

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

The National Society Magna Charta Dames



Addresses by

**DANIEL R. RANDALL
DANIEL O. HASTINGS
GEORGE H. HOUSTON**

Printed

July, 1936

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons



Mrs. George Harrison Houston

née Mary Stuart Hoge

President of the National Society

Magna Charta Dames

Mrs. Houston is also a Vice-President of
The Colonial Dames of America
and President General of
The Sovereign Colonial Society Americans of Royal Descent

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

Instituted March 1, 1909



Addresses by

DANIEL R. RANDALL
DANIEL O. HASTINGS
GEORGE H. HOUSTON

Printed July, 1936

Additional Copies may be obtained
by addressing the Secretary at P. O. Box No. 4222,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons



MRS. JAMES LEE GILLOGLY

née Lydia Lucelia Webster

1846 - 1936

Honorary President

The National Society Magna Charta Dames

"I feel a little tired and think I shall take a nap," said Mrs. Gillogly as her daughter Laura was reading to her. With these words she fell asleep, to awaken in glory.

Her life expressed to the fullest the best traditions of our heritage.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

In Memoriam

By SARAH LOUISE KIMBALL

Mrs. James Lee Gillogly, née Lydia Lucelia Webster, was born April 22, 1846, at Wethersfield Springs, New York, and died July 15, 1936, at her home in Alameda, California. She was the daughter of Abel and Caroline (Doolittle) Webster, of Wethersfield Springs, N. Y., and a descendant of Rev. Peter Bulkeley and his son, Rev. Gershom Bulkeley, whose wife was a daughter of Rev. Charles Chauncey; also of Gov. John Webster, Hon. Abraham Doolittle, John Savage and other founders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Hartford and New Haven, Connecticut. A graduate of Albany State Normal School, 1863, she was married June 30, 1870, to Rev. James Lee Gillogly, born December 23, 1843, at Lancaster, N. Y., died February 14, 1881; a graduate of St. Stephen's College, 1867, Berkeley Divinity School, 1870. He was the first Protestant Episcopal missionary to the Mormons in Ogden, Utah.

They were the parents of five children: (1) Helen Lucelia Gillogly, hereditary member of The National Society Magna Charta Dames in right of her mother, married George Starling Waterman of Fresno, California. She died March 4, 1931, leaving a son and a daughter Katherine Church Waterman, now Mrs. Edward A. Leyden, who has succeeded her mother as Mrs. Gillogly's successor in the Society. (2) James Webster Gillogly, married Clarah Belle Haven, and lives at Monterey. (3) Matthew Lee Gillogly, of San Francisco and San Rafael, married Zoe Henrietta Devoy, and has a son and three daughters. (4) Laura Louise Gillogly, married William George Hansen of Fresno, California, and has two surviving sons. (5) William Jay Syms Gillogly, who married Alice H. Gallagher, and was with his mother when the end came.

Mrs. Gillogly was a delegate to the Pan-Anglican Congress, London, 1908. She had always taken a great interest in family history and was a member of many patriotic societies, having been a charter member of Copa de Oro Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Alameda; also member of the National Society of The Colonial Dames of America resident in the State of California; California Chapter Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America; Daughters of Colonial Governors; National Society United States Daughters of 1812; The Huguenot Society of South Carolina; The Sovereign Colonial Society Americans of Royal Descent; The Colonial Order of the Crown; The Society of Descendants of Knights of the Most Noble Order of the Garter; The National Society Magna Charta Dames (Honorary President); the Adelpian Literary Club of Alameda (past president); the California Genealogical Society; the Institute of American Genealogy; Red Cross; and various Episcopal Church affiliations.

KING JOHN

A Poem by LYDIA H. SIGOURNEY

There stands at Runnymede a king,
 While summer clothes the plains,
 The blood of high Plantagenet
 Is coursing through his veins;
 But yet a sceptred hand he lifts
 To shade his haggard brow,
 As if constrained to do a deed
 His pride would disallow.

He pauses still; his faint eye rests
 Upon those barons bold,
 Whose hands are grappling to their swords
 With fierce and sudden hold.
 That pause is broke; he bows him down
 Before those steel girt men,
 And glorious Magna Charta glows
 Beneath his trembling pen.

His false lip to a smile is wreathed,
 As their exulting shout,
 From 'neath the green, embowering trees,
 Upon the gale swells out;
 Yet lingers long his cowering glance
 On Thames' translucent tide,
 As if some deep and bitter thought
 He from the throng would hide.

I know what sounds are in his ear,
 When wrathful tempests roll,
 When God doth bid his lightnings search,
 His thunders try the soul;
 Above the blast young Arthur's shriek
 Doth make the murderer quake,
 As if again his guiltless blood
 From Rouen's prison spake.

But though no red volcano burst
 To overwhelm the men of crime,
 No vengeful earthquake fiercely yawn
 To gorge them ere their time,
 Though Earth for her most guilty sons
 The festive board doth set,
 The wine-cup and the opiate draught,
 Yet say, can Heaven forget?

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons



BALTIMORE, the city of magnificent distances, was the scene of the gathering for the autumn meeting of the Society. On November 11, 1935, the Baltimore members and a few friends were entertained by Mrs. Alexander Gordon at a reception at her home, No. 1009 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland, in honor of Mrs. George Harrison Houston, President of the Society, the guests having been invited to meet the President, the Regents, and other officers. Mrs. Gordon's charming hospitality will long be remembered.

Magna Charta Dames Luncheon

Hotel Belvedere

November 12, 1935

This annual celebration of Barons' Day was observed at the Hotel Belvedere on November 12, 1935, members of the Society and their guests, both men and women, journeying to Baltimore from all parts of the country. This meeting was held in commemoration of the first assembly of the Barons in the year 1214 at St. Edmundsbury when they pledged themselves to bring King John to terms. A memorable one was this, the 721st anniversary.

Seen at the President's table, seated from left to right, were:

Mrs. Benjamin Harris Brewster	Mrs. George Harrison Houston
Mrs. Tunstall Smith	Mrs. George Dallas Dixon
Mrs. James Francis Sullivan	Rev. Arthur B. Kinsolving, D.D.
Mrs. Pierce Butler	Miss Margaret A. Lennig
Mrs. Alexander Gordon	Mrs. John S. Wurts
Mrs. James Starr	Mrs. William S. Hallowell
Hon. Daniel R. Randall	Mrs. de Courcy Wright Thom

The tables, beautifully decorated with red and gold ribbon and flowers, presented indeed an attractive scene.

Mrs. Houston called upon Dr. Kinsolving to offer the invocation.

Invocation

November 12, 1935

offered by

The Rev. Arthur B. Kinsolving, D.D.



GOD our Father, Ancient of Days, Thou art our refuge, our guide, and our hope. Thou keepest watch above the shadows. Thou dost beckon us on to higher and nobler visions through all the changes and chances of this mortal life, for **Thou** art ever whispering, "Behold, I make all things new."

We remember gratefully today the note of freedom from oppression sounded by the Barons of Runnymede seven centuries ago. As they stood forth as champions of their liberties, secular and religious, so may we prove ourselves as their true successors the worthy guardians of our own. Thy providence has given us a free country and great opportunities. Give us a deeper sense of gratitude for Thy goodness. By Thy Spirit move us to be more helpful to our Church, our country, and to everyone far and near. Open our eyes to see the vanity of this world's riches and rewards, and make us understand that living men are Thy glory. May we not be beguiled by the pleas of custom and expediency, but may we do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with our **God**, remembering that to whom much is given, of him shall much be required, may we each in our generation endeavor to set forward the welfare of this nation, whither the peoples of all languages have come. Help us to be noble and great-hearted citizens, and a spring of hope to all nations. Through **Jesus Christ** our Lord. Amen.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

In introducing Mrs. Houston, Mrs. George Dallas Dixon said:

*Madam President, Officers and Members of the
National Society Magna Charta Dames:*

I have a two-fold pleasure in being here today. The first is because it was in this beautiful and hospitable city of Baltimore that I spent six of the happiest years of my life, and it is a joy to meet again friends whose kindness and courtesy to me, a stranger, I shall never forget.

Then, too, I have the honor of presenting to you a lady who unites the charm and graciousness of a daughter of the South, with the ability, the efficiency, and the dignity of her long line of distinguished ancestors. It gives me pleasure to present to you our President, Mrs. George Harrison Houston.

Mrs. Houston responded: I also must confess to a two-fold purpose in asking Mrs. Dixon to introduce me. The first is that I am very devoted to her and count her as one of my very good friends. The second is that I thought she might say something nice about me, and as you have heard, I was amply justified.

I really am very happy to be here today and to acknowledge my deep appreciation of the honor which you have conferred upon me in choosing me to be your President.

When I joined the Society in 1929, shortly before going to Philadelphia to live, I had no idea that it would come to mean so much to me. Some of my happiest associations there have come through it. I soon came to know and love our President, Mrs. Large, and my friendship with her is a very treasured memory.

In the last year of her life, she frequently urged me to take her place as President, but I did not feel that I could even try to do so. Now that she is gone, and I have been chosen as your President, I am happy to think that in accept-

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

ing the honor I am fulfilling her wish. It is my earnest hope that some small part of the wealth of her gracious personality may descend upon me, so that I may live up to the high standard which she has set for us all.

Before proceeding with our program, I wish to pay a tribute to one who has carried our Society through the period which has elapsed since Mrs. Large's death.

Too modest and unassuming to accept the title of the presidency to which she was formally elected, she consented to serve as Acting President, and in that capacity has faithfully and capably carried out all the duties and responsibilities of President. Mrs. Large depended upon her for advice and help, and I expect to do so also. I refer, as you all may know, to Mrs. John S. Wurts.

It will interest you very much to know that the address which Mr. Montague delivered before our Society in June was so timely that Mr. Caleb J. Milne, President of the Colonial Society of Pennsylvania and a husband of one of our members, asked that Mr. Montague repeat it before his Society. The address was again delivered before an appreciative audience and later we had the privilege and pleasure of mailing a copy of our October publication containing the address to each member of the Colonial Society of Pennsylvania. In addition to this five hundred copies were sent by request to members of the Bar in New York City. It is a source of satisfaction that our Society is thus accomplishing one of its major purposes, the emulation of the high ideals of the Magna Charta Barons.

I wish to make an announcement. I have been authorized by the Council to request the privilege of restoring and redecorating a room in the Powel House as a memorial to our late President, Mrs. Large. The room which we have in mind is the back room on the ground floor which overlooks the garden. It is particularly fitting that we should choose this room, as from its windows it formerly would have been possible to look over to the house on Fourth Street which Mrs. Large occupied from her girlhood days.

When we have a definite answer on this matter the Council will take appropriate action.

We have with us today our Baltimore Regent, a very lovely lady, whom we in Philadelphia are proud to claim as partly ours. I am going to ask Mrs. Starr to introduce her to you.

Mrs. James Starr: If there is anyone in the room who does not know the lady I am going to introduce will she please stand. Every State in the Union claims her. She belongs to us. She has lived with us. We adore her. She has been President of several patriotic Societies and is loved and admired by everyone. We of Philadelphia had quite forgotten she had any other home. Baltimore claims her completely. New York thinks she belongs there and Virginia has a very strong hold upon her. This Baltimore meeting is being held under her guidance and her preparation for our entertainment and her provision for our comfort have been charmingly accomplished. I wish to present Mrs. Alexander Gordon.

To this introduction Mrs. Gordon replied: I was very happy to become a Regent within the State of Maryland, well knowing the pleasure to be derived in association with so many delightful acquaintances and friends, and I deeply appreciate the kind remarks of my dear friend Mrs. Starr, though I fear that she is prejudiced in my favor and I do not deserve so many lovely things said about me.

Mrs. Arrington: As Regent from North Carolina, I just want to say that we also claim Mrs. Gordon.

Mrs. Houston: We are fortunate in having as our guest of honor today Mr. Daniel Richard Randall. To many of us Judge Randall needs no introduction. As he was sitting next to me at the table he asked me not to say anything about him. He said that those in Baltimore know him and those who do not live in Baltimore will know him after this. Members of the Society of Magna Charta Dames and distinguished guests, I am happy to present to you the speaker of the day, Mr. Randall.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons



© Bachrach

The Honorable Daniel Richard Randall was born at Annapolis, Maryland, on December 25, 1864, the son of Alexander Randall and his wife Elizabeth P. Blanchard. He was graduated with honors from St. John's College, Annapolis, in 1883 with the degree of A. B., and received his Doctor's degree from Johns Hopkins University in 1887, where he was made a Fellow in history. He has held the professional offices of State's Attorney, and Assistant United States Attorney. For five years he was Postmaster of the City of Annapolis. He is also a member of the Maryland State Industrial Accident Commission, Governor of the Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Maryland, and Chancellor General of the National Society of Colonial Wars, having devoted much time to the activities of that Society and as President of the Maryland Society of the Sons of the Revolution.

Mrs. Randall who is no longer living was the former Elizabeth W. Harding of Boston. Their children are Mrs. Francis Foulke Beirne, Richard H. Randall, William A. Randall, and Mrs. H. Stuart.

Judge Randall died in Baltimore on April 13, 1936, after this sketch was prepared.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

Lest We Forget

an Address by

Hon. Daniel R. Randall

delivered before

The National Society Magna Charta Dames

Meeting in Baltimore

November 12, 1935

*Madam President, Dames of the Magna Charta,
and my fellow Guests:*



IN THE absence of any authorized official of the Free State or of this fair city, let me first extend to you the greetings of Maryland and of Baltimore. We are deeply impressed with the significance of this occasion, for in your history of twenty-six years you have never before honored us. Alas for the prestige of Baltimore as America's gastronomic centre, for so Dr. Holmes called us some sixty odd years ago. And by way of compliment, I surmise, he suggested the removal of the figure of George Washington from its most impressive setting in Washington Place and substituting for the Father of his Country a flying canvas-back duck. Not content with that impertinence this Autocrat of the Breakfast Table dared suggest a terrapin as the crowning feature of our Battle Monument in the lower city. We yield gracefully to any Breakfast Table suggestions, even impertinences, but we draw the line when he dares invade the Dinner Table! Alas again for our prestige, for our northern, southern and western neighbors have learned to cultivate a taste for these offerings of Chesapeake Bay, and how to cook them, too!

And now, in a more personal way, may I say that I, a mere Colonial, who boasts merely of a grandfather who held office under the Crown before the Revolution, and wore a sword in it, welcome the flattering opportunity offered me to meet so large a company of America's aristocracy whose cause, I trust, is yet free from any man-made restraint or foreign entanglements where your activities might conflict with the More Abundant Life in America.

You are however, let me warn you, very near the Potomac River upon whose banks that legalized and enforced Utopian theory of life is manufactured, like it or not.

My official duties carry me frequently to the mountain regions of Western Maryland, whence the Potomac derives its source: a limpid stream there among those forest-covered foothills of the Alleghenies, sparkling, unsullied and rapidly flowing toward the Chesapeake and ocean, careless and free of fear concerning any impending fate.

So it would seem to me is the stream, the trend of history that marks the growth of conscious freedom in our English-speaking peoples throughout the few hundred years of their recorded history.

It arose in meadows beside Runnymede, fresh and sparkling in anticipated freedom for the centuries to come, only too soon to be thwarted in its way and to become the prey of despots, whether kings of royal heritage or self-styled Führers and Stalins and Mussolinis of our modern day. Indeed, measured by the cool, unemotional trend of human affairs, a pure democracy appears unattainable and at times undesirable unless under Constitutional restraint. As we might stand on the banks of the Potomac where it enters its greater life in the broad bosom of the Chesapeake and analyze its waters, now sluggish and foul from abundant misuse in its miles of current from mountain springs leagues away, we in despair wonder if there is any virtue left. Has the onrush of its waters from their source to the

sea so utterly changed its vitalizing components that it has lost its essential goodness? The only cheering response is found in decisions of a Supreme Tribunal.

In this allegory or analogy of the Potomac River I seem to visualize the ever-changing, onrushing flow of human history. Perhaps Runnymede was not the primal source of the stream, but it was beyond contradiction the greatest manifestation in English history to its day of the successful realization of that yearning of the free-born Anglo-Saxon for liberty of thought, of action and of conscience.

Perhaps to the world of three hundred years later the Reformation proved as great a manifestation and of equal significance, considering after events, in the history of human liberty.

Again, the Revolution of the American colonies against the denial of equality to British subjects on these shores, the French Revolution, and the many revolutions of these later days may claim a share in historical importance in depicting the revolt of free peoples to the exactions, real or imaginary, of rulers who in a thirst for power disregarded human rights, early claimed at Runnymede. Great principles were involved in our civil conflict and in our own day in the World War, and from those conflicts, if we are optimistic we see emerge a greater freedom, a greater realization of our duty as citizens of a democracy based upon equality before the law. That principle is being urged today in protests against a New Deal in this land of the free, which fails to recognize our right to individual initiative and a freedom from regimentation. But that is a controversial subject which I leave now where it belongs, on the shelf of the political pantry.

In this brief relating of other historic manifestations do not think that I minimize the achievement at Runnymede in 1215. This has been tried vainly by pseudo-

historians and debunking writers for several centuries, as like attacks have been made on the value in human history of reformation, revolution, civil war and the war to end wars. Magna Charta stands forth today as a shining light, a beacon in the history of human affairs. Despotism, in its manifold forms of grim exterior or smiling face, whether in Church or State, has been met, is being met and will be ever met by resolute hearts and hands so long as the breath of freedom in the Anglo-Saxon soul exists. At every juncture in world history when the theory of the Great Louis, "Je suis l'Etat," manifests itself in the subjection of the individual, there have arisen groups of men and women who have wrested power from autocracy and reestablished the government of the people, for the people and by the people.

John met his fate on the plains at Runnymede at the hands of his subjects, made desperate by continuous overweening subjection, though the Barons' victory was short-lived, as within the year Pope Innocent by Bull annulled the Charter and excommunicated all its advocates. The forces that during the Reformation had been latent sprang into power, voiced by a humble priest, until the civilized world was ablaze. Samuel Adams in Boston and Patrick Henry in Virginia were spokesmen for larger groups who little dreamed, as they little desired, complete independence from the mother country, and a weak and disordered revolt became a revolution destined to found the world's first democracy. George III met, like John his predecessor, his Barons on the many battlefields of the Revolution, and surrendered his authority to a race of warriors and statesmen from whom we of colonial ancestry proudly claim descent. Within its first century of national life a problem of first magnitude was met by a Civil War and forever settled that the principles of equality under the law might be guaranteed to men of every condition and color. Lincoln, chosen by the Union party as its leader here in Baltimore,

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

proclaimed the accomplishment of those four years of bloody strife as he was about to lay down his life to the cause, when at Gettysburg he declared in those immortal words, "this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and popular government shall not perish from the earth." It was not a royal tyrant who had met his Runnymede, but a false theory of democracy that threatened the course of our national existence.

The World War and its varied complicated aftermaths was a Runnymede in many nations. Started over a minor event in an obscure corner of the globe, it was an expression of an almost universal creed that the weaker should not become the prey of the strong and a national life be sacrificed upon the altars of ungoverned greed.

That it accomplished this Utopia no man can yet say. We need the perspective that only the passing of years and of its leaders can give. And by the same token, who can say with any brave assurance that the Utopia of the New Deal bodes well for a national life still in the throes of depression?

Your honorable Society will have reached fuller maturity before coming historians can truthfully tell the story of these latter days and without prejudice declare that in the year 1935 and following it America successfully fought her battle of freedom on this modern Runnymede. In this time of uncertainty some decry the "horse and buggy days" of an earlier century. We all smile at the creations, the pleasures and the activities, so styled of the "Gay '90's," but they are contributive to a glorious tradition that we would not forget and should not permit to be forgotten, for so many pleasant things of the past are well worth preserving, heritages that add grace to life and a dignity which we can only admire and emulate.

We of this tradition are told that the youth of the Twentieth Century revolt against these gods and goddesses

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

of the earlier century and laugh at our adoration. But what of it? Has not the history of human liberty, like the flow of the Potomac, been chequered with revolts from its dawn to this year of grace? And that thought brings me back to my first premise. The various manifestations of revolt against existing conditions that have marked human progress from Runnymede to our day add to our respect for our present attainments. We are not a product of an age, but of the ages, through changing civilizations from those days when the ancient bard exclaimed:

"When Adam delved and Eve span,
Who was then the gentleman?"

America has been styled a melting pot of various nationalities whose product is our average citizen. God save the mark!

All men are not created equal, except before the law of the realm. Those who like ourselves claim descent from distinguished beginnings must draw a line, not too marked or fine perhaps, between those who honor and those who dishonor tradition. The burning torch must be kept alight even though its bearers suffer under the stigma of being styled "Tories" by socialists of the Harvard School. Whether we are called to this solemn duty by chance or by choice the obligation remains: A Sacred Trust to be handed down to those who come after. Only by such means has a blessed tradition survived the upheavals of time and space.

Rudyard Kipling must have had such a thought in mind when surveying England's past he wrote in his "Recessional":

"If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe,
Such boasting as the Gentiles use,
Or lesser breeds without the Law:
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Making every allowance for poetic license one gathers from these lines and the context of the whole, the prayer of the poet that the Anglo-Saxon descendant and those "within the law" should not lose sight of the great traditions of our race, but preserve them unsullied for posterity.

Our plains of Runnymede lie everywhere about us. Our duty, as we cherish the accomplishments of past generations, is to see that their deeds shall ever be incentives to patriotic action for us and for those who are to follow us.

There was once a political cry raised in our country, "America for the Americans." It may have once had a greater significance than is possible today. The whole trend of political activity in this phrase "America for Americans" is today toward rewarding the so-called forgotten man with gifts drawn from our nation's treasury. One fears to conjecture upon its outcome when the generous hand of Government is withdrawn and a new crisis faces the nation. Is the glorious light of a splendid tradition to give place to some political fitful will-o'-the-wisp which glows at intervals only when political conditions demand and sinks again into its marshy sources? We are not fatalists who would hold that the destiny of the man or of his country is some heaven-made affair that brooks no human interference. We can not hold to such doctrine if we inherit the stern realities of our forefathers and refuse to yield a birthright that has won its place as a precious jewel by centuries of self-sacrifice and death. True, we must bow before the storm of new realities and unrealities, all the while conscious that God has a place.

Forty years ago the Scotsman, Muirhead, wrote of us as a country of contradictions, in his "Land of Contrasts," but that was before Hollywood bred the queens and mother pigs bred without legal restraint. He would now style us a country of super-contradictions crying for help!

I say we must bow to this storm of unrealities, but we can rise again if in bowing we do not break. In spite of storms that threaten our existence, of war and of famine where there should be plenty, of battle, murder and sudden death on the road and in the air, the many worthwhile heritages from the past shine like grains of gold still sparkling in the dust of wanton destruction. These we must preserve for our children's and our country's good.

This mention of our children's good brings up another thought, as it brings me toward the end of a rambling discourse. My own experience may not be yours but I find the next generation, by and large, and yet of course with notable exceptions, unmoved by the appeal of tradition.

They have come to their maturity of mind and purpose surrounded by novelties in the world's progress, those gadgets of modern existence. They know little of an earlier existence and fret at being educated in it, and as for patriotism, it is to them much as Dr. Johnson defined it.

They believe their plain speech in this year of grace an improvement on the insincerities of our earlier generations when one would avoid calling a spade by any such name, if another could be found.

Can we elders do aught than bow to this manifestation of youth? Are they not on their plains of Runnymede, mentally and spiritually speaking? They have experienced, perhaps as children or as soldiers, or as the wives and sweethearts of soldiers in the World War, the calamitous, dynamic change wrought in the lives, feelings and fortunes among their generation. They watched and cheered the mighty hosts of our youth in their march to the battlefield. They waited and cheered their return in every city, town and hamlet of the land. Patriotism was vibrant in every breast. Then came the awakening. The world was not saved for democracy. The patriotically inspired soldier had become a bonus grabber. A sudden collapse of their Temple of Fame

has carried with it much that we had cherished and were wont to regard with awe. Nothing can take its place unless it be the pure light of a beautiful tradition, perhaps grown more beautiful as distance lends enchantment.

Every patriotic society in the land is feeling the reaction in the hearts of those who must of necessity carry on the high purposes of the founders. Our young people demand a sincerity of purpose. They have faced stern realities in their brief past and we can engage their attention to the Barons of Runnymede, the fathers of the Reformation, the leaders of our Colonial and of our Revolutionary periods, only if we answer their plain demand for the verities of the past, freed from all sophistry. They will and do demand that we spend no time in chasing the shadows at the expense of the realities of history. And they are right, for we too have debunked history in our day and generation and claimed credit for so doing. New material has yielded to the researches of students. Much of our Colonial past in its true light is yet buried in the vaults of our historical societies and in public as well as private collections. Our heroes may have lost some of their lustre and we are being disturbed in learning of the foibles, perhaps even of General Washington as records are dug from an obscure attic. And so to this day the burning light of criticism may disclose unwelcome tales that shake our credulity or perchance destroy our illusions. How happy is that Society which can remain calm during such attacks and can point dispassionately to a day in 1215 when a group of determined men compelled a haughty king to sign a charter of liberties that has remained an example of accomplishment to eight succeeding centuries. Our constitutional liberties were born at Runnymede. The personal equation plays a minor part in that record of a united demand for better conditions and accomplished without the horrors of war.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

The Labor Party in England today is demanding the abolition of the House of Lords as a foremost step in the leveling process yearned for by socialists in every land. How happy are the Magna Charta Dames in that, come what may, in the radical attacks upon or overthrow of constitutions and civil liberties, the noble example at Runnymede may ever remain a beacon of hope in a distracted, devastated world. This day of government—not of the people, nor by the people, nor for the people, but for the perpetuation of personal ambition in high places, operating through legions of conscripts in dark continents, through persecution of religious sects, or through a national beneficial association which would teach the unmusical to sing, the industrialist to strike, the juvenile of his family to recline in the comforts of a camp existence at a given salary, and a thousand other whimsies of a Harvard School of Political Design—points a moral as it adorns a tale. To us who belong to the “horse and buggy days” of Constitutional freedom, has come a supreme duty to ourselves and to our children to preserve “the faith once for all delivered” to our fathers, to hold above this turmoil of unreason the torch handed to us and to hand it down undiminished in the light and beauty to our descendants, lest we and they forget!

May I read some lines I clipped from a newspaper:

DREAM STUFF

By JAMES J. MONTAGUE

I hope nobody gives to me
The thing that's called a family tree,
So all my kin
Might wander in
And ask to borrow money;
And if, perhaps, they got in jail
And asked of me to furnish bail
To get them out
I rather doubt
That it would be so funny.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

I have no crest nor quarterings;
 I have no ancient signet rings.
 I have no deep
 Dark donjon keep,
 Nor do I own a castle.
 If burglars came, by night and stealth,
 To steal my little store of wealth,
 They'd get my all.
 I could not call
 A solitary vassal.

Perhaps you think I would not care
 To stroll along the thoroughfare,
 Aloof and proud
 While all the crowd
 Paid rentals to me yearly,
 And I so grandly moved along.
 But that, dear friend, is where you're wrong.
 I'd like to own
 A regal throne,
 I'd like it very dearly.

Mr. Randall concluded by saying, "A few days ago there was printed in one of the Baltimore papers a picture of King John, with dour beard and a very rough crown. Around him were a number of lovely ladies. A friend of mine said 'You didn't have a very good picture taken for The Sun'. I said I had never worn a beard and a crown had never been offered me. He replied, 'You can raise the beard if you want, but you will get crowned sure enough by the Dames after your speech.' I request that you crown me lightly."

Mrs. Houston replied: "I wish to crown Mr. Randall with a laurel wreath of our deep appreciation. The thought it leaves with me is, we must not be content merely to receive what has been done for us but we must prove that we too are worthy to be ancestors so that in centuries to come our descendants may point to us with pride and say, 'They fought the battle of 1936. They rallied to defend the Constitution, the great American Magna Charta.'"

At the home of Brigadier General and Mrs. David Dixon Porter, No. 1819 Nineteenth Street N.W., Washington, D. C., a reception and tea were given on March 2nd, the day preceding the Magna Charta luncheon. At this reception and

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

tea, given by Mrs. Porter, Mrs. Houston was the Guest of Honor. This most delightful occasion afforded the members residing in Washington the opportunity of meeting the President of the Society and the other Officers. Among the persons who attended as the guests of Mrs. Porter were: Mrs. Mark L. Bristol, Mrs. Hoggatt Clopton, Mrs. Thomas Worthington Cooke, Miss Adelaide Milton de Groot, Mrs. C. Goodloe Edgar, Mrs. Alexander Gordon, Mrs. William S. Hallowell, Mrs. William M. Hannay, Mrs. Charles B. Howry, Miss Elizabeth B. Howry, Miss Mary H. Howry, Mrs. Reginald S. Huidekoper, Mrs. Edward B. Huling, Mrs. Thaddeus M. Jones, Mrs. Charles M. Lea, Mrs. Michel M. LeBrun, Miss Margaret A. Lennig, Mrs. J. Hamilton Lewis, Mrs. Brewster Marwick, Mrs. Edward B. Meigs, Miss Margaret C. Merritt, Mrs. D. Buchanan Merryman, Mrs. Edward A. Mitchell, Miss Lillie Bell O'Donnell, Mrs. M. M. O'Gorman, Mrs. Julien Oritz, Mrs. David P. Penhallow, Miss Carlile Patterson Porter, Miss Aimee E. Powell, Mrs. John H. Russell, Mrs. Forrester H. Scott, Mrs. W. Goff Sears, Mrs. Finley J. Shepard, Mrs. John H. Small, Mrs. William F. M. Sowers, Mrs. F. B. Wallace, Mrs. Heloise Webb, Miss Isabella C. Wells, Mrs. Roger Williams, Miss Flora Wilson, Mrs. Cora Adams Woodbridge, Mrs. Frederick S. Woodward, Mrs. John S. Wurts.

Luncheon at The Shoreham

March 3, 1936

On this day the National Society Magna Charta Dames celebrated its twenty-seventh birthday, one of the three important days observed by the Society during the year. About a hundred and fifty members and their escorts assembled at The Shoreham where luncheon was served in the Gold Ballroom.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

The invocation was offered by the Rev. Samuel R. Allison, Pastor of The Covenant-First Presbyterian Church.

In the course of the President's address Mrs. Houston said:

It is very fitting that we should gather here today, as it was in Washington that our Society was founded twenty-seven years ago. In March, 1909, a group of women met together, resolutions were drawn up, officers were elected, and the Society of Magna Charta Dames came into being. The Society grew slowly for twenty years until 1929 when reorganization took place and Mrs. James Large became President, serving until the time of her death, March 23, 1934. We are very proud of the wonderful growth under her administration, but prize even more the glorious heritage which we share. Let us then never lose sight of the liberties which our ancestors have handed down to us, and let us guard them as a sacred trust to be handed on to future generations.

We are honored today with the presence of Miss Angela Morgan, a noted author, well known as the prize winner of the Arctic poem, "I Talked to Peary." Miss Morgan read her original poem, "The Unknown Soldier," over the bier of the unknown soldier in the rotunda of the Capitol at Washington, D. C., and has offered to write for the Society a poem about the Magna Charta Barons and their descendants.

[At this point in the program Miss Morgan recited her poem entitled "Today," which was enthusiastically applauded by her hearers.]

We have the good fortune to have Senator Daniel O. Hastings of Delaware as our guest of honor, and speaker. It is with great pleasure that I present him to you.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons



© Morrison

Daniel O. Hastings, the energetic successor to Senator T. Coleman duPont as Senator from the Diamond State and variously described as "able," "vigorous," and "human," was born in Maryland, March 5, 1874, the son of Daniel H. Hastings and Amelia Ellen Parsons, his wife. Educated under private tutors, he read law at Columbian (now George Washington) University. He is a member of the Delaware Bar and has held the offices of Deputy Attorney General of Delaware, Secretary of State, Justice of the Supreme Court, Special Counsel for the Legislature, Solicitor of Wilmington, and Judge of the Municipal Court. In 1898 he married Garrie Lee Saxton of Dover, Delaware, who died in 1930. His second wife is Elsie Saxton. For many years Senator Hastings conducted his own farm at Dover and was at one time the possessor of a fine herd of Holstein cattle. Not only was he farmer born, but he has had actual experience which gives him an understanding of the difficulties and hazards of farm life. He is a member of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church at Wilmington and of numerous clubs including the Congressional Country Club in Washington on the Board of Governors of which he and President Hoover serve.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

Our Democratic Form of Government Shall Endure

an Address by

Hon. Daniel O. Hastings

delivered before

The National Society Magna Charta Dames

Meeting in Washington

March 3, 1936

*Mrs. Houston, Members of the Magna Charta Dames,
and my fellow Guests:*



CONSIDER it a great honor to be invited to speak before The National Society Magna Charta Dames. The acceptance of such invitation carries with it a definite responsibility. I assume it is the hope and expectation that I should say something that will be helpful and applicable to present-day conditions.

The Magna Charta is a document that we all learned something about during our days at school, and we should all be greatly benefitted if we refreshed our recollection of what we once knew about it, and at the same time made a more careful study of its history. Such a study, I have no doubt, would demonstrate to us a thing which so many of us are apt to forget or overlook, and that is that our own democratic form of government is not one of those things which we can rightfully assume will last forever. As we boast of our own Federal Constitution, and the progress America has made since it was adopted, our tendency is to believe it is so nearly perfect, it comes so near to establishing and preserving all our rights, that it requires no effort on the part of this generation, nor the next, to have it function in its established way.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

There are two phases of our democratic form of government that are important, if it is to endure. One is the preservation of the Federal Constitution itself, by proper interpretation or by amendment. The other is to convince the people of the Nation that they must accept the duty imposed upon them by the Constitution and do their full duty in order that the rights and privileges granted to them may be realized and preserved.

Perhaps one of the most striking things found in the Magna Charta is the fact that it established a limited monarchy. With the signing of that great document, the Divine Right of Kings actually passed away. It is true the kings did not make any such admission, but the effect of Magna Charta and its re-statement from time to time after it was adopted, all had this effect.

Another thing about it is that it protected all classes of people. Whenever it became necessary, as it frequently did in the first century after its passage, to confirm the charter, it was done by a combination of all classes of people against the autocracy of the King. The confirmations were for the purpose of emphasizing the rights granted and the doing away with the ills that had grown up between such confirmation. Magna Charta and the Forest Charter were formally confirmed at least five times in the reign of Henry III, and twice in that of Edward I. Altogether it was confirmed with modifications about twenty-five times during the first hundred years.

The Magna Charta has an important place in the history of the world. It is perhaps more important to the English speaking people than to any other. Notwithstanding the greatness of this document, however, it was not sufficient to protect the liberties of the people as we understand such term today. The history of our forefathers, their migration to this new land, and the reason for such migration, is sufficient of itself to show the weakness of

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons
that great document from our point of view. In other words, it is a "far cry" from Magna Charta to the Federal Constitution of the United States of America.

When our own concepts of freedom and liberty were written into law, the framers had the benefit of the efforts that had been made along this line in the old world. With this knowledge, and their own experience of the insufficiency of the provisions contained in the Magna Charta, they wrote the most remarkable document that is to be found in history anywhere.

One of the difficulties which confronts us today, from the standpoint of many, is the complicated structure of the Federal Constitution. Such persons seem to overlook one of the most important facts contained in it, and one of the most important facts in our whole history, and that is that we have in effect in this country forty-eight separate and distinct states, which, except for the Federal Constitution, would constitute forty-eight separate and distinct nations, each dealing with the other as a foreign country. That it was wise for them to unite is admitted by all. It would have been impossible for them to have united, except upon terms and conditions that were satisfactory to the states then in existence. This makes a complication which is overlooked by many when they undertake to compare the ease with which things are done in other countries, with the difficulties we sometimes find when we try to do them here. I doubt whether there is more than a small percentage of the people who would actually like to do away with the existence of these sovereign states. I believe the effort which we originally made to leave exclusively to the sovereign states the question of determining how their people should be governed, how the local conditions should be treated, what restraints were necessary for their own good, is believed by the great majority of our people to be a wise provision.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

The job of one legislative branch, such as the Congress, undertaking to legislate in a way that would be satisfactory to the various states, would be an impossible task and would be wholly unsatisfactory to our people. When people complain about the Congress not being permitted to do this and that under the Constitution, they ought to remember that there must be in some instrument, somewhere, a dividing line between the rights of the Federal government and the various states.

They should likewise remember that the Federal government has only such rights as were granted by the states; all others were retained by each and every state. There does not exist in all cases a sharp dividing line. There are those who have always insisted that the states must constantly be on guard in order that the Congress does not succeed in getting too much power, thus partially destroying the power which it is necessary for the states to maintain over their internal affairs. I think it is not too much to say that in the past three years there has been a tendency to eliminate state lines wherever possible. The states have been literally bribed in giving their consent. The Administration of relief, the Social Security Bill, the Agriculture Adjustment Act, and many other things might be mentioned as illustrations. These are all state problems, but the Federal government sets forth a policy of assistance by contributing Federal funds and because of this contribution insists upon maintaining control. This is a direct violation of our form of government and no person can foresee the ultimate effect it will have upon it. It is not difficult to see, however, that it becomes a dangerous entering wedge. It is tinkering with the foundation.

Just as there must be some instrument which undertakes to define the rights between the states and the Federal government, there must be some independent body like the Supreme Court to render a final decision upon the

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

constitutionality of the Acts of Congress. Manifestly this could not be done by the Congress itself. The Congress only has the authority granted by the states as set forth in the Constitution. The states retained for themselves very great authority. To permit Congress to determine whether certain of its acts violate the rights of states is to destroy such rights. All this talk about the Supreme Court not having the authority to pass upon these questions, and all this talk about trying to limit that authority by requiring something more than a majority vote, is just plain nonsense. Many students of history have examined the subject thoroughly and they agree that this provision was not written into the Constitution because it was unnecessary. The Judges of the State Courts had been doing the same thing before the adoption of the Constitution, and it was generally conceded that it was not only their right, but their duty. While the Supreme Court did not pass upon the question until 1803, the Federal Court from the time it was organized by Congress in 1789, commenced to assert the right to review legislation. That question has been definitely settled and becomes an important and controlling function of our government.

I have stated that if our country is to endure, the Federal Constitution must be preserved. It constitutes the very foundation, and without it there could be no enduring structure. On the other hand, it is a serious mistake for the American people to believe that the maintenance of the Constitution is of itself security for this and all future generations. No more serious mistake could be made about our form of government. The country's vitality depends upon intelligent, active and patriotic service upon the part of its citizens.

Lord Macaulay, the famous historian, nearly eighty years ago, predicted that a pure democratic government like ours could not endure. In a letter he stated:

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

"It is quite plain that your government will never be able to restrain a distressed and discontented majority On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith. On the other is a demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists and usurers, and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink Champagne and to ride in a carriage, while thousands of honest folks are in want of necessities. . . . Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand; or your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth Century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

Lord Macaulay did not believe the true democracy for which Jefferson was so outspoken could ever succeed. Since that letter was written the United States has passed through many periods that would seem to give to Macaulay's doubts the acid test. The Civil War came shortly after this letter was written, and the Constitution was thereafter amended in such a manner as to give four million slaves the right of franchise. We have seen it amended again so as to extend the right to vote to the women of the country. Instead of heeding the dangers which Macaulay tried to point out, we have gone the other way in an effort to make more certain a true democracy.

Thus far, we have escaped the dangers set forth in the Macaulay letter, and certainly no thinking man today believes that we can ever turn back. Macaulay's own country has disregarded his warning and given its people an opportunity to express their opinion at the polls.

Advance in education among all classes of people here and in England makes democracy safer, but I think the American people make a mistake if they assume that our form of government is so complete and so perfect that it is safe for all future times. We must be very alert in order to preserve its essential qualities.

I am not concerned about those who advocate an amendment to the Federal Constitution. That effort is a perfectly legitimate one, and I am not afraid to have it

submitted to the intelligent voters of the nation; but what does concern me, and what I think ought to concern every patriotic citizen, is the effort to change our form of government by the deception of those who are sworn to protect and defend the Constitution. The men who are on the inside, the man or men who have been given great powers over the people because of the position he or they hold, are the persons upon whom we must center our attention. Every word they say, every act they perform, which indicates a lack of faith in American principles ought to be subjected to the closest scrutiny and to the severest condemnation and criticism.

The people of the nation continue their confidence and faith in the Supreme Court of the United States, but we must see to it that the burdens thrust upon it do not become too great. We must remember that that great body is a part of our democracy; that members of Congress who pass the laws for the nation are sworn to protect and defend the Constitution, and that, therefore, the Acts passed by the Congress are presumed in the first instance to be constitutional. It is only when they are clearly void that the Supreme Court makes that drastic decision.

The success of a democracy depends upon many things, but it seems to me the most outstanding is just ordinary, plain, honesty in public office. Ability is of course essential also, but ability without honesty availeth little. Honesty consists in keeping the promises made at the time of election. Honesty consists of frankness and avoids deception. Honesty in public office requires the maintaining and defending of the Federal Constitution. Unless we can make our citizens appreciate the importance of maintaining these principles; unless we can convince them that the safety of the country demands a repudiation of those who have been guilty of deceiving them, we shall soon realize that the high tide of America's progress has

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

been reached and the approaching years are full of distress and uncertainty.

We all appreciate that the Constitution is a great protector of our liberties, but the point I want to make now and emphasize is that America can be destroyed within the terms of the Constitution itself.

In the first place, it would be possible for an Executive having certain views upon economic questions and their relation to the Constitution to deliberately appoint men to the Supreme Court, who would undertake to interpret the Constitution in accordance with such views. I think such an act upon the part of an Executive would be clearly a violation of the spirit of the Constitution, but it would unquestionably be within its terms.

There is another thing, which to me is quite shocking and that is that members of Congress and the present Executive too, are constantly endeavoring to do things which the Supreme Court says they cannot do under the terms of the Constitution. It seems to me, this attempt to deliberately write into law a false statement in order to place the Supreme Court in a position where it will have to declare the act void is un-American, a fraud upon our form of government, and a thing which ought to be resented by the American people.

Let me give you an illustration of what I have in mind. The Supreme Court declared the Agricultural Adjustment Act invalid because it undertook to control agriculture, a matter belonging wholly to state regulation. Contracts made between the government and the farmer were condemned. The purpose of the new Act was declared to be for soil conservation, the idea being that soil conservation was a subject over which the nation had control. Contracts in the new Act were prohibited, but there was a distinct provision made in the Act that the Secretary of Agriculture could pay the farmer for comply-

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

ing with certain rules and regulations laid down by the Secretary. In other words the Secretary says if you will do this this year, I agree to pay you so much at the end of the year. This is just as clearly a contract as though it had been written. But after much argument against the constitutionality of the Act, it was finally suggested that we write into the Act this language, as one of its purposes,

"The protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses and in aid of flood control."

This suggestion was received with the greatest glee and relief upon the part of those in the Senate, who were sponsoring this bill. With this in it, it was said the Supreme Court dare not declare it unconstitutional. This, for the reason that navigation is clearly a thing with which the Congress constantly deals. Bear in mind however that the real purpose of this Act was to enable the distribution of \$500,000,000 annually to the farmers in order that they might be placed on parity with industry. It was not for the purpose of protecting rivers and harbors.

This is a real illustration of the dangers that confront America. The danger of the minority groups, who combine their interests and pledge one with another that they will only support those members of Congress who agree to do what such minority demands. There is nothing in the Constitution that saves us from a situation like this.

We find little comfort in relying upon the Constitution when we take a glance at the picture of our financial condition of today. We find nothing in it which prohibits a political party from success at the polls secured by promising to reduce the Federal expenditures by twenty-five per cent, and then to have them reverse that promised process and increase the expenditures by more than one hundred per cent. We find nothing in the Constitution to protect the American people who relied upon a pledge made by a

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons
political party that they would maintain sound money at all hazards, when we see within a brief period after the inauguration a repudiation of the promise to pay government debts in gold, a reduction of the gold content of the dollar by forty per cent, and the passing on to the Executive the authority to print three billion dollars in greenbacks. We get no comfort from the Constitution in recalling the promise to balance the budget to rid us of the annual deficit, when we observe the deficit increased at the rate of three and one-half billion dollars annually with no prospect of a balanced budget anywhere in sight. We have seen our annual debt in the last three years increased by the huge sum of about twelve billions of dollars. We may later see the holders of government bonds suffer by the simple process of repudiation and we must realize that these things are within the fundamental law. We can only complain that the members of Congress have violated their own obligations when we see them turn over to the Executive the huge sum of \$4,800,000,000 at one time for the purpose of granting relief, and paying for useless work, and erecting the kind of projects that he may choose, located in such places as he may select.

None of us have been able to point to the Constitution and find therein a specific provision for finding work and a weekly wage for the twelve and a half million that are unemployed.

Notwithstanding the recent "Soak the Rich" legislation, which is presumed to increase the annual Federal income by three hundred million dollars, those of us who are not rich can find no protection in the Constitution from a threatened tax upon us of about three and one-half billion dollars annually to meet the deficit. We cannot escape the five hundred million dollar nuisance taxes which we are now paying by relying upon the Constitution, nor are we going to escape the new tax that is about to be

levied which is supposed to raise something like three-quarters of a billion dollars annually.

With millions of people out of work and needing food and clothes, we found no way to prevent the destruction of cotton that was needed for clothing and six million pigs that were needed for food. We found no way to prevent the policy of scarcity being carried on, in the production of wheat and corn, and the subsequent importation of millions of bushels which our own farmers were so eager to produce. The importation of wheat, oats and corn for the first nine months of 1935, as compared with the first nine months of 1934, shows an increase of 1,180 per cent. We are enthusiastic about the supposed increase in wages but the housewife gets no consolation from the Constitution in the increased cost of everything she buys for the family.

Under the NRA we saw all our business people regimented and controlled, annoyed, abused, prosecuted, and persecuted for a period of about two years before the strong arm of the Supreme Court could be raised to protect them. We see the Utility Holding Companies and the coal operators going through the same process today, not yet knowing definitely whether there be any protection under the Constitution.

I have pointed out to you some of the things that may be done within the terms of the Constitution itself. I have selected these illustrations because to my mind the things I have mentioned are dangerous things for America. Of course, those who are responsible for them do not look upon them as dangerous, but have believed them to be necessary things for the safety of our country. Some would go so far as to say they were necessary if our democratic form of government were to endure, but whether you agree with them or not, I think you will not dispute the fact that they do constitute important things

in America's history, and they do demonstrate the wide field for governmental action within the terms of the Constitution itself and, after all, that is the one point that I am now trying to make.

I would like to emphasize that a great responsibility rests upon each of us. We have been led to believe that education was one of the necessities of life if we were to make a success. Education is not only helpful as a means of earning a living, but it is a source of great comfort and pleasure to those who possess it.

The person however who has only a limited education is particularly charged with the duty of seriously endeavoring to find out about the government under which he lives, and at the same time to endeavor by the one weapon he has, namely, the right of franchise, to improve the existing conditions.

I quoted from Macaulay's letter, in which he spoke of a statesman on one side preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith, and on the other side a demagogue ranting about the possessions of the wealthy while thousands of honest folks were in want of necessities.

The man in Congress who is intelligent, honest and endeavoring to do a patriotic service, needs the assistance, support and advice of intelligent and patriotic citizens everywhere. To resist the pressure and threats of the many minority groups, makes it necessary for him who is undertaking to do his duty, to forget that the end of his term is approaching. He makes a serious mistake if he has made up his mind to make a life's job out of such a position. It is only by forgetting all these things that he is enabled to concentrate on the question at hand. It is only by forgetting all these things that he can be a free man, freely stating his honest judgment about proposed legislation and declaring boldly that his vote shall be registered for the

general welfare of the country and not merely for the benefit of any particular group.

I am satisfied that our democratic form of government shall endure, but I am at the same time satisfied that it needs today, as it never needed before, the services of every American who prides himself upon his patriotism, his love of his country, and his devotion to his family.

One has but to turn back the pages of history before Magna Charta, in order to ascertain what miserable conditions existed for the average citizen of Europe. Nay, one has but to read the newspapers of today to find how easy it has been for people in this generation to lose the liberties they once enjoyed, and thought to be secure. I do not believe we are approaching any such condition, but I do know that good people like you must no longer harbor the thought that politics is not worthy of any effort upon your part; that it belongs to those who have made it a part of their life's work and that your only duty with respect to it is to read about it and gossip about it. The sooner we make politicians out of the best classes of our citizens, the sooner we shall avoid the threat of the calamity to our country that was predicted by Macaulay. The sooner we make the whole country politically conscious, the better off it will be.

Let us not only dedicate ourselves to upholding the rights provided for in the Great Charter and our own Federal Constitution, but let us at the same time appreciate the duty this Constitution imposes upon each and every one of us and declare to the world that our democratic form of government shall endure.



Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

I wish to thank Senator Hastings for myself and for the Society, for his forthright and forceful speech. This is the time for all true patriots to express themselves fearlessly and clearly, and the Senator gives us once again a notable evidence of his strong individuality and genuine patriotism. It is a message that we should all consider thoughtfully, ever mindful of the obligation, which is part of our heritage, to keep alive the spirit of liberty.

The meeting is adjourned.



Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

Huntingdon Valley

Reception and Luncheon

On June 16, 1936, the members of the National Society Magna Charta Dames and their friends met at luncheon at the delightfully situated Huntingdon Valley Country Club near Jenkintown, Pennsylvania. At the spacious Club House so charmingly located in this picturesque rolling country, the guests assembled about tables decorated with red and yellow flowers displaying the colors of the Society, each table seating ten persons. The meeting was well attended by members from many of the nearby States as well as by some who traveled from places as far away as California and Washington.

At the President's Table seated in the following order were:

Mrs. James Francis Sullivan
Mrs. George Grant Snowden
Mrs. Charles M. Lea
Mrs. George Dallas Dixon
Dr. J. Gresham Machen
Mrs. James Starr
Mr. Denison Godfrey
Mrs. George Harrison Houston
Mr. Charlton Yarnall
Princess Cantacuzene
Mr. George Harrison Houston
Mrs. Charlton Yarnall
Mrs. Percival E. Foerderer
Mrs. David Dixon Porter

Mrs. Houston called upon Dr. Machen to pronounce the invocation.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

Invocation

June 16, 1936

offered by

The Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D. D., Litt. D.



ALMIGHTY GOD, King of kings, Lord of lords, we come into Thy presence, with thankful acknowledgment of Thy many mercies and with confession of our grievous and heinous sins, through **Jesus Christ**, our Lord.

We rejoice that **Thou** art on the throne and that the nations are in Thy hands. We thank **Thee** that Thy power has been manifested in the years that have passed, through Thy instruments, our fathers, in furtherance of the cause of freedom.

We pray **Thee** that those precious things which were won at such cost may be preserved for us and for future generations, that the gospel of **Jesus Christ**, our Lord, may have free course, and that righteousness may reign upon the earth.

This we ask, with all other mercies, through **Jesus Christ**, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons



© Bachrach

Dr. J. Gresham Machen

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

The Reverend J. Gresham Machen, D. D., Litt.D., was born in Baltimore, Maryland, on July 28, 1881. Having received his A.B. degree from the Johns Hopkins University in 1901, he entered Princeton Theological Seminary, receiving the B.D. degree in 1905. After a year of study in Germany he was a member of the teaching staff of Princeton Theological Seminary, first as instructor and then as Assistant Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis. Since 1929 he has been Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

Dr. Machen is President of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. In 1934 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. issued an order that members of that Church who were also members of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions should resign from the latter organization. Holding that this order was contrary to the constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Dr. Machen did not withdraw from the Independent Board. He was brought to trial by the Presbytery of New Brunswick and was condemned by a commission of that presbytery in January, 1935. The case, involving very important doctrinal and ecclesiastical issues, came before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in June, 1936. Dr. Machen and certain of his colleagues were "suspended." Having severed his connection with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., he is now a minister in "The Presbyterian Church of America," which was constituted June 11, 1936, in Philadelphia.

Dr. Machen's theological position is that of the Reformed Faith as set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith. He has opposed Modernism in the Church and has sought to uphold the orthodox or conservative position.

Dr. Machen is the author of "The Origin of Paul's Religion," "New Testament Greek for Beginners," "Christianity and Liberalism," "What Is Faith?" "The Virgin Birth of Christ" and "The Christian Faith in The Modern World."

Memorial to Mrs. James Large

After luncheon had been served Mrs. Houston said: It was just a year ago that we had our reception and luncheon here. Since that time we have had two meetings, one in Baltimore and one in Washington. At the Baltimore meeting we announced the plan to have a memorial for Mrs. Large. I am going to ask Mrs. Starr if she will tell us a little more about it because there are a great many here today who were not present in Baltimore.

Mrs. Starr then spoke as follows: Even at the risk of not being heard I shall not speak into the microphone as it never behaves for me.

I was very glad, indeed, when our president asked me to say a few words about this memorial to Mrs. Large, because it seemed to me that the emulation of such a character as hers is so in line with the purpose of the Order of Magna Charta. We go back in our thought to what we are celebrating, to what we believe, and that is why we are in existence. The future is so in the hands of others and there is so much confusion, so much of a battle cry on all sides that it is a wonderful thing to go back in memory to the life of one who has done so much in all the gentler arts, and to all the wonderful attributes which were so exemplified in the life of our late president, Mrs. Large. So I feel that it is a matter of ideals, a matter of spirituality, and am sure that every one of us who knew her, and those who have benefitted by her policies, will be glad to take part in a memorial for her. The size of what we may undertake, whether it is to be a commemoration, whether it is to be something of a larger nature, I believe is not within my province to announce this afternoon, but it is my hope that every one here will sign a card—the gentleman on my right has just said,

"Here is mine," and I feel it is a great privilege to be able to say to our president that I have one that I now present to her.

The way in which the memorial is to be conducted and the treasurer's name are on the little card, and I am going to ask you, if you are interested to write some amount on the card, and each person today, in memory of her, to send in something. What you will send is of course your own privilege to decide, but I am sure there couldn't be anyone of us who wouldn't be glad to take part in some way in anything as perfectly delightful as this is going to be. And to this Mrs. Houston replied:

I thank the gentleman on my left for being the first contributor to this cause. As Mrs. Starr has told you, we haven't fully decided what form the memorial will take. We want it to be something lasting and, possibly, if we are able to do so, a permanent headquarters for our Society, a place where we may keep our literature and genealogical books and a library. We feel if we could find a home for them which is also a memorial for Mrs. Large it would be a very fitting tribute to her.

We are very fortunate in having as our guest of honor and speaker, Mr. George Harrison Houston. I shall ask Mr. Charlton Yarnall to say a few words of introduction.

Mr. Yarnall: What Mrs. Starr has said as to the difficulty of being heard reminds me of an experience of my father's. He more than once was a guest at the famous breakfasts which were given in London by the poet Samuel Rogers. At the last one the old Banker Poet had aged much and he said to my father, "Ah, Mr. Yarnall, old age is overtaking me. My faculties are fast declining. I cannot see or hear well and now my voice is failing and I find the only way I can make myself heard is by saying ill-natured things."

Being a modest man, I assure you it is a very serious thing to stand before such an ancient and illustrious organization as this. I think your society is probably the oldest

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

that exists, and its antiquity reminds me of what Mr. Choate said about the Lord Chancellorship—"It is so ancient an office that I might almost refer to it as being wet with the spray of the deluge and lost in the mists of time."

I think your organization must be in much the same class. Introductions are apt to be perfunctory and must not be taken too seriously. I might be pardoned for repeating what my friend, Sir Willmott Lewis told me the other day. It fell to him to introduce Will Rogers to Mr. Bryan, then Secretary of State, two great commoners. I think we all agree Will Rogers was the greater commoner of the two! Mr. Bryan was rather pompous and a little bit condescending. He turned to Mr. Rogers after Lewis had introduced them and said, "Mr. Rogers, I am glad to meet you. I think you and I are pretty much in the same line. I understand you write humorously and I write very seriously." "Yes," said Will Rogers to the Secretary, "and perhaps both of us may be wrong."

It is indeed a pleasure and a privilege to introduce your guest of honor. He is too well known in Philadelphia for me to say anything in regard to his outstanding qualities except this: for his intellectual endowment I have a profound respect, for his personality an affectionate regard.

He has carried a tremendous load for the last few years. As the head of one of the greatest industrial organizations in the country, plunged into the worst depression that the world has ever known, by his dauntless, indomitable courage, by his cheerful nature and his brilliant intellectual abilities, he has finally brought that great industrial organization into smoother waters, and I hope that in a short time his efforts will meet with entire success.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce Mr. George H. Houston, President of the Baldwin Locomotive Works.



Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons



© Ellis

Mr. George Harrison Houston was born in Covington, Kentucky, on January 4, 1883, the son of Charles R. and Elizabeth H. (Mapes) Houston. He married Mary Stuart Hoge in Louisville, Kentucky, on April 29, 1909. Their three children are Peyton H., George H., Jr., and Mary Stuart.

Mr. Houston was engaged in consulting work on industrial management in New York City from 1915 to 1929, the greater part of this period as a member of the engineering firm of George W. Goethals & Company.

In 1929 Mr. Houston retired from consulting work to take the Presidency of The Baldwin Locomotive Works.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

The American System

an Address by

Mr. George Harrison Houston

delivered before

The National Society Magna Charta Dames
Meeting at the Huntingdon Valley Country Club

June 16, 1936

In Celebration of the 721st Anniversary of the
Granting of Magna Charta

*Madam President, Ladies of the Magna Charta,
and distinguished Guests:*



I WANT to speak to you today about the American system of individualism, its origin and background, as contrasted with the various forms of collectivism accepted in recent years by some of the nations of Europe as a solution of their social and economic problems.

I would like, if I were able, to indicate how our traditions, English and American, have affected the form of our political and economic organizations and the reasons why our existing institutions should not be lightly changed or abandoned.

I do not wish to speak extemporaneously or casually because the subject is so vast and intricate and is susceptible to so much misunderstanding that I must either wear you out by too much detail or fail to make my points clear by inadequate presentation. For these reasons I am going to burden you by reading what I have to say.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

The history of civilization is written in its laws. The underlying characteristics of a people may be recognized readily by an understanding of the laws they have created and under which they have lived. Law may be said to be the distillation of past experiences into rules for the future guidance of human conduct. The laws of Europe and America, aside from maritime law, find their origin in one of two small localities: the City of Rome in the Italian peninsula, and the Southern part of the Island of Great Britain. James Bryce, in an essay on Roman and English law, said:

"The world is, or will shortly be, divided between two sets of legal conceptions or rules, and two only. The elder had its birth in a small Italian city, and though it has undergone endless changes and now appears in a variety of forms, it retains its distinctive character, and all these forms still show an underlying unity. The younger has sprung from the union of the rude customs of a group of Low German tribes with the rules worked out by the subtle, acute and eminently disputatious intellect of the Gallacized Norsemen who came to England in the eleventh century. It has been much affected by the elder system, yet it has retained its distinctive features and spirit, a spirit specially contrasted with that of the imperial law in everything that pertains to the rights of the individual and the means of asserting them . . .

"It is therefore to Rome and to England that the eye of the student of political constitutions will most often turn. They represent the most remarkable developments of ordered political life for the ancient and the modern world respectively . . ."

Roman law conceives of the State as supreme with the individual subordinated to it, possessed of no rights which do not derive from the State and which rights the State, upon occasion, may rescind. In contrast, English law recognizes the supremacy of the individual, conceives of the State as deriving its just powers from and with the consent of the individuals comprising it, with many limitations placed upon the use by the State of the powers so derived, rights and privileges not so delegated to the State being retained by the individual. These rights and privileges may be said to constitute what is meant by personal liberty.

Generally speaking the laws of modern nations are based upon a constitution, written or unwritten. James Bryce places in the category of written constitutions those which are expressly set forth in a specially important document or documents, and in the category of unwritten constitutions those which began not in formal agreements, but in usage, a usage which lives in man's recollections, and which, even when it has been to a large extent defined, and secured against error, by being committed to writing, is recorded as embodying that which men have observed, and are deemed likely to continue to observe and not as that to which they have bound themselves formally by a law. One may be said to be comprised usually in one instrument; the other a matter of slow growth. The outstanding example of the unwritten constitution is that of England; of the written constitution that of America.

We are prone to think of the Magna Charta as the origin of the English constitution, but in fact it was the culmination of a considerable amount of experience set forth in earlier codes from the time of Alfred, through the later periods of Edward the Confessor, William the Conqueror and the first and second Henry's. The significance of the Magna Charta, to us of the present day, is not so much the originality of its substance, as the fact that it constituted a renewed and more binding acknowledgment, by entrenched authority, of the rights of the individual that could not be set aside by the wishes or even the necessities of such authority. It is this characteristic, evident at that early day, which has vitally differentiated English law through the centuries from Roman or civil law. English history records many efforts on the part of those in power, since the signing of the Magna Charta, to destroy the guarantees therein given, of the liberties of the

individual, but each such effort has resulted ultimately in a reiteration and strengthening of these guarantees.

Our own American institutions and system of government were founded on this English tradition. While our Constitution is written and otherwise differs extensively from the English, yet among its most vital characteristics are the guarantees it gives to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the individual. Not all these guarantees were embodied in the Constitution, as originally drafted, which was devoted largely to the form and procedure of the central government. Others were added, however, in the first ten amendments known as the Bill of Rights, required by certain of the original states before they would adopt the Constitution, and in later amendments adopted subsequently at the dictates of experience.

Our Constitution was formed to bring together under one central government a group of sovereign states already existing, without destruction of that characteristic of government which has been proven of immeasurable value through the centuries of English history in the protection of individual liberty—namely, local self government with respect to local matters, leaving to the central government only matters in which local government is inherently incompetent. This objective was gained by the organization of the central government as a federation of the existing states. The country was thus organized with three gradations of centralization of governmental function, namely, the individual state, which possessed all residuary power of government not otherwise delegated; a central government to which was delegated specific powers and to which the exercise of all other powers was specifically prohibited; and subdivisions of states, including counties, townships, municipalities and villages, each organized for the purpose of local government with respect to local matters.

The Constitution provided further for the division of the functions of the Federal government into three coordinate branches, the Legislative, the Executive and the Judicial. I believe this separation of the Judicial from the Legislative and Executive functions may be truly said to be America's outstanding contribution to the world's technique of government. Its value in sustaining the guarantees of the Constitution against the encroachment of government, both Federal and State, upon the rights of the individual, has been apparent for many years but never more so than during these recent months.

Under the government thus created the American people have lived for 150 years and have proved what has well been called the American system. Within this structure they have enjoyed the ordered liberties of a free people, coupled with a material prosperity never before approached in the world's history. While there has been great wealth and great poverty in places, yet there has been a more general distribution of material prosperity and individual opportunity than in any other great nation, at any other time, in the world's history.

America has long been known as the land of opportunity, opportunity for the individual to live his own life in his own way, to strive, to accomplish, to accumulate and to enjoy the fruits of his accomplishments. The liberties of the individual American have been threefold, the right to worship God as he chooses; freedom from the caste rigidities of the social organizations of the Old World; and the privilege of pursuing the satisfaction of his physical wants in his own way.

The American system is essentially a system of free and individual enterprise. It may be defined as a form of social organization in which the facilities of production, distribution and living are owned and controlled privately, that is, by

private individuals or groups of private individuals. It is based upon three simple propositions:

First, the right of the individual to seek and find employment where, when and how he may desire; and to accept therefor whatever he may agree upon;

Second, the right of the individual to exchange freely the proceeds of his labor or any of his goods and property with others for whatever consideration he can get and may wish to accept; and

Third, the right of the individual to own and to enjoy the use of property thus acquired so long, and to the extent, that such ownership and such use do not interfere with like ownership and use of property by others.

In common with the countries of Europe which felt the full impact of the World War, America has passed through several years of deep depression. Its people have suffered seriously from the psychological fatigue of hope long deferred. In this condition they have been and now are being subjected to pressure from special groups to change the character of the American system from one of free and individual enterprise to one of coerced and collective enterprise.

Collectivism, as thus advocated under many disguises, means simply a form of social organization in which the facilities of production and distribution and, to a greater or less degree, the facilities of living are owned or controlled by the State. Such a system would substitute for the free exchange of goods and services, a government controlled exchange. Of necessity this would be accompanied by government control of production, because if exchange of goods is thus controlled the production of such goods must of neces-

sity come within the scope of the same control. It would also, as a necessary corollary, substitute for the right of the individual to seek and find the employment he desires, the allocation or assignment of work, because if production is controlled, employment must of necessity be equally controlled. The control by the State of the facilities of production and distribution thus effected would soon lead to their outright ownership by the State and the complete subordination to the State of the economic activities of the individual. History has yet to show a single instance of economic subordination of this character that has not been accompanied concurrently or subsequently by suppression of every form of freedom of action and individual liberty. This procedure is vitally different from governmental regulation of business, undertaken to insure its conduct by private enterprise in a fair and orderly way, but without direct governmental participation or control.

This centralized control of the economic life of a nation is generally referred to as national economic planning. It involves the planning of all production and distribution by a central group for the purpose of balancing production with consumption demand and the enforcement of such plans by the powers of government. Such a system substitutes governmental coercion for the individual enterprise and voluntary cooperation of the American system. It substitutes the concentrated judgment of a few for the diversified judgment of the many. Errors made through such centralized planning would be of infinitely greater magnitude and the danger done of infinitely greater concentration than would be the case where decisions were averaged as under our American system of individual enterprise. The few selected as planners probably would possess no greater intelligence than the individuals possess who now deal with such matters and in fact are likely, by virtue of political selection rather than selection by competitive merit, to be possessed of less

intelligence. National economic planning would destroy completely the traditional supremacy of the individual under the American system and establish the complete and uncontrolled supremacy of the State. It would substitute Autocracy for Democracy.

The experience of the past few years has indicated that these changes are not possible under the American Constitution as it now stands. Numerous legislative efforts to this end have been declared by the Supreme Court to be contrary to the principles of our American system as laid down in the Constitution. It is coming to be recognized that the only way in which these objectives can be attained is by far reaching changes in our form of government, either by changing the text of the Constitution or by changing the interpretations already given to the existing text in such a manner as to violate and destroy the guarantees to the liberties of the individual, contained within it.

It has been said frequently that the present conflict is comparable with that waged between Jefferson and Hamilton with respect to the degree of centralization of government that should be permitted under the Constitution. The present issues are far more comprehensive, however, comprising a vast extension in the field of actual governmental activity, both Federal and State, much of which is specifically prohibited by the Constitution, as well as usurpation by the central government of many functions now being carried on by State Governments. This extension applies not only to the detailed control of every phase of the economic life of the country but also to the actual performance by government of many functions of production and distribution and to the actual ownership by government of vast facilities for the carrying on of such functions.

It is just as possible for the individual states, except as restrained by their respective constitutions and the Federal Constitution, to destroy individualism in this manner as it

is for the Federal Government to do so. Many phases of these proposals are planned to that end.

It is axiomatic that privately owned enterprise cannot live in competition with government owned or controlled enterprise, because private enterprise must finance itself, including its own losses, and at the same time be subject to the burden of taxation necessary to finance competitive enterprise by government. In the presence of government enterprise, private enterprise must die.

Twenty years ago the Russian Revolution brought into being the most comprehensive undertaking of national economic planning that the world has yet seen. Later Italy and then Germany have changed the form of their social order from one of free enterprise, with limitations, to one of complete government controlled enterprise. Is it of any significance that the laws of each of these nations were founded on Roman law and its concept of the Supremacy of the State? Will America, with its great heritage of personal liberty, follow in their footsteps? There are, among the leaders of our people, a substantial number, holding positions of power and influence both in Government and in private life, who appear firmly convinced that it should do so. They say that individualism has failed so utterly as to justify its abandonment in favor of collectivism, or possibly of some compromise between the two systems, hoping thus to obtain the good points of each.

America cannot be organized in accord with both systems; we cannot simultaneously be individualistic and collective; the two concepts carry us in opposite directions; we must of necessity choose one or the other. Once having chosen, events which follow will make the retracing of our steps and the modification of our decision very difficult, if not impossible.

These issues find their origin largely in a difference in the concept of the functions of government and of industry

in the social order. The critics of individualism advance two thoughts:

First, that the prime objective of government is to raise the standard of living of the people; and

Second, that industry should be used, under the control of government, as a vehicle for insuring and guaranteeing economic security to each individual.

The advocates of the existing order hold, however, that the prime objective of government is not merely to raise the standard of living of the people, but rather, after providing for such vital functions as national defense and the perpetuation of the mechanism of government, to administer justice, to protect the rights and liberties of the individual even against the pressure of numerical majorities; and to keep open to each, freedom of opportunity to work and to enjoy the fruits of his own labor, that is, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Without questioning the desirability of economic security for the individual as a social objective, with which every thoughtful person is in sympathy, it should be noted that industry should perform only three functions for society, namely:

Production and distribution of goods and services;

Provision of gainful employment for those who desire it; and

Creation of an opportunity for the investment of the savings of the people and the conservation of these savings until again required by the investor.

The most important of these functions is production and distribution. In the final analysis the standard of living is the sum of all of the things produced, divided by those

available to consume them. While much improvement is possible in distribution, yet anything that reduces the aggregate volume of production, ultimately must lower the standard of living of the people as a whole, in that there will be less to distribute. When industry is called upon to assume other burdens than those indicated, such as insuring and guaranteeing the economic security of all individuals, it does so at the expense of its effectiveness in production and thus actually defeats the end sought by the Collectivists themselves, that is, the raising of the standard of living of all the people.

Neither the American system nor a planned economy can guarantee to any man that he will find the work he wants, that he shall receive wages sufficient for his needs or that he shall not suffer from physical want. These are not rights but privileges arising from the enjoyment of opportunity. Society cannot permanently assure a living to each individual, irrespective of the contribution of such individual to the well being of the community. The community may and should, so far as is possible, prevent the individual from going without the physical necessities of life because of inability to acquire them through personal incompetence or external obstacles. Social service, such as providing economic security to each individual, should be undertaken to the extent required, directly by the whole community and be paid for through taxation upon all portions of the community. It should not be added as a direct burden solely upon production or distribution. Such action by the community should constitute privilege to the beneficiary, however, and not the exercise of a right on his part. We must be careful to differentiate between the obligation of society to keep open the way to opportunity for the individual and the obligation of society to reward the individual as though he has taken advantage of such opportunity. The former is a service that society should render to the individual to

the best of its ability; the latter must be gained by the individual through the exercise of his own efforts and ability.

We hear criticism at times of the Federal Constitution and also of the various State Constitutions, as interfering with social progress. Such interference, when closely examined, is found generally to affect the application of some new social theory which, if accepted, would merely open the way to greater control by the government of the details of our daily lives.

The recent decision of the Supreme Court in declaring unconstitutional the Minimum Wage Law of the State of New York aroused criticism of this character. This situation is of such immediate interest and ultimate importance that I would like to discuss it somewhat in detail. This law gave a commission the power, among others, to fix a minimum wage for women but with no specific obligation to consider the value of the services to be rendered for such minimum wage. It was declared unconstitutional because it interfered with the freedom of contract between private individuals. The decision followed closely a decision of the Supreme Court in a similar case thirteen years ago. The Court's decision in the New York case was said to create a No Man's Land in which no machinery of government was available for control. This No Man's Land was hailed as a newly discovered defect in our Constitution requiring immediate correction by amendment, regardless of the fact that for thirteen years since the earlier decision no such action was deemed necessary or desirable. The advocates of such a change have overlooked the fact that the American people have never delegated to government the control of all of their affairs, but have provided very specifically in the Constitution, that the enumeration therein given of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people and that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution or prohibited by it to

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people. It will be seen, therefore, that the so-called No Man's Land is really the land in which each man has retained his individual supremacy.

Before supporting any such change we should consider carefully how far this supremacy of the individual should be surrendered to the State even under the exigencies of present day industrial conditions. Confining our thought for the moment solely to the principle of giving the State the right to fix a minimum wage, let us consider how this right, once vested in the State might work out. Were a constitutional amendment vesting this authority in the State to be interpreted subsequently, as it well might be, as extending the power of the State to fix rates beyond the minimum, that is, maximum and intermediate rates, we would have handed over to political control the fixing of the entire wage structure of enterprise. Wage earners are always in the minority as compared with consumers, so we would have taken away from the wage earner and turned over to the general public the determination, under political procedure, of the conditions under which the individual worker shall labor for a livelihood. This would mean fastening upon the producers of the country the supreme autocracy. No tyranny is worse than that of a selfish majority imposing, in the name of the public good, upon a helpless minority.

Assuming, however, that a constitutional amendment could be drafted which would be limited permanently to the fixing by the State of a minimum wage only, what would be its effect? Would we have a flat minimum throughout a given State? In such a case if the minimum were set low enough not to destroy the ability of enterprise to operate in country districts, it would be entirely too low to protect employees against exploitation in the great centers, like New York City. Is the minimum wage to be graded on the

basis of the cost of living in each locality? If so, who is to determine the standard of living to be used and the relative cost in each locality? Who is to assume responsibility for the results obtained? Let such a minimum rate be set too high, and the result, of necessity, would be a general exodus of business to a more favorable locality. Let it be set too low and real exploitation would occur. Can a State Commission, no matter how powerful and intelligent, no matter how much it may be freed from the dictates of political coercion, be expected invariably to exercise such supreme wisdom as to make no mistakes? Has the art of government progressed far enough in America to warrant delegating to governmental agencies the determination of these delicate adjustments and the making of the infinite decisions required to effect them?

What is the responsibility of the State to the individuals thrown out of work because of such mistakes? It will be recognized that even though the State did have the power to thus determine a minimum wage it could not compel employment in private enterprise at such a rate. Must not the State be prepared, when it sets a minimum wage for gainful workers, to support such workers if such regulation prevents their employment? Would it not be more practical for the State, in recognition of its responsibility to protect the weak against exploitation by the strong, if it were to proceed directly on this premise? Could not the State reach its objective more effectively by assuming immediately, the responsibility it cannot avoid ultimately, once it undertakes to regulate conditions of employment, by saying that such women and children need not work for less than a given minimum wage, but that if they cannot find employment at or above such minimum rate the State will pay them a dole for not working? I do not advocate a dole, nor do I advocate delegating this power to the State. I am endeavoring simply to indicate a way by which the State may accomplish its

objective in this instance within the present structure of the Constitution.

It is interesting to note the viewpoint of labor with respect to this whole subject of State regulation of conditions of employment. Little comment was made by the newspapers at the time, but radio announced that Mr. William Green, in testifying before the Resolutions Committee of the Republican Convention, or before one of its subcommittees, with respect to statutory regulation of minimum wages, stated that the American Federation of Labor was prepared to support a constitutional amendment which would permit the States to fix minimum wages and other working conditions for women and minors, but not for men. He added that men did not wish to subject themselves to the dictates of government with respect to these matters. I wonder if in this day when women are seeking to remove the last vestige of statutory discrimination against their sex, they will want a constitutional amendment for the specific purpose of acknowledging that they are not competent to compete with men but must be subjected to special protection. From the character of the arguments presented by several women's organizations in the New York case this is subject to serious question.

There can be little doubt as to the ultimate outcome, once these proposed changes in our American system are placed before the people clearly and are fully understood by them. The danger lies in changes effected by indirection permitted through lack of understanding of what is contemplated, together with its implications and ultimate goal. Our Supreme Court has proven itself to be an effective check upon hurried and thoughtless change. It has worked well up to this time but cannot be looked upon as a permanent barrier. The only medium by which our institutions can be protected and our national policies safely guided, is the intelligent opinion of the American people expressed through the

ballot box. Unfortunately many of us are suffering from the fatigue and confusion of years of struggle, hardship and depression. Under such conditions the idealistic theories of the proponents of change look particularly attractive when compared with the practical realities of actual existence under the vicissitudes of recent years. Reduce these theories to practice by actual application to American life and you will have accomplished one of the major catastrophes of all history. Real and lasting security to the individual cannot be accomplished by this route but only by the restoration of conditions favorable to individual initiative, enterprise, industry and thrift. These qualities of the individual have made America what it is and will sustain it in the future.

James Truslow Adams says in his recent biography of Jefferson that the present issue in America is "whether we shall govern ourselves or be governed." We are faced at this time with a greater hazard to our liberty as individuals, and to our rights and privileges as a self-governing people, than were the colonists for whose liberties Jefferson labored. The hazard is increased by virtue of the fact that the issues are not in the open, but are hidden under glittering theories, plausible words and pleasing personalities. Let us not be carried away by these superficialities, however, to a point where we believe that the principles which have been the bulwark of English liberty since the signing of the Magna Charta and of American liberty since the Declaration of Independence have suddenly become obsolete and must be replaced by the theories of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler. We need none of these doctrines in America; our social and economic organization is not perfect, in fact, it leaves much to be desired, but it is better than any that has yet been devised by any other country, and our future well being lies in perfecting and adjusting it within its existing constitutional framework, rather than in casting it aside for the defeatist doctrines of the Old World.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

Those of us who so believe are faced with the very great responsibility of preserving this system and passing it on to the next generation without loss of any part of the strength and vitality it possessed when we of this generation received it from our forefathers. We can accomplish this only by making clear to all the people just what the American system is; the real substance of the proposed changes; and the effect of these changes upon the individual.

Our acute problem today still is unemployment. Cure this and the pressure for these changes will largely disappear. Reemployment is possible, however, only by release of enterprise from the many interferences and obstacles that have fettered it, some through ignorance, some possibly to justify the arguments for change. Remove these and let the individual have a fair opportunity and I am firmly convinced that we shall again enjoy our normal American prosperity and begin again to go forward toward a genuinely abundant life.

While the issues we have discussed are essentially social and economic, yet they must be settled through political channels. In the final analysis they can be comprised in the simple questions: What kind of country do we want America to be, free or controlled? Shall we govern ourselves or be governed? The right answers will be given only if and when the American people understand their full significance.

Mrs. Houston: Personally and on behalf of the Society I wish to thank Mr. Houston individually and collectively for his very clear and forceful exposition of this subject which is of paramount interest to us all.

The meeting is adjourned.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

In Loving Remembrance

- MISS JOSEPHINE KING BARBER.....January 6, 1936
 MRS. ARTHUR BERRY (Margaret de Clare Monteiro de Barros),
 September 11, 1935
 MRS. ARMINIUS WESLEY BILL (Harriet Augusta Woodford)..May 21, 1935
 MISS HATTIE MAY BROWN.....July 5, 1935
 MRS. LEON C. BUTTERFIELD (Lillian Soule).....October 21, 1935
 MISS IDA CUSHMAN.....May 20, 1936
 MRS. JOSEPH FRANCIS DAHLGREN (Anne Huntly Gordon)....June 21, 1936
 MRS. ALEX J. DALLAS DIXON (Margaretta Sargeant)...September 20, 1925
 MRS. PORTER BAKER EUBANK (Louise Rubie Hicks).....February 9, 1935
 MRS. CHARLES CLEMENT FRENCH (Mary Catherine Bronaugh),
 February 12, 1936
 MRS. JOHN COFFIN WHITNEY FRISHEMUTH (Hannah Miller Biddle),
 July 17, 1935
 MISS MARY S. GARRETT.....July 19, 1926
 MRS. JAMES LEE GILLOGLY (Lydia Lucella Webster).....July 15, 1936
 MISS AMELIA COMEX HAMILTON.....March 5, 1936
 MRS. WALTER ALEXANDER HARRIS (Emily Williamson)June 5, 1936
 MRS. HENRY P. LOOMIS (Julia Josephine Stinson).....December 23, 1933
 MRS. EFFINGHAM BUCKLEY MORRIS (Ellen Douglas Burroughs),
 April 30, 1932
 MRS. JAMES MOSES (Mary White MacDonald).....September 20, 1935
 MRS. JOHN MOSES (Olivia Gardner Forman).....December 29, 1927
 MRS. ALBERT FRANK OLSON (Althea Luella Sinclair).....1934
 MISS FRANCES DEVEREUX REED.....June 13, 1933
 MRS. GEORGE RANDALL ROBERTS (Katharine Stuart Marsh).....1931
 MISS ANNA TANCER SMITH.....
 MADAME SORTSI (Lillian Mac Moore).....May 20, 1936
 MISS CARRIE ADRIELLE SOUTHWICK.....January 27, 1935
 MRS. HUGH LEWIS SUTHERLAND (Ethel Cosby Burrus)..February 24, 1933
 MRS. PETER FIRESTONE VOLLNOGLE (Prudence Sharpless Doyle),
 January 20, 1936
 MRS. JOHN ROBINSON WEBSTER (Gertrude Margaret Potter)..June 24, 1935
 MRS. MORIS JONES WENTWORTH (Lizzie Shaw Hunt)....December 22, 1935
 MRS. ROBERT CAMPBELL MORRIS WILSON (Elizabeth Church Dake),
 March 24, 1936

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

OFFICERS

President

MRS. GEORGE HARRISON HOUSTON (Mary Stuart Hoge), Pennsylvania

First Vice-President

MRS. JOHN S. WURTS (Dorothy Barrett Williams), Pennsylvania

Vice-President

MRS. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS (Jean Cabot Emerson), Massachusetts

Vice-President

MRS. GEORGE DALLAS DIXON (Mary Quincy Allen), Pennsylvania

Vice-President

MISS EUNICE LATHROP, Massachusetts

Vice-President

MRS. CHARLES M. LEA (Charlotte Augusta Brown), Devon

Vice-President

MRS. JAMES STARR (Sarah Logan Wister), Pennsylvania

Vice-President

MRS. WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT (Helen Herron), Washington

Herald General

MRS. JULIEN ORTIZ (Alice Eugénie du Pont), Delaware

Regent General

MISS ELIZABETH FISHER WASHINGTON, Pennsylvania

Regents

Mrs. Arthur Dwight Allen (Jane Potter Mengel)	Kentucky
Mrs. James Blythe Anderson (Alice Simms)	Kentucky
Mrs. Peter Arrington (Katherine Clark Pendleton)	North Carolina
Mrs. Edwin LeRoy Bowen (Ellen Brooke Culver)	California
Mrs. John Thompson Dorrance (Ethel Mallinckrodt)	Pennsylvania
Mrs. Alan Edward Stuart Douglas (Sallie Wood Hume)	Honolulu
Mrs. Alexis Felix duPont (Mary Richard Chichester)	Delaware
Mrs. William Owen Goodman (Erna Malvina Sawyer)	Chicago
Mrs. Alexander Gordon (Elizabeth Southall Clarke)	Baltimore
Mrs. William Satterthwaite Hallowell (Anna Jenkins Ferris)	Germantown
Mrs. Theodore Jesse Hoover (Mildred Brooke)	California
Mrs. William Macpherson Hornor (Julia Crawford)	Bryn Mawr
Mrs. Edward Bentley Huling (Sarah Julia Hawks)	New York
Mrs. Daniel Kent (Hattie May Leland)	Massachusetts
Mrs. Michel Moracin LeBrun (Maria Olivia Steele)	New Jersey
Miss Lucretia Christophers Lennig	Philadelphia
Mrs. Gilbert Anderson MacKenzie (Luella Wood)	Iowa
Mrs. Charles Batchelor McLean (Clara Clementine Chamberlain)	Pittsburgh
Mrs. George Jackson Mead (Evelyn Cary Hoge)	Hartford
Miss Susan Billings Meech	Florida
Mrs. Edward Stephen Moulton (Elizabeth Edge Armington)	Rhode Island
Mrs. C. Edward Murray (Jennie Scudder)	New Jersey
Mrs. Alton Brooks Parker (Amelia Day Campbell)	New York
Mrs. David Dixon Porter (Winifred Metcalf Mattingly)	Washington
Mrs. Homer Day Rankin (Florence West)	Ohio
Mrs. Oscar Herbert Rixford (Elizabeth May Leach)	Vermont
Mrs. Alpha Eugene Rokey (Phila Jane Watson)	Oregon
Mrs. Joseph Carl von Schwinbeck (Elizabeth West)	Missouri
Mrs. Finley Johnson Shepard (Helen Miller Gould)	New York
Mrs. James Francis Sullivan (Lutie Romaine Nichols)	Radnor
Mrs. Norman Frederick Thompson (Adaline Eliza Emerson)	Connecticut
Miss Alice Elizabeth Trabue	Louisville
The Princess Pierre Troubetzkoy (Amélie Louise Rives)	Virginia

Secretary and Treasurer

MISS MARGARET CURTIS MERRITT

For convenience kindly address
all correspondence to the Society's
Post Office Box, No. 4222, Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons



The National Society Magna Charta Dames

was instituted at the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, on March 1st, 1909. It is a social Order, directed by a Council and composed of women who are lineal descendants of one or more of the Barons of England who in or before the year 1215 rendered actual service toward securing, and who, after many defeats, finally did secure the articles of constitutional liberty, properly called the Magna Charta, from their sovereign, John, King of England, which he ratified and delivered to them "in the meadow which is called Runnemede between Windsor and Staines," on the Thames, above London, on the 15th day of June, A. D., 1215.

Copyright 2012 National Society Magna Charta Dames and Barons

SOME RECENT MEETINGS OF THE SOCIETY

- June 10, 1929, Guests of Mrs. James Large at The Ritz-Carlton, Philadelphia. Address by John S. Wurts, LL.B., "A Priceless Heritage."
- November 21, 1929, at The Copley Plaza, Boston. Addresses by Mrs. Daniel Kent and Mrs. William S. Hollowell, "Magna Charta Ideals."
- March 1, 1930, at The Drake, Chicago. Address by Miss Isabel Wurts Page, "Our Twenty-first Anniversary."
- June 12, 1930, Guests of Mrs. Julien Ortiz at "Valmy," Greenville, Delaware. Address by John S. Wurts, LL.B., "The Field of Runnymede."
- November 5, 1930, at The Willard, Washington. Addresses by Dr. Marcus Benjamin and Dr. Joseph G. B. Bulloch, "Magna Charta and the Ladies."
- March 17, 1931, at The Vanderbilt, New York. Address by Mrs. Finley J. Shepard, "The Trend of the Times—A Plea for the Christian Faith."
- June 11, 1931, Guests of Mrs. James Large at Strawberry Mansion, Philadelphia. Address by Miss Sarah D. Lowrie, "A New Era of Hospitality."
- November 12, 1931, at The Barclay, Philadelphia. Address by Dr. G. Campbell Morgan, "Two Principles of Magna Charta."
- June 11, 1932, Guests of Mrs. Finley J. Shepard at "Lyndhurst," Irvington-on-Hudson, who also made the address.

A fuller account of these meetings appears in the Brochure, entitled "A Priceless Heritage—A Sacred Trust," and Dr. Morgan's address has been printed completely in a separate edition for the Society.

- November 16, 1932, at Green Hill Farms, Overbrook. Addresses by Anna Lane Lingeibach, Ph.D., "The Magna Charta and William Penn"; Rev. D. Wilmot Gateson, M.A., "The Pen and the Sword."
- June 12, 1933, Guests of Mrs. James Starr at Fort Hunter on the Susquehanna. Address by Mrs. Edward B. Meigs, "Fort Hunter."
- November 14, 1933, at The Barclay, Philadelphia. Address by Frances Lester Warner, "A Foot-Note to Magna Charta."
- June 12, 1934, Guests of Mrs. John T. Dorrance at "Woodcrest," Radnor. Address by Dr. Leicester Crosby Lewis, "The Ordered Liberty of Magna Charta."
- November 20, 1934, at Sherry's, New York. Addresses by Major Montgomery Schuyler, "Early Settlements in America"; Major John V. Bouvier, "Our Political Recession"; Dr. William Sohler Bryant, "Allegiance."

A detailed account of these meetings appears in the eighty-page magazine dated June, 1935.

- June 18, 1935, Guests of Mrs. George Harrison Houston at the Huntingdon Valley Country Club. Address by the Hon. Gilbert Holland Montague, "The Constitution and Magna Charta."

A detailed account of this meeting appears in the thirty-two-page magazine dated October, 1935.

- November 12, 1935, at the Belvedere, Baltimore, Maryland. Address by the Hon. Daniel R. Randall, "Lest We Forget."
- March 3, 1936, at The Shoreham, Washington, D. C. Address by the Hon. Daniel O. Hastings, "Our Democratic Form of Government Shall Endure."
- June 16, 1936, at the Huntingdon Valley Country Club. Address by Mr. George Harrison Houston, "The American System."

A detailed account of these meetings appears in this magazine.

**Copies of the above may be obtained from the Secretary
as long as they are available.**