

successors to govern in a constitutional manner; (2) they may be created by a nation when it has thrown off its old form of government; (3) they may be created by a new community when it enters upon organized political life; (4) they may arise by the tightening of a looser tie than has theretofore existed.

As regards the stability of rigid Constitutions, they cannot be stretched to meet revolution half way. When a Constitution will not bend, the discontent of the people may find vent in a revolution or civil war. (Slavery question in U.S.)

Broadly speaking, two methods of amending a rigid Constitution are in use. (1) That which gives the function to the Legislature. (2) That which gives the function to the people. It has often happened that constitutional amendments prepared by the Legislature have been rejected by the people, because fuller discussion revealed objections whose weight had not been appreciated when the proposal first appeared.

Regarding the probable future of the two types with which we have been dealing, two reasons suggest themselves which predict the prevalence of the rigid type. (1) That no new flexible Constitutions have been born into the world for many years past. (2) That no country now possessing a rigid Constitution seems likely to change it for a flexible one. The countries which have flexible Constitutions are not likely to change them, for in the United Kingdom, at any rate, the people are not likely to part with the free play and elastic power of their historical Cabinet and Parliamentary system.

G. C. O'KEEFE, '16.



The idea of utility is always inimical to the idea of wit.

—*Sydney Smith.*

Mathematical truth is not the only truth in the world.

—*Leigh Hunt.*