

SENATOR DOLLIVER

In Senator Dolliver not merely the State of Iowa, but all the people of the United States, have lost one of the ablest, most efficient, and most sincerely patriotic public servants that we have seen in recent years in public life. It has been my good fortune to have been intimately associated with him for twenty years, and I feel a keen sense of personal loss in his death; but this sense of personal loss is entirely swallowed up in the sense of loss to the Nation. Senator Dolliver was not merely an absolutely honest public servant in the narrow and technical sense of the term; he was also a far-sighted and devoted worker in the real interests of all the people of the United States. His genuine loyalty to his party was of that healthy type which shows itself mainly in the resolute effort to make the party an efficient and useful servant of the public. He instinctively abhorred what was mean, petty, and base, and worked with a large devotion to the common weal.

One of his salient traits was the way in which he declined to permit himself to be diverted from a great purpose by minor considerations. One of the difficulties in getting good service in government, and perhaps especially at Washington, lies in the fact that most men grow to view their several offices as in themselves all-important, instead of being important solely from the standpoint of service to the public. Throughout our history there have been plenty of examples where Presidents and Cabinet officers, judges, Senators, and Congressmen, have each grown absorbed in exalting the so-called dignity and the privilege of his particular office, instead of remembering that the office is of use only in so far as it is efficient for the public good. Those men will often speak of the encroachments of the Executive, or the encroachments of Congress, without any regard to what the so-called encroachments really are. For example, it was of the utmost importance that under Abraham Lincoln the Presidency should grow as he made it grow. But under his successor, Andrew Johnson, it was equally important that Congress should control the President. There was no inconsistency in supporting the Presi-

dent in the one case and Congress in the other, simply because the essential thing in each case was the service to the public, and not the exaltation of the office. Senator Dolliver always realized this. When, for instance, the question of the ratification of a treaty with a foreign Power came up, he could be depended upon to vote on the matter purely from the standpoint of the interests of the Nation, instead of being led off into taking some action against the interests of the Nation, but in the fancied interest of the party to which he belonged. This may not seem an important matter to those not acquainted with the workings of our Government. But in reality it is most important, and it is highly characteristic of the kind of service which Senator Dolliver rendered.

Moreover, the Senator, in addition to being a singularly staunch and loyal friend, viewed matters with so large a sweep of vision that the interests of all parts of the country were the same in his eyes. On a question like the Panama Canal, for instance, it was absolutely certain that he would take the broad National view-point, simply because the question was one of National importance. He worked in every way for the betterment and uplifting of conditions at home. Yet he never forgot, as very many sincere and zealous reformers who think only of home conditions tend to forget, that, in addition to the interests within our own borders, there are certain interests outside our borders which affect all Americans—indirectly, it is true, but vitally—and as to which it is absolutely necessary that the American people, through their Government, should exercise wise forethought in preparation. Without such forethought and preparation, when the crisis arrives, there can be neither dignity nor effective action.

Senator Dolliver was a Republican of the school of Abraham Lincoln. He scorned to do injustice to the wealthy; he would have protected the rights of any rich man as quickly as those of any poor man; and yet he steadfastly strove to bring about conditions which should be in the interests of the plain people and should make this country an economic and industrial, no less than a political, democracy. He was a high-minded patriot and

public servant, and the whole country is poorer by his death.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.



THE NEW NATIONALISM

The New Nationalism is simply a later stage in the development of a continually developing Nationalism. The relation between the States and the National Government was not settled once for all by the written Constitution, and could not be. The Constitution is not like the hoops of a barrel that hold the staves together. Hoops fitted for a barrel of thirteen staves would not serve for a barrel of forty-eight. It is like the bark of a tree that grows with the growth of the tree and expands with its expansion. Chief Justice Marshall, by his interpretation of the Constitution, did almost as much to make it what it is as did its original framers.

Says Joseph H. Choate, in his interesting address on Alexander Hamilton :¹

For the five years that preceded the adoption of the Federal Constitution the whole country was drifting surely and swiftly toward anarchy. The thirteen States, freed from foreign dominion, claimed, and began to exercise, each an independent sovereignty, levying duties against each other and in many ways interfering with each other's trade. European nations, finding that Congress had no power to protect American trade, proceeded to impose fatal restrictions upon it. They also refused to enter into treaties with the United States because they could not tell whether they were dealing with thirteen nations or with one. This only was sure, that Congress could carry no treaty into effect.

Mr. Choate adds : "It is clear to me as A B C," said Washington, who from his retirement at Mount Vernon watched the course of affairs with the utmost anxiety, 'that an extension of Federal powers would make us one of the most happy, wealthy, respectable, and powerful nations that ever inhabited the terrestrial globe. Without them we shall soon be everything that is directly the reverse.'" In the formation of the Constitution, despite the jealousy of some States and the fears of others, this extension of Federal powers was given to the Central Government, and by that gift the Nation was

born. But it was never the intention of the founders, that it should be always in its cradle ; they intended that the Federal powers should grow with the growth of the Nation, that it might, as a Nation, become happy, wealthy, and respectable, because powerful.

The New Nationalism, initiated by Washington in his call for an "extension of Federal powers," was assailed by Calhoun nearly half a century later. Calhoun's contention may be here condensed into a sentence : The powers of the Federal Congress are enumerated powers ; if it attempts to exercise any power not in the Constitution enumerated, it transcends its authority, and its act is null and void ; and it is for the State which gave the authority to decide whether the authority has been exceeded. This was the doctrine of nullification. Not so, replied Chief Justice Marshall ; it is for the Supreme Court of the United States to decide whether that authority has been exceeded. The States did not accept Mr. Calhoun's theory ; they have, despite some strong opposition, accepted Chief Justice Marshall's theory. The creation of the Union of States constituted the first stage in the development of a New Nationalism ; the rejection of nullification constituted the second stage in the development of that New Nationalism.

A quarter of a century later Jefferson Davis propounded the doctrine of secession. It was at once more logical and more radical than the doctrine of nullification. It was, in brief, this : The Union is a union of sovereign States ; it is the very essence of this union that it is voluntary ; if a State finds itself dissatisfied in the Union, it may withdraw ; there is no power given to the Federal Government by the Constitution to forbid its withdrawal. Not so, replied Abraham Lincoln. This is an indestructible Union of indestructible States ; the right of self-preservation is inherent in the Nation as in the individual. The defeat of secession and the triumph of Unionism as the result of the Civil War constituted the third important stage in the development of the New Nationalism.

Prior to the Civil War banking had been conducted by State banks and under State regulation. In 1862 Abraham

¹ "Abraham Lincoln and Other Addresses," pp. 105, 106.