

public, while standing aloof from "permanent" alliance with one nation in its merely selfish rivalry with another nation, should decline in any part of the world to declare itself for liberty, humanity, and civilization as against tyranny, cruelty, and barbarism, or to ally itself freely, for the sake of imperiled human rights and social progress, with any Power, whether transatlantic or cisatlantic. On the other hand, an observer of the habitual mendacity of the party press toward political opponents must confess that party spirit is still an exorbitant and disturbing element in our political life, far exceeding all that Washington regarded as salutary and safe.

The one point of the Address which will probably obtain least notice, while deserving emphasis as strong as any other, is one which our political history has accentuated for thoughtful readers. It deserves pages instead of the few lines required by present limits.

The Constitution, in distributing the functions of government into the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branches, provides, as far as it can, that these, within the lines prescribed for them, shall be mutually independent and equal powers. But already in Washington's time there were symptoms of that tendency of the legislative branch to encroach upon the constitutional rights of the others, to which in a democracy it is inherently prone. It was illustrated by the struggle in the House to nullify the Jay treaty. Out of this experience came Washington's counsel of caution to "resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its [the Constitution's] principles, however specious the pretexts." He exhorts "those intrusted with administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another." The most notable case in which this counsel was set at naught was the impeachment of President Johnson, which only the superiority of statesmanship to partisanship in a few members of the dominant party prevented from succeeding. Professor Woodrow Wilson's work on "Congressional Government" conclusively demonstrates the historical fact that the constitutional balance between the co-ordinate branches of government, which Washington counseled us to maintain, has been subverted. "From whatever point we view the relations of the executive and the legislative, it is evident that the power of the latter has steadily increased at the expense of the prerogatives of the former." Nor is the case different, as he also shows, between the legislative and the judiciary. That the constitutional rights of the executive may be maintained on Washington's lines, the occupant of the President's chair must needs be a man of strong will and high courage, as well as political wisdom. If such a man, however, undertakes to live up to the constitutional theory that the executive is a co-ordinate, not a subordinate, part of the government, he is certain to be maligned as domineering and despotic, precisely as was Washington himself.

One other passage of the Address deserves special notice for its peculiar pertinency to recent and dangerous evils. Its bearing upon these is quite as clear and cogent as that of any provision of the Constitution which is now construed as bearing upon questions wholly beyond the foresight of its framers.

This counsel of the Address was called forth by the mob spirit, whose most serious demonstration was in the whisky insurrection of 1794 in Philadelphia; but it is applicable in full strictness to proceedings of a more pacific but equally dangerous kind.

"All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are . . . of fatal tendency." Had Washington foreseen the *imperium in imperio* of a plutocracy governing under the forms of democracy, as when a corporation created by the legislature controls its creator, he could not have uttered a more forcible or a plainer warning against practices which threaten the life of democracy through the transfer of political power from the people to the purse.

Washington's retirement from office at the end of his

second term has often been referred to as a precedent worthy to be followed. A popular reference-book, Frederic Harrison's "Calendar of Great Men," says: "He firmly refused [a third election], deeming the precedent a bad one." For various reasons no President has ever entered upon a third term, and the custom has now come to be regarded by many as "an unwritten law." But, apart from any judgment of the merits of this custom, it is open to serious question whether it can fairly rest any claim to consideration upon Washington's example. Any authoritativeness of it as derived from him is based on utter misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the grounds on which he determined to retire from office. These grounds were wholly personal. Through a period of forty-five years he had been nearly all the time in the public service. As General and as President he had borne for more than sixteen years the heaviest burdens of official responsibility, through constantly recurring crises, amid great perils and great perplexities, and simply longed to rest, as soon as it might be without detriment to public interests. That any length of service in the highest station disqualifies a man from serving further at the call of his country is an idea to which he has set no seal. It is matter of history that, but for a great exigency, Washington would have retired from the Presidency at the end of his first term. The only precedent which he can fairly be regarded as having set in this matter is that a man is bound to serve his country to whatever extent she requires.

When the Address appeared, though the partisan press ascribed it to the meanest motives, it was received, on the whole, with due respect. Several State Legislatures ordered it entered upon their journals. Every year it is read before the Senate of the United States on Washington's birthday. Its autograph, dated September 19, 1796, is now preserved in the Lenox Library at New York. In this centennial year it will undoubtedly be viewed with a fresh interest, and obtain an intelligent interpretation of its bearing upon the somewhat changed conditions of our time. Our political manners have improved during the century perhaps more than our political principles. Party hatreds are less rancorous. Sectional animosities have cooled. But growth is still required into the true Americanism so nobly exemplified in Washington, seeking the lasting good of the country as a whole above any temporary interest of persons, parties, or sections. Significantly has Washington expressed this spirit in the date, "UNITED STATES," which he has given to this alone of all his official papers.

Toward this genuinely National spirit the study of the Farewell Address, as of a supplement to the Federal Constitution, may be expected to contribute.



The Manner of Manners

By Lillie Hamilton French

I saw old Colonel Preble in the dining-room of a Country Club the other day—old Colonel Preble, who lost an arm in the War. "What exquisite manners he has!" my friend said to me. "His daughter has not come in, yet he drew her chair out from the table before taking his own." I looked at the old gentleman, a kindly, unobtrusive, white-haired man, bearing the marks of suffering without obtruding them, like one who cared less for sympathy for his weaknesses than for some ability to make, in spite of them, the ease and comfort of those about him. "Surely," I said to myself, "the perfection of manner, too, is there. The thought of what is due to others has become an integral part of him, independent of all rules for set occasions."

And manner, it seems to me, is just this thing—the attuning or disciplining of a man's whole nature to one interior note or principle until that note or principle has become an integral part of him. It may be a bad note or a good one, a note of pride, of arrogance, of self-assertion, of doubt of others, of serenity, cheerfulness, love, or abasement of self. But whatever the fundamental note of a man's nature may be, that the man's whole manner will be, whether he wishes it or not.

And manner, of course, is to be distinguished from man-

ners. Manners are mere emanations from the general body; they are the adornments of life—they go to make up its decoration and finer appointments. Manners are controlled by custom, by climate, by geographical lines. No one law governs them all. A man may violate some law of what we hold good manners to be, and yet do it with so good a manner that we hold him above reproach. My friend Mary Perkins sat by a Russian Prince at dinner who ate his ice-cream with a knife. But he did it like a Prince! The man who pushes rudely by you in getting on the cars, determined on securing the best seat for himself, has bad manners, but one feels instinctively that his manner of thinking is worse.

You may drill a child in manners, but the manner must be its own. Its temperament, character, spontaneity or reserve of nature, will control it. It is a fashion now to teach little girls to make the merest little dip of a curtsy when greeting an older person, just as it has always been a custom to teach them to pause on the threshold of a door before entering, for the fraction of a moment, in order to begin again on the proper foot. I count among my friends many children who have been taught these things, together with all the other ways and customs of the world. But I know only two in whose manner, for all their training, one finds delight. One is twelve, the other six. They greet you, whatever your age, with no shyness or self-consciousness, but with a sudden lighting up of the face and a direct movement toward you, not as if they were doing what they had been taught to do, but as if the pleasure of seeing you had inspired them, and made them anxious to convey some of this pleasure to you, if only in the form of a welcome. And I am inclined to believe that these children are governed by some such feeling. Knowing their mothers as I do, I know what their training has been, and how every sweet and generous outgoing impulse has been cultivated and encouraged.

As manner is not to be confused with manners, neither is it to be confounded with presence. The best-bred man or woman is never conspicuous, never obtrusive, does not try to attract attention—is never out of the picture, as the theatrical people put it. We all recognize this fact, and instinctively draw away from one whose manner challenges attention in the street or a public assembly. And yet there are people of faultless manner, and irreproachable manners, whose presence is always felt, wherever they may be, by those who are sensitive to such influences. There is my friend Mathilda Wadsworth, for instance. She could never escape observation wherever she might be. She is beautiful and holds herself like a queen, but the secret of her power lies in the secret of her magnetism. I met a young married woman who sat for an hour or more behind her in the cars without knowing who she was. She told me afterward that, as she watched her sitting quietly talking to some friend, every one else in the car was forgotten. There was something so full of love and generous quality about Mathilda, she felt irresistibly drawn. And the presence of man or woman full of love and generous feeling must always be felt, however quiet and unobtrusive their manner may be. The law of vibration governs this. The presence of Bishop Brooks must have been felt, yet no man's manner was quieter.

"Why discuss manner with you?" I heard one friend say to another. "Our points of view differ." I realized all at once, as I listened, how wide apart they were, for all the similarity of their social training. One thought graciousness and love of pleasing insincere. The other thought cold reserve of manner very near to rudeness. For the natures of these two women were dissimilar. The manner of each was the nature of each, and, according to the temperaments and taste of different friends, each manner found its sympathizers.

And so, after all, getting down to an understanding of manner means getting down to an understanding of life. Ideal manner springs from ideal conceptions, manners being technicalities of expression. And into this conception must enter the attitude of the individual toward life, toward friends, toward personal desires and tendencies. For it matters much in manner whether a man be governed

by a desire to make himself and his own wishes paramount, or a desire to give way to the pleasure and happiness of others; whether he be willing to be governed by the larger law of attraction ruling all, or by a determination to be a law unto himself, forcing others to accept it.

When, therefore, a man's manner is good, his manners may be left to take care of themselves. The courteous and gentle Japanese is never offensive, however limited his training in our school of manners may have been. One's manner of addressing servants is as great a test of manner as a knowledge of the etiquette of courts and social life. The technicalities of polite expression are easily acquired by one who is open and receptive. Experience as well as training give these. But manner no man can teach another who does not teach that other some truth, some law of taste, some principle of harmony, by which the action of that other may be governed and controlled. Faultless manners do not make the best manner.

We judge the manner of a man, then, with the same test questions we bring to the judgments of a life: What has been its guiding principle—love of self, of individual interests, of whims and tempers; or love of something better for which we should all live, and for the sake of which we should subordinate ourselves, our personal pride and prejudice? And this test may be applied to the manner of a man living in any age, whatever the best manners of his time may have exacted as observances from those it esteemed as well-bred.



The New Psychology

The International Psychological Congress of 1896

By Herbert Ernest Cushman

The first International Psychological Congress, which was held in Paris in 1889—M. Ribot presiding—was really the result of the efforts of M. Richet and the different societies that had for a long time been formed to discuss hypnotic phenomena and telepathic hallucination. It is important to note that this first Congress took the name of the Congress for Physiological Psychology. The second Congress met in London in 1892, under the name of Congress for Experimental Psychology. The President, Professor Sidgwick, explained the term "Experimental" to mean a science founded on observation and experiment. The third Psychological Congress has just held its meetings in Munich, under the simpler name of the Psychological Congress. Of the four hundred and fifty members there were many famous men present—the trim Vaihinger, leader in the Kantian renaissance; the tall and gracious Brentano, at present the only leader of a school in the philosophical world; Ebbinghaus, famous for untiring experiments on the memory; the Frenchmen Janet, Binet, and Flournoy; the veteran Sidgwick; the Jew Münsterberg. Almost every member present had local fame. Conspicuous in their absence were the greatest of all living psychologists, Professor Wundt, of Leipzig, and the most charming of living personalities, Professor James, of Harvard. The American and English delegation was large. In point of numbers, moreover, the Congress was a great success, and the hospitality of the Munich people was unbounded. This Congress represented the development of what is called the "new" psychology from the physiological psychology of the first Congress and the experimental psychology of the second. At first, calling itself physio-psychological in opposition to the old Hegelian idealism, it claimed to be the beginning of a science; then, with enlarged boundaries, it dropped its first name and called itself experimental. Now the territory has been further enlarged, and, experiment and observation having been acknowledged as necessary, it has taken the simple name of psychology. In its first period it embraced only studies in telepathy and other rare mental phenomena; now it includes studies in ethnology, philology, law, sociology, history, epistemology, aesthetics, pedagogics, anatomy, zoology, physiology, psychiatry, and pathology. The sub-