Historians have struggled to give a clear definition to the progressive movement. In general, it was a mood among middle-class professionals that order needed to be imposed on the chaotic American free enterprise system. Progressives addressed most of the same concerns as the Populists, but did so from a broader base, in a less angry, alienated, and apocalyptic way, for many progressives were themselves the products of the economic system that they sought to reform. Thus, the progressive movement was thoroughly ambivalent, and progressives frequently took opposite sides on many issues, and produced contradictory legislation, and often faced unintended consequences. But the one unifying theme of progressivism was statism: At one level or another, progressives called for increased governmental power to deal with social problems. It was in this period that the term “liberal” was inverted from its nineteenth century laissez-faire to its twentieth century big-government definition.

Progressives usually favored the expansion of executive power, seeing nineteenth-century politics dominated by legislatures and courts, and above all by corrupt parties in cahoots with business interests. Woodrow Wilson, an academic political scientist before entering politics, was a pivotal progressive theorist. Wilson was the first prominent thinker to argue that the founders’ constitutional system had become obsolete and needed to be radically altered. Reflecting the evolutionary ethos of the era, Wilson argued that a constitution was an organism that must grow and adapt, or die. Federalism, separation of powers, checks-and-balances—the various devices by which the Constitution limited government power—now rendered the government incapable of dealing with contemporary problems.

There is one great basic fact which underlies all the questions that are discussed on the political platform at the present moment. That singular fact is that nothing is done in this country as it was done twenty years ago.

We are in the presence of a new organization of society. Our life has broken away from the past. The life of America is not the life that it was twenty years ago; it is not the life that it was ten years ago. We have changed our economic conditions, absolutely, from top to bottom; and, with our economic society, the organization of our life. The old political formulas do not fit the present problems; they read now like documents taken out of a forgotten age. The older cries sound as if they belonged to a past age which men have almost forgotten. Things which used to be put into the party platforms of ten years ago would sound antiquated if put into a platform now. We are facing the necessity of fitting a new social organization, as we did once fit the old organization, to the happiness and prosperity of the great body of citizens; for we are conscious that the new order of society has not been made to fit and provide the convenience or prosperity of the average man. The life of the nation has grown infinitely varied. It does not centre now upon questions of governmental structure or of the distribution of governmental powers. It centers upon questions of the very structure and operation of society itself, of which government is only the instrument. Our development has run so fast and so far along the lines sketched in the earlier day of constitutional definition, has so crossed and interlaced those lines, has piled upon them such novel structures of trust and combination, has elaborated within them a life so manifold, so full of forces which transcend the boundaries of the country itself and fill the eyes of the world, that a new nation seems to have been created which the old formulas do not fit or afford a vital interpretation of.

We have come upon a very different age from any that preceded us. We have come upon an age when we do not do business in the way in which we used to do business—when we do not carry on any of the operations of manufacture, sale, transportation, or communication as men used to carry them on. There is a sense in which in our day the individual has been submerged. In most parts of our country men work, not for themselves, not as partners in the old way in which they used to work, but generally as employees—in a higher or lower grade—of great corporations. There was a time when corporations played a very minor part in our business affairs, but now they play the chief part, and most men are the servants of corporations.

You know what happens when you are the servant of a corporation. You have in no instance access to the men who are really determining the policy of the corporation. If the corporation is doing the things that it ought not to do,
you really have no voice in the matter and must obey the orders, and you have
oftentimes with deep mortification to co-operate in the doing of things which
you know are against the public interest. Your individuality is swallowed up in
the individuality and purpose of a great organization.

It is true that, while most men are thus submerged in the corporation, a
few, a very few, are exalted to a power which as individuals they could never
have wielded. Through the great organizations of which they are the heads,
a few are enabled to play a part unprecedented by anything in history in the
control of the business operations of the country and in the determination of
the happiness of great numbers of people.

Yesterday, and ever since history began, men were related to one another
as individuals. To be sure there were the family, the Church, and the state,
institutions which associated men in certain wide circles of relationship. But
in the ordinary concerns of life, in the ordinary work, in the daily round, men
dealt freely and directly with one another. Today, the everyday relationships of
men are largely with great impersonal concerns, with organizations, not with
other individual men.

Now this is nothing short of a new social age, a new era of human relation-
ships, a new stage-setting for the drama of life....

There has come over the land that un-American set of conditions which
enables a small number of men who control the government to get favors from
the government; by those favors to exclude their fellows from equal business
opportunity; by those favors to extend a network of control that will presently
dominate every industry in the country, and so make men forget the ancient
time when America lay in every hamlet, when America was to be seen in every
fair valley, when America displayed her great forces on the broad prairies, ran her
fine fires of enterprise up over the mountain-sides and down into the bowels of
the earth, and eager men were everywhere captains of industry, not employees;
not looking to a distant city to find out what they might do, but looking about
among their neighbors, finding credit according to their character, not according
to their connections, finding credit in proportion to what was known to be in
them and behind them, not in proportion to the securities they held that were
approved where they were not known. In order to start an enterprise now, you
have to be authenticated, in a perfectly impersonal way, not according to yourself,
but according to what you own that somebody else approves of your owning. You
cannot begin such an enterprise as those that have made America until you are
so authenticated, until you have succeeded in obtaining the good-will of large
allied capitalists. Is that freedom? That is dependence, not freedom.

We used to think in the old-fashioned days when life was very simple
that all that government had to do was to put on a policeman’s uniform, and
say, “Now don’t anybody hurt anybody else.” We used to say that the ideal of
government was for every man to be left alone and not interfered with, except
when he interfered with somebody else; and that the best government was
the government that did as little governing as possible. That was the idea that
obtained in Jefferson’s time. But we are coming now to realize that life is so
complicated that we are not dealing with the old conditions, and that the law
has to step in and create new conditions under which we may live, the condi-
tions which will make it tolerable for us to live.

Let me illustrate what I mean: It used to be true in our cities that every
family occupied a separate house of its own, that every family had its own little
premises, that every family was separated in its life from every other family. That
is no longer the case in our great cities. Families live in tenements, they live in
flats, they live on floors; they are piled layer upon layer in the great tenement
houses of our crowded districts, and not only are they piled layer upon layer,
but they are associated room by room, so that there is in every room, sometimes,
in our congested districts, a separate family. In some foreign countries they
have made much more progress than we in handling these things. In the city
of Glasgow, for example (Glasgow is one of the model cities of the world), they
have made up their minds that the entries and the hallways of great tenements
are public streets. Therefore, the policeman goes up the stairway and patrols
the corridors; the lighting department of the city sees to it that the halls are
abundantly lighted. The city does not deceive itself into supposing that great
building is a unit from which the police are to keep out and the civic authority
to be excluded, but it says: “These are public highways, and light is needed in
them, and control by the authority of the city.”

I liken that to our great modern industrial enterprises. A corporation is
very like a large tenement house; it isn’t the premises of a single commercial
family; it is just as much a public affair as a tenement house is a network of
public highways….

…I used to say, when I had to do with the administration of an educational
institution,1 that I should like to make the young gentlemen of the rising
generation as unlike their fathers as possible. Not because their fathers lacked
character or intelligence or knowledge or patriotism, but because their fathers,
by reason of their advancing years and their established position in society, had
lost touch with the processes of life; they had forgotten what it was to begin;
they had forgotten what it was to rise; they had forgotten what it was to be
dominated by the circumstances of their life on their way up from the bottom
to the top, and, therefore, they were out of sympathy with the creative, forma-
tive, and progressive forces of society.

1Wilson was president of Princeton University (1902–1910).
Progress! Did you ever reflect that that word is almost a new one? No word comes more often or more naturally to the lips of modern man, as if the thing it stands for were almost synonymous with life itself, and yet men through many thousand years never talked or thought of progress. They thought in the other direction. Their stories of heroisms and glory were tales of the past. The ancestor wore the heavier armor and carried the larger spear. “There were giants in those days.” Now all that has altered. We think of the future, not the past, as the more glorious time in comparison with which the present is nothing. Progress, development—those are modern words. The modern idea is to leave the past and press onward to something new.

But what is progress going to do with the past, and with the present? How is it going to treat them? With ignominy, or respect? Should it break with them altogether, or rise out of them, with its roots still deep in the older time? What attitude shall progressives take toward the existing order, toward those institutions of conservatism, the Constitution, the laws, and the courts?

Are those thoughtful men who fear that we are now about to disturb the ancient foundations of our institutions justified in their fear? If they are, we ought to go very slowly about the processes of change. If it is indeed true that we have grown tired of the institutions which we have so carefully and sedulously built up, then we ought to go very slowly and very carefully about the very dangerous task of altering them. We ought, therefore, to ask ourselves, first of all, whether thought in this country is tending to do anything by which we shall retrace our steps, or by which we shall change the whole direction of our development?

I believe, for one, that you cannot tear up ancient rootages and safely plant the tree of liberty in soil which is not native to it. I believe that the ancient traditions of a people are its ballast; you cannot make a tabula rasa upon which to write a political program. You cannot take a new sheet of paper and determine what your life shall be tomorrow. You must knit the new into the old. You cannot put a new patch on an old garment without ruining it; it must be not a patch, but something woven into the old fabric, of practically the same pattern, of the same texture and intention. If I did not believe that to be progressive was to preserve the essentials of our institutions, I for one could not be a progressive.

One of the chief benefits I used to derive from being president of a university was that I had the pleasure of entertaining thoughtful men from all over the world. I cannot tell you how much has dropped into my granary by their presence. I had been casting around in my mind for something by which to draw
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2 Tabula rasa—blank slate
several parts of my political thought together when it was my good fortune to entertain a very interesting Scotsman who had been devoting himself to the philosophical thought of the seventeenth century. His talk was so engaging that it was delightful to hear him speak of anything, and presently there came out of the unexpected region of his thought the thing I had been waiting for. He called my attention to the fact that in every generation all sorts of speculation and thinking tend to fall under the formula of the dominant thought of the age. For example, after the Newtonian Theory of the universe had been developed, almost all thinking tended to express itself in the analogies of the Newtonian Theory, and since the Darwinian Theory has reigned amongst us, everybody is likely to express whatever he wishes to expound in terms of development and accommodation to environment.

Now, it came to me, as this interesting man talked, that the Constitution of the United States had been made under the dominion of the Newtonian Theory. You have only to read the papers of *The Federalist* to see that fact written on every page. They speak of the “checks and balances” of the Constitution, and use to express their idea the simile of the organization of the universe, and particularly of the solar system—how by the attraction of gravitation the various parts are held in their orbits; and then they proceeded to represent Congress, the judiciary, and the President as a sort of imitation of the solar system.

They were only following the English Whigs, who gave Great Britain its modern constitution. Not that those Englishmen analyzed the matter, or had any theory about it; Englishmen care little for theories. It was a Frenchman, Montesquieu, who pointed out to them how faithfully they had copied Newton’s description of the mechanism of the heavens.

The makers of our Federal Constitution read Montesquieu with true scientific enthusiasm. They were scientists in their way—the best way of their age—those fathers of the nation. Jefferson wrote of “the laws of Nature”—and then by way of afterthought—“and of Nature’s God.” And they constructed a government as they would have constructed an orrery—to display the laws of nature. Politics in their thought was a variety of mechanics. The Constitution was founded on the law of gravitation. The government was to exist and move by virtue of the efficacy of “checks and balances.”

The trouble with the theory is that government is not a machine, but a living thing. It falls not under the theory of the universe, but under the theory of organic life. It is accountable to Darwin, not to Newton. It is modified by its environment, necessitated by its tasks, shaped to its functions by the sheer pressure of life. No living thing can have its organs offset against each other as checks and live. On the contrary, its life is dependent upon their quick cooperation, their ready response to the commands of instinct or intelligence, their
amicable community of purpose. Government is not a body of blind forces; it is a body of men, with highly differentiated functions, no doubt, in our modern day, of specialization, with a common task and purpose. Their co-operation is indispensable, their warfare fatal. There can be no successful government without the intimate, instinctive co-ordination of the organs of life and action. This is not theory, but fact, and displays its force as fact, whatever theories may be thrown across its track. Living political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice. Society is a living organism and must obey the laws of life, not of mechanics; it must develop.

All that progressives ask or desire is permission—in an era when “development,” “evolution,” is the scientific word—to interpret the Constitution according to the Darwinian principle; all they ask is recognition of the fact that a nation is a living thing and not a machine.

Some citizens of this country have never got beyond the Declaration of Independence, signed in Philadelphia, July 4th, 1776. Their bosoms swell against George III, but they have no consciousness of the war for freedom that is going on today.

The Declaration of Independence did not mention the questions of our day. It is of no consequence to us unless we can translate its general terms into examples of the present day and substitute them in some vital way for the examples it itself gives, so concrete, so intimately involved in the circumstances of the day in which it was conceived and written. It is an eminently practical document, meant for the use of practical men; not a thesis for philosophers, but a whip for tyrants; not a theory of government, but a program of action. Unless we can translate it into the questions of our own day, we are not worthy of it, we are not the sons of the sires who acted in response to its challenge.

What form does the contest between tyranny and freedom take today? What is the special form of tyranny we now fight? How does it endanger the rights of the people, and what do we mean to do in order to make our contest against it effectual? What are to be the items of our new declaration of independence?

By tyranny, as we now fight it, we mean control of the law, of legislation, and adjudication by organizations which do not represent the people, by means which are private and selfish. We mean, specifically, the conduct of our affairs and the shaping of our legislation in the interest of special bodies of capital and those who organize their use. We mean the alliance, for this purpose, of political machines with selfish business. We mean the exploitation of the people by legal and political means. We have seen many of our governments under these influences cease to be representative governments, cease to be governments representative of the people, and become governments representative of
special interests, controlled by machines, which in their turn are not controlled by the people.

Sometimes, when I think of the growth of our economic system, it seems to me as if, leaving our law just about where it was before any of the modern inventions or developments took place, we had simply at haphazard extended the family residence, added an office here and a workroom there, and a new set of sleeping rooms there, built up higher on our foundations, and put out little lean-tos on the side, until we have a structure that has no character whatever. Now, the problem is to continue to live in the house and yet change it.

Well, we are architects in our time, and our architects are also engineers. We don't have to stop using a railroad terminal because a new station is being built. We don't have to stop any of the processes of our lives because we are re-arranging the structures in which we conduct those processes. What we have to undertake is to systematize the foundations of the house, then to thread all the old parts of the structure with the steel which will be laced together in modern fashion, accommodated to all the modern knowledge of structural strength and elasticity, and then slowly change the partitions, relay the walls, let in the light through new apertures, improve the ventilation; until finally, a generation or two from now, the scaffolding will be taken away, and there will be the family in a great building whose noble architecture will at last be disclosed, where men can live as a single community, co-operative as in a perfected, co-ordinated beehive, not afraid of any storm of nature, not afraid of any artificial storm, any imitation of thunder and lightning, knowing that the foundations go down to the bedrock of principle, and knowing that whenever they please they can change that plan again and accommodate it as they please to the altering necessities of their lives.

But there are a great many men who don't like the idea. Some wit recently said, in view of the fact that most of our American architects are trained in a certain École in Paris, that all American architecture in recent years was either bizarre or “Beaux Arts.” I think that our economic architecture is decidedly bizarre; and I am afraid that there is a good deal to learn about matters other than architecture from the same source from which our architects have learned a great many things. I don't mean the School of Fine Arts at Paris, but the experience of France; for from the other side of the water men can now hold up against us the reproach that we have not adjusted our lives to modern conditions to the same extent that they have adjusted theirs. I was very much interested in some of the reasons given by our friends across the Canadian border for being very shy about the reciprocity arrangements. They said: “We are not sure whither these arrangements will lead, and we don't care to associate too closely with the economic conditions of the United States until those conditions are as modern
as ours.” And when I resented it, and asked for particulars, I had, in regard to
many matters, to retire from the debate. Because I found that they had adjusted
their regulations of economic development to conditions we had not yet found
a way to meet in the United States.

Well, we have started now at all events. The procession is under way. The
stand-patter doesn't know there is a procession. He is asleep in the back part of
his house. He doesn't know that the road is resounding with the tramp of men
going to the front. And when he wakes up, the country will be empty. He will
be deserted, and he will wonder what has happened. Nothing has happened.
The world has been going on. The world has a habit of going on. The world
has a habit of leaving those behind who won't go with it. The world has always
neglected stand-patters. And, therefore, the stand-patter does not excite my
indignation; he excites my sympathy. He is going to be so lonely before it is
all over. And we are good fellows, we are good company; why doesn't he come
along? We are not going to do him any harm. We are going to show him a good
time. We are going to climb the slow road until it reaches some upland where
the air is fresher, where the whole talk of mere politicians is stilled, where men
can look in each other's faces and see that there is nothing to conceal, that all
they have to talk about they are willing to talk about in the open and talk about
with each other; and whence, looking back over the road, we shall see at last
that we have fulfilled our promise to mankind. We had said to all the world,
“America was created to break every kind of monopoly, and to set men free,
upon a footing of equality, upon a footing of opportunity, to match their brains
and their energies.” And now we have proved that we meant it.