

the lakes to the Polar Sea. They are all drawing their ideals from the facts of the past, and there is surely great reason to enquire whether, like their predecessors who did the same in previous ages, *they will not all be disappointed.*

One might reach such a conclusion merely from a consideration of the fate which has awaited ideals similarly founded in the past. But it is desirable, and may be possible, to discover why the system of national States should be no farther developed, and what conditions are to arise to take its place.

In political institutions, as in nature, there are two tendencies which seem antagonistic, but which are, nevertheless, capable of reconciliation. There is the tendency to unity and the tendency to diversity. In nature, their reconciliation is complete, and this is the true secret of her charm. In man, however, who is a moral being, such a reconciliation can only be attained by incessant struggle and conflict, by long centuries of striving and seeming failure. Man loves unity, and he loves diversity. In other words, he loves law and he loves freedom, because both are necessary to the completest development of his being. On the other hand, he hates despotism, and he hates anarchy; for each alike leads to stagnation and inevitable death. He is weak and imperfect. In his strivings after the ideal, he runs now to one extreme, now to another. Yet the main result has been permanent, substantial progress. In Greece, the tendency to diversity prevailed. Each city tenaciously maintained, if it could, its independence of the rest. The City-State became the ideal State. But the tendency, of course, went to extremes, and produced dissension and decay. The evil, nevertheless, brought its own cure. In the struggle of city with city, the strongest survived,—rose to empire and ruled the rest. Instead of Grecian diversity, we now have Roman unity. An universal em-

pire became the ideal State. This, too, in turn was carried to extremes. Excessive unity brought stagnation and decline. Yet as before, the excess of evil wrought its own cure. The desperate strivings of the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire, for universal dominion, and their vain struggles with each other during the middle ages, left the nations free to develop individual strength; and when they were formed, the Reformation and the Thirty Years' War overturned both Empire and Papacy together. Instead of Roman unity, we now have European national diversity. The National State has become our ideal State. We are little wiser than our forefathers, and there is reason to fear that we, too, are going to extremes. We have swung far round in the direction of diversity. Everywhere, as we have seen, vigorous efforts are being made to establish or maintain a national individuality. There is danger here, because in the struggle, economic or military, of modern nation with nation, as in that of ancient city with city, the strongest only will survive and rule. Excessive national individuality means excessive diversity and the ultimate triumph of force. Across the sea from Greece a great Republic arose, whose people were intensely patriotic, and thoroughly believed in their own high destiny. That Republic conquered and ruled the world, and became an Empire through the force of economic conditions. Across the sea from Europe there has arisen another great Republic, whose people are intensely patriotic, and believe as thoroughly in their own high and peculiar destiny, and in which the centralization of wealth is going on as rapidly as it did in Rome. If that Republic included the whole Northern continent,—if all the inhabitants of North America were assimilated to each other, and differentiated from the nations of Europe,—if, in a word, national individuality were here carried to a far extreme, we have a