

The Virginia Teacher

Volume XX

MAY, 1939

No. 5

JAMES MADISON

THREE documents hold first rank in the English-speaking world. First is Magna Charta, which, under heavy guard, has crossed the ocean and is now on exhibit in the British pavilion of the World's Fair in New York. The second is the Declaration of Independence, which intoned the dominant note of the 19th century. The third is the Constitution of the United States, of which James Madison was the Father. I congratulate Madison College in bearing a name that has so much historic significance. Stephen Langton stands for Magna Charta; Thomas Jefferson for the Declaration; and Madison was the builder of federal democracy on this continent. He was a student-statesman; and so, appropriately, his character and moral purpose symbolized this College.

Prior to your adoption of his name, there was really no fitting memorial to Madison in Virginia. Strange as it may be, he is not found in the group surrounding Washington's statue in Richmond, though most people take for granted that he is there. Statues of Jackson are found here and there throughout the state; but of Madison, the maker of the Constitution, there was none until Governor Pollard placed a bust of him in a niche of the Capitol in Richmond, among the eight Virginia-born Presidents. Your noble President and Trustees have done a real service to Virginia and the Nation, by singling out this constructive statesman for special honor, by naming for him a college that will outlast warriors and war-makers.

To show how difficult was the task undertaken by Madison in working out a frame of government for our country, we have only to remember that three constitutions, in three different countries, were

made at the same time. Under the Constitution of James Madison, Washington took the oath of office as President on April 30, 1789. Five days thereafter, the States-General met in Versailles and blocked out for France a new Constitution. Simultaneously, Poland wrought out a new government. Of the three, only that of Madison's make survives, after 150 years. The Constitution of France stood for less than a year, and Poland was blotted out as a nation soon after its new form of government went into effect. Such is the enduring nature of Madison's political forethought.

What claim has Madison to be regarded as "the Father of the Constitution"? He took the initiative in every important step leading up to the convention of 1787 in Philadelphia. His singular identification with practically every step of the way may have been in part by accident; yet this fact must not obscure the persistence of his purpose to change the Confederation—"a rope of sand"—into a strong National government which should combine local liberty with central efficiency. It was Madison who, in 1784, proposed in the Virginia Legislature that a joint conference with Maryland be held in 1785 in Alexandria (or rather, Mount Vernon) to break down the tariff barriers between the states, which were wrecking the Union. He likewise took the initiative in following up this conference by one at Annapolis, the following year, which actually issued the call, written by Hamilton, for a Convention in Philadelphia in 1787. Alexandria in 1785, and Annapolis in '86, were the first two rounds on the ascending ladder that led to stable government in our country. Madison managed them both.

As soon as the Convention in Philadelphia was decided upon, Madison's mind bent its energies to blocking out the pro-

visions of the new frame of government. What are the proofs of this statement? First, three letters embodying his specific suggestions were written, on March 18, to Jefferson, who was then in Paris as American Minister; on April 8 to Edmund Randolph, as Governor of Virginia; and on April 16, 1787, to Washington, who was of course the leading spirit in seeking to found a government based on wisdom, justice, liberty and perpetuity. The spirit in which Madison took up his task is shown in this sentence: "I hold it for a fundamental point that an individual independence of the State is utterly irreconcilable with the idea of an aggregate sovereignty. I think, at the same time, that consolidation of the State into one single Republic is not less unattainable than it would be inexpedient. Let it be tried, then, whether any middle ground can be taken, which will at once support a due supremacy of the National authority, and leave in force the local authorities, so far as they can be subordinately useful." Mark, if you please, how he steers between Scylla and Charybdis. "Let it be tried, then, whether *any middle ground can be taken.*" That's the voice of Virginia. The Mother Colony, midway on the Atlantic, Virginia's rôle in American history has been vicarious. Her office has been mediatorial. This springs, in part, out of her geography and history, but is due in large measure to the legacy of political instinct that flows in the blood of Englishmen. If Madison's work in making a government survived, as over against the fleeting makeshifts of France and Poland, it is due to that 'middle ground, for which his mind groped and at last, agonizingly, found. Patrick Henry and Richard Henry Lee deserve infinitely our gratitude, as men who set the ball of the Revolution rolling; and yet, when it came to actually building a government, they fought this middle way for which Madison stood.

Reasonableness is the basic quality in the mind of the Virginia people, and Madison

embodied this in the fullest degree. He avoided extremes at both ends, in the true spirit of Edmund Burke, the greatest political philosopher of England. People sometimes try to slur this aspect of statesmanship by calling it 'compromise.' But in a memorable talk with Harold J. Laski in London, I remember that he dwelt upon the fact that the British government is built upon compromise. The middle ground may not stir the heroic passions, but it is the safe way of the traveller who seeks the path to home and comfort and constancy. This middle ground of Madison was something that Calhoun, and even Jefferson, never fully understood. In walking the tight rope it is easy for the acrobat to jump to the right or the left; but that's not the game. His job is to keep on that rope and get across. Nullification and Secession, whether in Hartford or Charleston, have been departures from Madison's middle ground.

Madison was a Nationalist, along with Washington. In the draft of the Virginia Plan, which he in large measure shaped, the word 'National' occurs 19 times, with a capital "N." It is the irony of fate that the sons of these National statesmen of 1787, from the South, should have drawn their swords in 1861 against the very Republic which the founding Fathers established. I recall it here, simply to emphasize that Madison's middle ground is, after all, the golden way.

As we have seen, for three years Madison toiled to call the country into conference on the necessity of framing a better government. When the Convention met in Philadelphia, in 1787, Madison arrived on May 3, though the day appointed for the opening was May 14. As a matter of fact, a quorum did not appear until May 28. How did Madison use these precious twenty-five days, while he was waiting for laggard delegates to arrive? A volume could be written on the use of his time in these days, and the resulting fruitage to American solidarity. He drew together,

particularly, all the Virginia delegates. Washington came on May 13, with Blair and McClurg next day. Randolph, the Governor, arrived on the 15th, and Mason two days later. "These seven men met together daily, and drew up the outlines of a new Government, which was submitted to the Convention by Randolph on the first day of discussion." Madison's skilful hand is plainly visible in all this spade work. Months before, he had studied Federalism, in ancient leagues, Switzerland, Holland, wherever a vestige could be found of the type of government necessary for this continent. What a class he had, to teach these basal facts! Look around at those seven men. Washington, of course, was silent; Wythe was a teacher, with Jefferson and Marshall and Monroe to his credit as students; Mason, that solid neighbor from Gunston Hall, had written the Virginia Bill of Rights and drafted our first Constitution in 1776. It was a great ensemble, this Virginia group alone, as well as the Convention as a whole. William Pierce of Georgia tells us that: "Mr. Madison is a character who has long been in public life; and, what is very remarkable, every Person seems to acknowledge his greatness. He blends together the profound politician, with the Scholar. In the management of a very great question, he evidently took the lead in the Convention, and tho' he cannot be called an Orator, he is a most agreeable, eloquent and convincing Speaker. From a spirit of industry and application which he possesses in a most eminent degree, he always comes forward the best-informed man of any point in debate.... A Gentleman of great modesty,—with a remarkable sweet temper." The French Minister, in 1788, pronounced Madison more profound, but less brilliant, than Hamilton.

Not only was Madison identified with every step leading up to the Convention, and in framing the outline of government which was the basis of discussion, but he is

virtually the sole historian of that memorable meeting. It is as the recorder of the transcendent events that took place in that secret conventicle, that the basis is formed of his enduring fame. It was agreed, wisely, by the members, that nothing should be given out as to the debates, while they were in progress. Hence that generation knew little or nothing about the actual proceedings. But Madison, prophetic in this, as in so much else, took a seat near the president, Washington, where he could easily hear the speakers, and jotted down notes of all the debates. Happily, he was present at every session. These short-hand notes he would at night transcribe, and in his later years perfect. The secrecy of this manuscript he sacredly guarded, leaving it among his papers at Montpelier, when he died, in 1836, the last survivor of that immortal group of fifty-five men. Such is the origin of Madison's Notes, or Journal, which is now our chief source of information as to the details and opinions of the men that made the Constitution. I am glad to know that your President is already wisely gathering all available Madison material, and that various people are instinctively sending it to him. In your great new library, I hope there will be fireproof provision made for keeping this priceless material. You will no doubt have every edition of Madison's Notes. The Government has reproduced it with every erasure and asterisk of the original.

Madison was 36 years old, as he sat in the Philadelphia Convention. He was slightly more than five feet, six inches tall, was precise in dress and manner, and clad usually in black. He had been a student at Princeton, under the great Witherspoon, to whom probably we owe in no small measure the central ideas of Madison's philosophy,—religious liberty, moderation in government, the spirit of compromise, and, above all, the ability to discern how local initiative and central efficiency can be made complementary.

It may be just a fancy, but I have long wondered whether James Madison did not have something to do with suggesting that the Canadian border be unfortified, a fact which is the most important single feature of America's foreign policy. The basis of this hint as to the origin of that idea lies in the fact that Madison and John George Jackson, who made the motion in Congress that there be no fleets nor forts on the Canadian border, married sisters. Let me remind you, young ladies, that Madison had a jewel of a wife, Dolly Madison. The sisters were of a family of Friends, the Paynes. Was the idea original with Jackson, or was it perhaps suggested by Madison on the prompting of one of these two Quaker ladies? That is a piece of research that I leave to some student of this College to delve into at her leisure.

It should be emphasized that Madison's first public utterance was for religious liberty. It came about in this wise. When George Mason read his Virginia Bill of Rights to the Convention in Williamsburg in 1776, Madison, then just returned from Princeton, arose and questioned the use of the word 'toleration,' declaring that Virginians desired religious liberty,—something quite different. Throughout his public career, he remained a staunch supporter of religious freedom, and his name should be linked with those of Roger Williams and Thomas Jefferson in securing this boon for mankind. I suggest that some one of you make a study of Madison's dealings with John Leland; for perhaps we owe, in no small degree, to the coöperation of these two men the guarantee in the Constitution of the rights of conscience.

You will note that I have come to the end of this address without once alluding to the fact that Madison was Secretary of State, and twice President of the United States. Evidently, Virginia Presidents, in writing their epitaphs, have a flair for omitting any reference to that item. As this was true of Jefferson, so it may be of Madison.

It is sufficient for this College, which will perpetuate his name in an honorable way, to remind its students that he was "The Father of the Constitution." You will agree with me that no office which a man may have held adds anything to this creative act. And yet Madison would be the first, if he were here, to speak up and say this his Constitution was not a creation, but only a skilful adaptation of the political experience of the British and Americans, from Magna Charta and beyond, to the novel conditions which he faced in this new world.

SAMUEL CHILES MITCHELL

THE ESSENCE OF SCHOLARSHIP

TO one who seeks an accurate and discriminating definition a dictionary is of doubtful value. One may find in its dozen or more varied uses of well-known words the formal set that conveys factual ideas of the significance of the word in question. But words have connotations, they call up associations, they are the embodiments of past struggles, of present theories, of ardent aspirations. Are there any two people who have the same mental picture of such words as "creed," "church," "party," "justice," or any word outside of the technical terms of the exact sciences?

The definition of the word "scholarship" which seems to fit into our discussion is "accurate and well-disciplined learning, especially in the liberal studies." Perhaps every word in this definition has a different subjective value to each of us. But nevertheless our task in this discussion is primarily to define scholarship. One of the recognized methods of approach is the establishment of those things which are not scholarship, however much they may add to scholarship. The scholar has knowledge, he must have it, but it does not make him a scholar until he has organized it, has evaluated it, has related it to the past, present,