

FRAGMENTS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

ON

NATIONALISM

AND

INTER-NATIONALISM.

BY FRANCIS LIEBER, LL. D.,

CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE FRENCH INSTITUTE, ETC.,

PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC LAW IN THE LAW SCHOOL OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE IN  
NEW YORK.

*A nation without a national government is an awful spectacle.*

ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

---

NEW YORK:

CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO.

1868.

C. S. WESTCOTT & CO., PRINTERS,  
79 JOHN STREET, NEW YORK.

ON THE EVE OF A MOMENTOUS NATIONAL ELECTION

THE WRITER OF THESE FEW PAGES MAKES BOLD

TO DEDICATE THEM TO

# GENERAL U. S. GRANT.

MAY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

CONFER UPON HIM

*The Chief Magistracy of this Nation,*

CONSCIOUS OF ITS FREEDOM AND ITS GRANDEUR

AND NOW ASSAILED AGAIN

IN ITS BEST AND NOBLEST INTERESTS

BY THOSE ENEMIES

AGAINST WHOM BUT A SHORT TIME AGO

HE LEAD THE NATIONAL HOSTS

TO VICTORY AND PATRIOTIC GLORY.

AND LET THE PEOPLE OF THIS CONTINENTAL REPUBLIC

ON THE COMING FOURTH OF MARCH

GREET HIM AS CHARLEMAGNE WAS HAILED AT ROME:

PACIFIC VICTOR.



# NATIONALISM AND INTER-NATIONALISM.

---

*The National Polity is the normal type of Modern Government; Civil Liberty resting on Institutional Self-Government is the high political calling of this period; Absolutism, whether Monarchical or Democratic, intelligent and brilliant or coarse, its pervading danger; and increasing International Neighborliness with growing Agreement of National Forms and Concepts, its fairest Gage of the Spreading Progress of our Kind.*

---

## I.

### *Normal Types of Government. Nationalization.*

As the city-state was the normal type of free communities in antiquity, and as the feudal system must be considered as one of the normal types of government in the forbidding middle ages, so is the national polity the normal type of our own epoch—not indeed centralism.

The highest national polity yet developed is the representative national government, equally distant from the market-republic of old and the despotism of Asia or Europe, from absorbing centralism and dissolving communism, so-called. Centralism may be intensely national, even to bigotry; it may become a political fanaticism; it may be intelligent and formulated with great precision; but centralism remains an inferior species of government. It is no government of peaceful development, and decentralization becomes neces-

sary as self-government or liberty are longed for and present themselves clearer to the mind of a people waxing in manliness and independence. Centralism may be national, but National Polity and Centralism are far from being equivalent terms. England, which has enjoyed a national polity long before other European countries, is to this day the least centralized state of Europe, and possesses a far higher degree of self-government than any people of the neighboring continent. Germany, although the Germans were called the German Nation in the early times of the emperors, never acquired a national polity, like the English, which dates from the days of Alfred, and is openly and liberally marked out by Magna Charta. There was an England with unbarred national intercommunication long before there was a national France, Spain, or Italy, or a political, national Germany.

The "Evil Tolls" of which the Great Charter of England speaks, and which included the arrogant extortion of tolls by feudal lords along the roads and rivers, and the custom-lines between the different provinces, were abolished on the continent at a much later period. The journal minutely kept by Albert Duerer, when called by Charles V. from Nuremberg to Ghent, gives an appalling picture of the former, and the latter were abolished in France only by the first revolution. Prussia has been at work ever since the Congress of Vienna to abolish the internal Evil Tolls in Germany, and at last succeeded in a measure. Happy, indeed, are we that our constitution forbids the "evil tolls" in this country.

Those large communities, which we call nations, were gradually formed on the continent of Europe out of the fragmentary peoples left by the disintegration of the Roman empire. The different processes of Nationalization form one of the most instructive subjects in the whole history of civilization. England dates the blessing of a national polity over a thousand years back, and in her alone liberty and nationality grew apace. Other nations are even now in the act of forming; others, already existing, are carrying out more distinctly or establishing more firmly the national elements of their polities. For this reason, and because the existence of

many nations at the same time deeply influences our civilization, the present period will be called the National Period. It began plainly when so many other great things began—when great events happened and great ideas burst upon mankind, and when inventions and discoveries were made, which ushered in the modern era—in the middle of the fifteenth century; that age when the conquering Mussulman tore the fairest portion from Europe, and thereby forced the restoration of letters and revival of inquiry upon her; when Europe lost Greece in the East, and sent Columbus to the West to discover our continent, and when, close upon this event, the still greater Reformation began at home.

The process of nationalizing the many dialects and jargons had begun in some countries—geographically marked as countries, but wholly unnationalized otherwise—at an earlier time. Dante, singing in the Tuscan dialect, raised it thus to the dignity of the language for all Italy, as later Luther by his own translation of the Bible, made his dialect the German language; and Dante, the greatest poet of his country, which he calls *Italia mia di dolor ostello* (the very inn of grief), because torn to pieces and lacking her destined nationality, became thus the first nationalizer of Italy in the thirteenth and at the beginning of the fourteenth century—five hundred years before Cavour; and now only has Germany made a vigorous movement toward her political nationalization, in which may Heaven bless her leaders' boldest acts.

## II.

### *What is a Nation in the Modern Sense of the Word?*

The word Nation, in the fullest adaptation of the term, means, in modern times, a numerous and homogeneous population (having long emerged from the hunter's and nomadic state), permanently inhabiting and cultivating a coherent territory, with a well-defined geographic outline, and a name of its own—the inhabitants speaking their own language, having their own literature and common institutions, which

distinguish them clearly from other and similar groups of people; being citizens or subjects of a unitary government, however subdivided it may be, and feeling an organic unity with one another, as well as being conscious of a common destiny. Organic intellectual and political internal unity, with proportionate strength, and a distinct and obvious demarcation, from similar groups, are notable elements of the idea of a modern nation in its fullest sense. A nation is a nation only when there is but one nationality; and the attempt at establishing a nationality within a nationality is more inconsistent and mischievous even than the establishment of "an empire within an empire."

No groupings of human beings, short of nations, are adequate to the high demands of modern civilization. Without a national character, States cannot obtain that longevity and continuity of political society which is necessary for our progress. Even our patriotism has become preëminently national. Modern patriotism is not satisfied with the narrow bounds of a city, as of old, or the limits of a province, though it be the fairest. Nothing but a Country, that is the dwelling-place of a nation, suffices for the *patria* of modern men. But the noblest sentiments and deeds and victories of sword or mind, even of ancient Greece, were of a Pan-Hellenic character. Greece never got, in her political life, beyond frail confederacies with the unavoidable, undefined, but forcibly asserted hegemony of some one State, but her Hellenism—her nationalism in all other respects—in religion, in literature, in the arts, in language and poetry, in philosophy, in republicanism, in colonization and commercial spirit, and indeed in every branch of high culture, blossomed forth everywhere. She died of crushing State sovereignty, which proved so fatal to Germany; to which Napoleon III. strongly desired to reduce Italy, and which was near to be our grave.

In the organic unity lies the chief difference between the words Nation and People. People generally means the aggregate of the inhabitants of a territory, without any additional idea, at least favorable idea. In all European languages, except the English, the words corresponding to People had ac-

quired the meaning of rabble, populace, the lowest and least respectable class. The French Dictionary of the Academy gave hardly another definition of the word *Peuple*; and in England alone, to her great honor, did it retain, or at any rate acquire at a very early period, an honorable meaning, as *Populus* had possessed a dignified meaning in the better times of Rome. While the French Academy thus ignominiously defined the word *People*, Chatham, when George III. had reluctantly appointed him premier, used to be called the People's Minister for "His Majesty's Secretary of State;" and, on the other hand, it was natural that Louis XV. was startled when first the word *Nation* came to be heard in the last century, in France. He is reported to have said: "Nation! What is Nation? Is there anything besides myself?" The remark seems to be too profound for a being such as he had sunk to be; but there can be no doubt that this supposed question indicated the sentiment of that portion of the French court which was led by the Jesuits, then as under the Spanish predominance, and as now, hostile to national organic unity and to nationalism in its varied manifestations.

Extensive and organized power over large populations does not suffice to make a nation. The Roman monarchy was no national empire; nor had the vast dominion of Charles the Fifth a national character. Prussia, ever since the Peace of Paris, in 1815, called one of the Five Great Powers, never formed a nation. She herself acknowledged, and still acknowledges, that the nation to which she belongs is the German nation, though not yet politically nationalized, as Martin Luther had called it in 1520, in his grand and inspiring letter "To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation on the Bettering of the Ghostly Class" (Clergy). Nor does common extraction and demarcating institutions, not even a peculiar religion, necessarily constitute a nation in the modern sense. The modern Jews dispersed over the globe have never consolidated into a nation. The Armenians with their many characteristics, of religion, language, and culture, form no nation. Nor does a common language alone constitute a nation. If Panslavism were ever so successful, there would

be no Panslavic nation ; nor can we properly speak, at present, of a Russian nation, however distinct the Russian empire may be. The Russian system has rather the tendency to trample out nationalities and national characteristics for the benefit of a gigantic bureaucracy, called Russia.

• In antiquity and the early middle ages there existed no nations in the modern sense, this side of China, with the only exception of the Israelites. There were Assyrian and Median and Persian empires, but no nations. The empires were called after the conquering and ruling tribe or race. Hence their sudden conquests and speedy annihilation.

The Mosaic constitution establishes the Israelites as different yet very closely related tribes wrought into a national sacerdotal government ; but, either the untoward surroundings of that people in close propinquity to fully developed, conquering Asiatic despotism, or the inaptitude for political development and organic congregation which seems to be common to the whole Semitic family, led the Israelites to disruption and secession long before their national government had fully and comprehensively developed itself. The history of the Hebrews is a saddening account of national humiliation and suicide.

The appointed and historic work of the Hebrews was to guard, in spite of their pagan pruriency, the idea of one God, Creator and Sustainer of all things and beings, through centuries of alluring, sensuous, and sometimes æsthetic polytheism around them. Political nationality was subordinate with them ; yet the fact ought to arrest our grave attention that the only monotheistic people, and the people for whom Moses legislated, formed, in the earliest times of history, a nation in the modern sense. The same cannot be said of ancient Egypt.

However striking a characteristic of a nation may be found in a separate language, and however important a separate name for a country or a nation may be, neither is absolutely necessary. We are an illustration. We have not our separate language ; and more than two distinctly separate nations may speak the English tongue, before the

Cis-Caucasian race passes into the twentieth century. But are we a nation ?

### III.

*The Americans form a Nation. The Vein of Nationality crops out from our earliest periods, and the sacrifices of our Civil War have been made for two objects, one of which was to save our indispensable Nationality.*

Some American publicists and statesmen consider the States, as now constituted, the preëxistent elements of our comprehensive polity ; somewhat as though the present reluctance of Nova Scotia to join the Canadian Union indicated a Nova-Scotian sovereignty preordained from the beginning. This is a radical error. The first States arose, in a great measure, out of the colonial governments, while the genesis of the later and far greater number of States is absolutely national ; and it is, indeed, a fact of moment in our history that thus comparatively small divisions of the country were formed and became normal, differing from the vice-royalties in Spanish America ; but there was nothing in these demarcations of the colonies or in the charters or the crown gifts, that had any intrinsic connection with a future sovereignty. The motives of these charters were often reprehensible ; the geographic demarcations frequently indicated by ignorance. What, however, really became important in the colonization of this portion of the globe, are the following things and circumstances which may be justly called factors of our growth and elements of our public life, in nearly all which our characteristics are the direct opposite to the elements of South American colonization.

The country in which our first colonists settled was an almost unbounded body of land, in the temperate zone, with an extensive coast and a dignified geography, a rewarding soil and rich in minerals ; thinly peopled by rovers in the hunter's stage of civilization ; extending from sea to sea, and situated between the Old and the Older World. The age at which

our settlers came hither was the age marked by two characteristics—the formation of nations and the struggle of fierce Spanish Catholicism against Protestantism. In the Netherlands Freedom had been victorious against sinister absolutism; in Germany the direst of all wars, the Thirty Years War, was raging, and Hugo Grotius published at the same time the first portion of his immortal work. It was that period at which in Spain Absolutism in politics, and the Inquisition and unlimited persecution had been fully developed, while in England, whence our settlers came, the people accustomed to freedom were preparing for resistance to rising and tentative absolutism. Our colonists belonged to the virile branch of the Teutonic race in England; they were protestants, they rather fled for peaceful existence than that they conquered and slaughtered populous tribes; they came from a country in which a national government had existed for centuries; the feudal estates had long been shaped into a representative system with Two Houses, and in which a Common, that is a National Law, had evolved itself in a great measure independent of the executive, containing manly principles of individual independence and self-government, with a position of the judiciary and the advocate which soon expanded in the noblest dimensions and led to the independence of the judiciary and to the position of the lawyer in North America, which had and continues to have a marked influence on our public life. The colonists brought no feudalism along with them; land was owned almost everywhere in fee simple; no lords, no peasants; and almost all the original settlers came from the independent middle class, from which nearly all freedom in the history of our race has come; and these settlers brought along with them that marked desire to establish common and higher schools with which the Reformation had everywhere leaped into life (the Bible and worship in the mother tongue, and grammar schools); they were experts in self-government; their country was in one of those periods which seem profusely gifted in literature—Shakspeare had but just died, and Milton began to lift his wings; and to all this

must be added that dark feature in the history of our proud race, that while the people struggled bravely for liberty in many portions, and when Europe had abolished slavery within her bosom, she introduced negro slavery in her colonies in America.\*

Our Cis-Caucasian race, which has been the keenest of all races in the pursuit of wealth, and the most systematically cruel in this pursuit and in religious persecution, developed this new slavery and slave-trade with a fiendish zeal and deplorable success. Slavery became thus also one of the factors of our public life, and we all know the bitter consequences to which it lead—the bitterest of all anachronisms.

Long before the American Independence was actually declared, the consciousness of our forming a national entirety was ripening. The Continental Congress used the words Country and America in its official acts—in resolutions and appointments—before that day of mark, the Fourth of July. The very name Continental Congress, Continental Army and Money, shows that the idea of a national unity was present to the minds of all—at home as well as abroad. Unfortunately no name had formed itself for our portion of the globe. No one can say in what bed our history would have coursed, had there been a distinct name for our country, and had Philadelphia become the national capital. Nothing seemed to offer itself for the formation of a name so fit as Americus, of which the German schoolmaster Waldseemüller formed the beautiful but cruelly unjust name for our entire hemisphere.† As it was, general names came to be used. North America was not unfrequently used to designate our country, as it is still in Germany and France. The bank which the Continental Congress established, May 25, 1781, in Philadelphia,

\* No more astounding fact exists in all history than this, that slavery was recognized as perfectly legal in the colonies, that is at a distance, but declared unable to stand before reason and justice at home. The case of Somerset was anticipated in France under Louis XIV.

† Waldseemüller, who barbarously changed his long name by græco-latinizing it into Hylacomilus, was a schoolmaster at Strasburg, and proposed the name America to the cosmographic academy of Loraine. Happily he showed more taste in making our name than in the transformation of his own.

after having received the all but desponding letter of General Washington, was called Bank of North America. It is called thus to this day. The seal of the Treasury of the United States, probably devised by Alexander Hamilton, as it may be seen on each of our legal tender notes, is: *Thesaur. Amer. Septem. Sigill.* (Seal of the Treasury of North America). If this seal is not of Hamilton's devising it must come from Robert Morris, but Robert Morris was Superintendent of the Finances; there was no Treasury before the year 1789, and it was in 1781 that the office of the "Superintendent of the Finances" was created. John Adams, and other writers of that period, frequently use North America. Chatham and his contemporaries always used the name America; Washington was appointed to the command in order to defend and protect "American liberty," before the Declaration of Independence. But whether there was a distinct name or not, all felt that we were a nation. United America, as the Italians now speak of United Italy, was another name used at the time, and later by Washington and others, for our country. John Adams ascribes to the speech of Otis against the Writs of Assistance, therefore before the outbreak of the Revolution, the power of having "breathed into this nation the breath of life;" and when Doctor Franklin, with Deane and Lee, were received as Ministers of the United States of America by the king of France on March 19, 1778, after the conclusion of the treaty between the two governments, the king spoke to Franklin of "the two nations."

The pre-revolutionary speeches, specimens of which are given in a modest but very instructive school book ("Patriotic Eloquence," by the late Mrs. Kirkland), show that the leading men of America had at that early period no other idea than that of a country, of our land; and that of a nation, of our people. The puny provincialism which unfolded itself under the insufficient Articles of Confederation, came into vogue after the heroic period of the Revolution, and it led the country to the very brink of ruin and extinction. So at least Washington and his contemporaries, who

knew the state of the country, with sympathetic patriotism and keen insight thought and wrote.

There were constant partial crystallizations of the colonies, united indeed under the British crown, but here demarcated by geographic lines the one from the other. Toward the end of the first half of the seventeenth century, the New England colonies confederated for common protection. Toward the end of the same century, in 1697, a proposition of union of the different colonies was made, as it is supposed with good reason, by William Penn, in "A brief and plain scheme, how the English colonies in the north parts of America, viz., Boston, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and Carolina, may be made more useful to the Crown and one another's peace and safety, with an universal concurrence."\* Equality of rights of property, and free ingress, egress, and abode, was proposed to be secured to all. In 1754, again fifty years later, Dr. Franklin drew up and proposed the (now called) Albany Plan of Union, unanimously adopted by the delegates at Albany, but not passed by the different assemblies—a plan which foreshadowed the later Union under the Continental Congress.

The time of resistance to England approached, and at every point it is to be observed that it is the "whole," as the Greeks called it, that moved and ultimately resisted; all exertions were instinctively national, or in the spirit of a nation to be born. Of the Declaration of Independence there shall be mentioned here three points only: It begins with calling the Americans *one people*, as contradistinguished to the people of the mother country, the other people; it calls Americans fellow-citizens, and it is Pan-American throughout. No separate independences, and, after this, no aggregate independence are spoken of; no separate complaint is even

---

\* The plan itself, and reasons why it is probable that it comes from William Penn, can be found in an Address delivered at Chester, before the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, on the 8th of November, 1851, by Edw. Armstrong, etc., etc., in Celebration of the 169th Anniversary of the Landing of William Penn at that place: Philadelphia, 1852—now of course rare, as pamphlets go.

alluded to.\* The Americans had always the national comprehensive English Constitution before their eyes—no provincial polity—and repeatedly referred to it.†

■ In 1777 The Articles of Confederation were adopted. They were called Articles, indeed, yet they are Articles of Confederation and 'Perpetual Union between the States; and in the official Letter of Congress, dated Yorktown, November 17, 1777, in which the States are advised to adopt the Articles, is this passage: "In short, the salutary measure can no longer be deferred. It seems essential to our very existence *as a free people.*" The Articles declare that "each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence," but no State had or has ever since enjoyed what the law and all the world call sovereignty, and moreover, the Articles themselves contain numerous passages of a plainly national character, some of them directly antagonistic to separate sovereignty; for instance, that provision in Article IX., according to which nine out of the thirteen sovereigns can bind, in the most momentous measures, the four remaining sovereigns of the thirteen. The Articles themselves, having declared each State sovereign, take from the States those powers which are universally considered the main attributes of sovereignty. Nevertheless, the Articles provided for no national government, no broad and open political formulation of our nationality; yet Congress, "supported by the confidence of the people, but without any express powers, undertook to direct the storm, and were seconded by the people and by the colonial authorities;" and after the presentation of the Articles to the States (not adopted by all until the year 1781), Congress proceeded as if invested with the most explicit powers; it even went so far as to bind the nation by treaties with France; nor was it thought necessary that those treaties should be ratified by

---

\* A notable passage on this subject in Reverdy Johnson's speech, in Proceedings at a Public Meeting of the Friends of the Union, Baltimore, January 10, 1861.

† Washington wrote to Congress, July 10, 1776, "that freedom and those privileges which have been and are refused us, contrary to the voice of nature and the British Constitution."

State legislatures.\* Under the Articles of Confederation, in 1782, the seal of the United States, with *E pluribus unum*, was adopted, and early in the year 1786 the oath of military officers and each one is made to swear that "he owes faith and true allegiance to the United States, and agrees to maintain its freedom, sovereignty, and independence." †

The period between the adoption of the articles and the Constitution is the most humiliating in our history. All our leading men acknowledged it, and well-nigh lost hope and confidence. It is a period far too little studied. The Articles of Confederation are known by very few. Disorganizing provincialism became more and more active and destructive, until a stop was put to the nuisance by the Constitution of the United States, the genesis of which is at least as important as the instrument itself. It is a national work from beginning to end, conceived by the living national spirit of "one people," in spite of destructive provincialism, and establishing a National Government in the fullest sense of the word. The instrument is called a Constitution, not Articles; the word sovereign does not appear once; a national legislature, the members of which vote individually and personally, not by States, and an eminently national and individual Executive, in the person of one man, are established, and a portion of the people or of the States (though it must be a large majority) can oblige the smaller portion to adopt amendments to the Constitution. No minority of *sovereigns*, however small, can be made subject to a majority of sovereigns, however large. This single fact would annihilate *sovereignty*. We are a nation. The general government was always called in the earlier years of our present government, the National Government, and justly so. The Constitution makes our polity a National Representative Republic. Ever since the establishment of our government two political schools have existed, with varying distinctions, the National one and the Provincial one, which has often

---

\* Lieber's Two Lectures on the Constitution of the United States. New York, 1861.

† Journals 417-462, March 14, 1786.

appeared to consider liberty to consist in a marring opposition to the National Government, which rejoiced in our not having a name for our country (which is a deficiency not quite unlike the deficiency of the English language itself in not possessing a word for *Patrie* or *Vaterland*), and openly declared the loosest possible confederacy the best of all governments, while the whole world was agreed to consider it in modern times the worst, and confederations good only in as far as they unite, and not as far as they sever.\*

We have had State rebellions; we have had Nullification, and we had a territorial rebellion fomented by State-Rights doctrine, coupled with the dark declaration of the divinity of slavery. Our people have gone through a sanguinary and laborious war in order to save and establish more firmly our nationality. We are a nation, and we mean to remain one.

The magnificent words, We, the People, with which the Constitution begins, have often been denied a national character. This absence of national character it was said, was indicated by the words which follow, viz., of the United States. Mr. Calhoun denied even the national character in the President of the United States, and allowed only a joint representation of the many different State sovereignties within his individuality, by what mysterious process it is impossible to see. It seems, however, that the meaning of We the People of the United States, did not appear to the secessionists so absolutely clear as not to require an alteration in the preamble of their constitution, as the reader will perceive from the following comparison of the preamble of our Constitution and that of the constitution adopted by "the Congress of the Confederate States of America," March 11, 1861.

---

\* A prominent and bitter State-Rights man and, later, Secessionist, praised, within my hearing, in a public speech, returning from a foreign mission, the then existing Germanic Confederacy as the best polity! And the most prominent State-Rights man, when I once said to him what a pity it was that no American Nelson ever could signal so stirring an order as "England expects, etc.," because we have no name for our country, promptly replied: "We have no country, and need no name for one; we ought to have only a name for a mere political system, as you call it."

*Preamble of the Constitution of the United States of America.*

We, the People of the United States,

in order to form a more perfect Union,  
 establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity,  
 provide for the common defence,  
 promote the general welfare,  
 and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity,

do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

*Preamble of the Constitution of the Confederate States of America.*

We, the People of the Confederate States, each State acting in its sovereign and independent character,

in order to form a permanent federal government,  
 establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity

(Left out.)

(Left out.)

and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity,

invoking the favor and guidance of Almighty God,

do ordain and establish this Constitution for the Confederate States of America.

#### IV.

##### *Political Characteristics of our Age.*

The three main characteristics of the political development which mark the modern epoch are :

The national polity.

The general endeavor to define more clearly, and to extend more widely, human rights and civil liberty, (not unconnected as this movement is with the pervading critical spirit of the age, and the wedlock of Knowledge and Labor, which marks the nineteenth century.)

And the decree which has gone forth that many leading nations shall flourish at one and the same time, plainly distinguished from one another, yet striving together, with one public opinion, under the protection of one law of nations, and in the bonds of one common moving civilization.

The universal monarchy, whether purely political, as that of the Romans was, or that attempted again by Napoleon I.; or whether coupled with the papacy, as cruelly attempted by Charles V., and especially by Philip II., under whom the war-cry was: "One Pope and One King;" a single leading nation; an agglomeration of States without a fundamental law, with the mere leadership or hegemony of one State or other, which always leads to Peloponnesian wars; regular confederacies of petty sovereigns; a civilization confined to one spot or portion of the globe—all these are obsolete ideas, wholly insufficient for the demands of advanced civilization, and attempts at their renewal have led and must lead to ruinous results, the end of all anachronisms recklessly pursued.

Even the course which civilization has steadily taken for thousands of years, from the southeast to the northwest, has ceased in our times. It now spreads for the first time in all directions, and bends its way back to the Orient. The old historic belt between 30° and 50° northern latitude, within which the great current of events has flown, shall confine history no more.

All great ideas which have set whole periods and entire races in motion, and which ultimately are established in great institutions, have their caricatures—often fierce and sanguinary. Communism is thus a caricature of one of these characteristics, and the recently proclaimed anti-nationalism another. All division into nations is to be done away with; all Europe is to be one ant-hill! But why only Europe? Let it be repeated, every idea in history, even the greatest and the holiest, has its hideous caricature.

## V.

### *Inter-Dependence of Individuals and Nations. The Commonwealth of Nations.*

The multiplicity of civilized nations, their distinct independence (without which there would be enslaving Universal Monarchy), and their increasing resemblance and agreement,

are some of the great safeguards of our civilization. Modern nations of our family have come to agree in much, and the agreement is growing. We have one alphabet; the same systems of notation, arithmetical and musical; one division of the circle and of time; the same sea-league; the same barometer; one mathematical language; one music and the same fine arts; one system of education, high and low; one science; one division of government; one domestic economy; one dress and fashion; the same manners, and the same toys for our children (Asia and Africa have no toys): we have a united mail system, and uniting telegraphs; we have an extending agreement in measures, weights, coinage, and signals at sea, and one financial conception, so that all merchants' exchanges have become meetings of international import, at least of equal effect with that of international diplomacy; we have a rapidly extending international copyright; perfectly acknowledged foreign individual property; we have a common international law, even during war. Add to this, that we really have what has been, not inaptly, called an international literature, in which a Shakespeare and a Kepler, a Franklin, Humboldt, Grotius, and Voltaire are belonging to the whole Cis-Caucasian race; we have a common history of Civilization; and Columbus and Frederic, Napoleon and Washington, for weel or woe, belong to all.

Formerly the process of nationalization was appearing as one of the novel things; now the process of inter-nationalization is going on; and yet there will be no obliteration of nationalities. If such were the case, civilization would be seriously injured. Civilization always dwelled preëminently in ancient times with one people, and one government always swayed and led. Hence the simplicity of chronologic tables presenting the events of that time; and all ancient States were short-lived. Once declining, they never recovered. Their course was that of the projectile: ascending, a maximum, a precipitate descent, and no more rising. Modern nations are long-lived, and possess recuperative energy wholly unknown to antiquity. They could neither be the one nor possess the other without national existence and comprehensive politics,

and without the law of nations, in its modern and elevated sense, in which it is at once the manly idea of self-government applied to a number of independent nations in close relation with one another, and the application of the fundamental law of Good Neighborhood, and the comprehensive law of Nuisance, flowing from it, to vast national societies, wholly independent, sovereign, yet bound together by a thousand ties.

The all-pervading law of inter-dependence, without which men would never have felt compelled to form society, beyond the narrowest family ties—and it is even one of the elementary principles of the family—inter-dependence which like all original principles or characteristics of humanity, increases in intensity and spreads in action as men advance,—this divine law of inter-dependence applies to nations quite as much as to individuals.

The individual division of labor is no more impelled by it, than the production by territorial and climatic division of labor is quickened by the mutual dependence of the dwellers on the earth. This propitious and civilizing inter-dependence among nations is becoming daily more freely and willingly acknowledged, and the wise saying, *Ubi Societas ibi Jus*, finds constantly increasing application to entire nations. The civilized nations have come to constitute a community, and are daily forming more and more a commonwealth of nations, under the restraint and protection of the law of nations, which has begun to make its way even to countries not belonging to the Christian community, to which the Law of Nations had been confined. Our Wheaton's Law of Nations has been translated into Chinese, and is distributed by the government of that empire among its high officials. Soon it will form a subject of the Chinese higher state examination. The leading nations—the French, the English, the German, the American—they draw the chariot of civilization abreast, as the ancient steeds drew the car of victory : and these pages are writing at the time when the imperial chancellor of the German Union has been directed by the Union's parliament to propose to all nations the perfect security of private prop-

erty on the high seas during war, even though belonging to an enemy ; and when a citizen of the American Republic has entered our city, at the head of a Chinese embassy, sent to the great Western Powers in America and Europe, for the avowed purpose of attaching China to that Union of Nations among whom the Law of Nations has its sway in peace and in war.

