting American ideal,—unselfish nationalism.

## CHAPTER XII

### LOYALTY TO THE FLAG

ON THE 14th of June, 1777, the Congress of the United States passed the following resolution:

“Resolved, that the flag of the thirteen United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white, that the union be thirteen stars white on a blue field, representing a new constellation.”

On January 13, 1794, President Washington approved the following Act of Congress:

“Be it enacted, etc., that from and after the first day of May, one thousand, seven hundred and ninety-five, the flag of the United States be fifteen stripes, alternate red and white, and that the union be fifteen stars in a field of blue.”

On April 4, 1818, President Monroe approved an act to establish the flag of the United States, as follows:

“Sec. 1. Be it enacted, that from and after the 4th day of July next, the flag of the United States be thirteen horizontal stripes, alternate

red and white, that the Union have twenty stars white in a blue field.

“Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, that on the admission of every new State into the Union one star be added to the Union of the flag; and that such addition shall take effect on the 4th of July next succeeding such admission.”

The old flag has come down to us today, over more than a century of years, with no taint of scandal, no spot of dishonor, and no record of defeat.

Great tributes have been paid to it, in song and story and eloquence and poetry and loyalty. Its beauty and inspiration are beyond the description of words. It has been called “Old Glory,” “Flag of the Free,” “The Star-Spangled Banner,” “Flag of Our Union Forever,” “The Red, White and Blue,” “Our Flag,” “Your Flag and My Flag,” “The American Flag.”

There is tremendous meaning in that beautiful and inspiring symbol of our past efforts and achievements, our present pride and possession, our future hopes and prayers.

The thirteen stripes are in loving remembrance of the thirteen original colonies which began the formation of “a more perfect union” under the Constitution of the United States. The stars represent the number of States and have in-



creased with the increasing number of splendid States that form this mighty Republic.

The blue is "true blue." It is symbolic of the truth, the loyalty, the constancy and infinity of the fundamental principles and eternal justice which have made us a great nation.

The white is clean and pure. It purifies all other colors with which it mingles. It is symbolic of the cleanliness of motive, purity of purpose and prayerfulness of devotion to the fundamental principles and eternal justice which have made us a beneficent people.

The red stands for courage. It is symbolic of the courage that has been shown, the sacrifices that have been made and the blood that has been shed (when necessary) in order that we might surmount all difficulties to establish and maintain and perpetuate the fundamental principles and eternal justice which have made us a tower of strength at home and a ministering angel abroad.

Much can be said in commendation of the attitude of most Americans toward the flag during recent years. Large amounts of money are invested in flags. The flag is given general display from our homes, our schools and public places on proper occasions.

The American Flag Day Association has

brought about the designation of June 14th as Flag Day, when a portion of the day is set aside for paying tribute. We stand at salute and with uncovered heads as the flag passes on parade. We stand with reverent respect as the band or orchestra plays "The Star-Spangled Banner." Quite generally our children are taught in school to stand at salute and recite the pledge of "allegiance to the American flag and to the Republic for which it stands."

There are many other flags in this country, such as the President's flag, the flags of other departments of the government, college, fraternity and society flags, service flags and the beloved gold-star flags, but they are all subservient to the Stars and Stripes.

There are some people in this country who would hoist the red flag to supplant the Stars and Stripes. They do not cherish the memory of the thirteen original colonies; they do not respect the States symbolized by the stars; they would wipe out the blue of truth, loyalty and constancy, and the white of cleanliness and purity. They would have only the color of blood and cruelty and revolution and carnage and murder. They would overturn property rights, lower the standards of the home, destroy the church, overthrow

the government and substitute revolution and chaos for the orderly processes of law and order.

Our loyalty to the American flag will be determined by the dispatch and thoroughness with which we eliminate the red flag, that symbol of treason, from the confines of this Republic.

We should all endeavor to bring about a better understanding on the part of ourselves and our children of how the flag came into being, and of all the things for which it stands. We should make clear also the meaning of the red flag, and the fact that those who unfurl it do not regard it as subservient to the Stars and Stripes, but that they would supplant Old Glory with it.

Above all, we should try to select public officials who understand the meaning of the oath to uphold the Constitution, and of sufficient character to have a high regard for the sacredness of taking an oath. It is my solemn conviction, after much observation and thought, that more of our difficulties than we realize are due to the lack of understanding with which many public officials take the oath to uphold the Constitution and the utter indifference with which many of them regard the oath.

If there has been repetition upon this point, it is intentional, because it is so essential that the people should understand and public officials should

recognize the vital and far-reaching importance of fidelity to the oath to uphold the Constitution. Violation of that oath is disloyalty to the flag, of the most dangerous kind, because it is the disloyalty of those who have sought and accepted a trust.

Flag and Constitution have traveled side by side. The fundamentals of the Constitution and the symbols of the flag are co-essential. They will stay up or go down together.

We are heirs of the grandest flag that ever symbolized the aspirations of a great people. We should so live, and teach our children to live, that at present and in the future, as in the past, that old flag, wherever it may be unfurled to the breeze, whether on our native soil, in foreign ports, on foreign lands or over the distant seas, shall be recognized as the guardian of the lives and property of our people.

We should so revere the symbolic truths of Old Glory, and proclaim them to the world, that wherever it floats, our flag shall always be looked upon and admired and respected and saluted as the most sacred emblem that was ever wafted to the heavens, as the most beautiful banner that was ever kissed and caressed by God's untainted air.

Away with the red flag. Let us firmly uphold that magnificent American ideal, loyalty to the flag.

## CONCLUSION

**T**HERE is no pretense of thorough discussion of these American ideals. Volumes could be written on every chapter without exhausting the subject. It is an effort, rather, to start a train of thought, and provide a mental track on which to run, for those who are asking, "Wherein lies the trouble and what can I do to help?"

Recently I had a very unusual conversation with one of the most industrious, thoughtful, successful and patriotic men in this country regarding a contemplated extensively organized national movement to put on a campaign for genuine Americanism.

This man has been industrious and thrifty and has accumulated sufficient wealth so that he could retire from business and live comfortably on the income of his investment, so there is no prejudice in his point of view, but he is intensely interested in the present crucial situation and the future welfare of his fellow citizens.

After telling me something of the amount of time and money he had spent making investiga-

tions and gathering statistics relative to general conditions, he arose from his chair, began pacing the floor, and spoke about as follows:

“It is too late. This Republic has reached the beginning of the end. Do you know that there are seven hundred and twenty-seven departments, boards, commissions, bureaus and investigating and dictatorial bodies in Washington, with approximately 90,000 employees, most of whom are confusing conditions still more, multiplying expenses and increasing the ever-growing burden of taxation, and that similar conditions prevail in most of the State governments?

“Are you familiar with the statistics indicating the growing percentage of people who live in cities and the decrease of percentage in the country; the increase of tenants and the decrease in percentage of home owners in the cities; the increase of tenants and the decrease in percentage of farmers who live on their own farms? Do you know of the alarming drift of our young people into the ranks of criminals? Have you noted the tendency toward class legislation by our law-making bodies? Have you been watching the trend toward disregard of property rights, not only by people generally, but as evidenced by the decisions of our higher courts?”

After continuing for a time along a similar strain regarding other fields of activity, such as socialism in our educational institutions, the attitude of union labor, etc., he exclaimed: "Why, Atwood, I doubt if even you comprehend the gravity of the situation, and the tragedy is that not one American in ten thousand is sufficiently wide awake to even sense the danger, to say nothing of providing a remedy."

If there is more than an element of truth, or too much truth, in what he said, it emphasizes the need for us to clarify our thinking and redouble our efforts to surmount the difficulties.

During recent years there has been much talk of new visions, a new world, a new era, a new way and a new day. But the makers of such phrases are gradually awakening to the fact that their new visions are cloudy, that their new world is weary with isms, that their new era is tempestuous, that their new way seems uncertain, and that their new day grows darker and darker.

Why not realize that we are living in the same old world today, that it must be saved and improved in the old way, by adhering to the eternal principles and guarding the fundamental institutions that history and experience and common

sense teach so clearly are the milestones on the highway of progress?

This is a time for individual introspection regarding our attitude toward American ideals. For their preservation, perpetuation and higher development, let us all take this self-examination:

Am I putting the spirit of service into industry?

Is my home a center of character building? Am I encouraging better training for citizenship in the schools? Am I supporting and strengthening the church as a spiritual influence?

Do I understand and support the Constitution and insist that public officials shall be faithful to their oath to support it? Do I support representative government and oppose all hazardous attempts to supplant it with direct government?

Do I insist upon my individual property rights, and encourage others to do so, by opposing the dangers of socialism, communism, paternalism and government ownership?

Do I exercise individual freedom in industry, and aid others to do so, by supporting the policy of the open shop? Do I avoid class consciousness and class agitation and oppose class legislation, and do I promote the principle of individual responsibility for individual conduct?



Do I manifest a reverence for law by encouraging proper discipline, proper respect for authority, the practice of thrift and obedience to the laws of God and man?

Do I favor the security of unselfish nationalism and avoidance of the dangers of internationalism until the boundary lines of the nations are defined and established, with agreement that no effort shall be made to extend them by conquest?

Does my loyalty to the flag include a constant endeavor to understand the meaning of its symbolic grandeur and a determination that the red flag shall not be unfurled in this Republic?

Order will come out of chaos, and progress will supplant confusion, just in proportion as an increasing number of individuals can answer these questions with positive affirmation.

Therein lies the way out of present difficulties.

Therein lies the assurance of a mighty future, that may transcend our glorious past.

“Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet—  
Lest we forget, lest we forget.”

## HARRY F. ATWOOD'S OTHER BOOKS

# Back to the Republic, \$1.00

(Also Polish translation)

Contains { a copy of the Constitution  
a diagram of the Constitution  
an analysis of the Constitution

Mr. Atwood's book is a marvel of straight thinking and clear writing. It clears away the fog of confusion. A stimulating contribution to the literature of Americanization, and it all makes a book that should be in the hands of every person who is honestly searching for the cause and the remedy of the present chaos and confusion. It is a little book with a big message and as timely as it is forceful.—*The Boston Herald*.

"At the moment when the terminology of politics and government has a heavy load of meaning to bear, but is not very capable of bearing it, Harry F. Atwood does a great service to clarity of thought in writing this short and simple, but fundamental book."—*Chicago Evening Post*.

## Keep God in American History, 35c

One of Many Similar Comments

Nothing which I have received at this happy time of the year has made the profound impression upon me that the little booklet, "Keep God in American History," has. I have read it twice. Would that it could be brought to the fireside of each family in America during the next few months. It is infinitely better in my humble opinion than Elbert Hubbard's "Message to Garcia." No thinking man can read this magnificent treatise so ably expressed by Mr. Atwood, without believing it was penned for some great purpose. It is so peculiarly appropriate in this transition period of industrial unrest and chaos.

RUFUS JARNAGIN, *Secretary,*  
*Metropolitan Safety Council,*  
NEW YORK, N. Y.

---

Published by

**LAIRD & LEE, Inc.**

**Chicago, Ill.**









UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**A** 000 689 842 3

