

■ The “New Freedom”

Date: 1912 (various dates during campaign)

Author: Governor Woodrow Wilson

Genre: speech

Summary Overview

Woodrow Wilson is generally considered a key figure in the history of liberalism because of his dedication to progressive reforms and advocacy for expanding government intervention to promote social and economic justice. His “New Freedom” agenda targeted the breakup of large trusts and the promotion of free enterprise, aligning with the liberal support for economic fairness and individual rights. Though his policies on race and segregation are viewed critically today, his overall approach—centered on government action to improve society and expand democratic ideals—places him within the liberal tradition of the early 20th century.

Over the course of the 1912 presidential campaign, then-Governor Wilson of New Jersey gradually elucidated his philosophy of government. While the journalist William Allen White famously claimed that the difference between Wilson’s “New Freedom” and his chief rival Theodore Roosevelt’s “New Nationalism” were about the same as between the famously similar *Alice in Wonderland* characters “Tweedledee” and “Tweedledum,” Wilson came to believe that the differences between their two positions were vast, and that they represented the difference between a future of economic freedom versus economic slavery for average Americans. The first chapter of his collected speeches, “The Old Order Changeth,” is illustrative both of Wilson’s fears of monopoly and of his general belief in the importance of government interventionism on behalf of under-represented individuals during a time of laissez-faire capitalism.

Wilson had been in politics for only two years when he made this speech. While he was known as a political scientist and a reform governor, his exact policy prescriptions were little known. They would remain so after the campaign. Wilson campaigned on a philosophical position rather than on a specific set of policy proscriptions. He made general statements about economic justice and social reform. As a result, many Progressives gradually came to his side—even when presented with a newly radicalized Theodore Roosevelt, who had broken with the Republican Party, as an alternative.

In this speech, Wilson makes American corporations the enemy, in much the same way that slave masters had been made the enemy of Northerners in the antebellum period. Fear of corporations, however,



Woodrow Wilson. Photo via Wikimedia Commons. [Public domain.]

showed no regional distinctions, thus explaining how economic populism could be used as a successful strategy for becoming the first Democratic president since Grover Cleveland (served 1885-89; 1893-97) and Wilson could present himself as the first reform-minded Democratic president since Andrew Jackson (served 1829-37).

Defining Moment

This speech is the clearest statement Wilson ever made about what his concept “the New Freedom” actually meant. The speech is simultaneously a summary of radical changes in society and a call for further radical changes in American social and political organizations in response to previous developments. Many of the changes that Wilson alludes to here came as a result of industrialization. His general call to make government more active in protecting individuals marks a sea change from the late-nineteenth century, when government became an engine for protecting corporate profits at almost any cost. Instead of protecting the freedom of corporations, Wilson wanted the federal government to protect the freedom of individuals from corporations. In that respect, the speech demonstrates the links between Wilsonian Progressivism and the later New Deal ideology of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It also highlights, in retrospect, the difference between Wilson’s “New Freedom” and Theodore Roosevelt’s “New Nationalism.”

Wilson’s campaign strategy was to forge a coalition of Progressives in both the Democratic and Republican parties. The lack of specific policy proposals in his speeches was important to achieving that goal. What Wilson could do safely is diagnosis the problems in America, one of which was the domination of the “trusts,” or large, monopolistic enterprises. While Theodore Roosevelt had been a proven trust-buster while in office (served 1901-09), he believed that some trusts were good for national development and should not be broken up. Wilson was much more hostile to any kind of unfair accumulation of economic power. Understanding how trusts developed was key to understanding what should be done about them, and this is where Wilson offers that explanation, in contradistinction to Roosevelt’s position. This speech, in other words, gets precisely to the most important

difference between two otherwise very similar candidates.

Author Biography

Before Woodrow Wilson became Governor of New Jersey, he had been a prominent political scientist and political historian. Even while serving as President of Princeton University, he continued to write and speak about political issues. Wilson’s primary mission as an academic was to champion aspects of the British political system that he felt could be imported to the American system. For example, Wilson would be the first president to directly address Congress with an annual State of the Union Speech, because he found the British prime minister’s practice of visiting Parliament frequently to be very worthwhile. As a political scientist, as with his career in politics, Wilson was a “small d” democrat, supporting efforts to make the government more accountable to the will of the people. (Whether he succeeded in that respect is debatable.)

Such tendencies are apparent in his first campaign speeches. Wilson’s democratic leanings became apparent in the Progressive policies he supported as president (many of which did not, however, originate with him, such as the direct election of U.S. Senators). As president, Wilson would help move the Democratic Party toward a more democratic stance on many issues—racial politics being the one major exception. The “New Freedom” is sometimes used to refer to the Progressive reforms passed during the early years of Wilson’s presidency, such as the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914 and the federal income tax (1913). However, Wilson did not have as big a role in the passage of many of these laws as did Franklin Roosevelt in the legislation related to the New Deal or Lyndon Johnson with the legislation making up his Great Society.



Historical Document

“The New Freedom”

The Old Order Changeth

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

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

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

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

It is true that, while most men are thus submerged in the corporation, a few, a very few, are exalted to a power which as individuals they could never have wielded. Through the great organizations of which they are the heads, a few are enabled to play a part unprecedented by anything in history in the control of the business operations of the country and in the determination of the happiness of great numbers of people, in the determination of the happiness of great numbers of people. Yesterday, and ever since history began, men were related to one another as individuals. To be sure there were the family, the Church, and the State, institutions which associated men in certain wide circles of relationship. But in the ordinary concerns of life, in the ordinary work, in the daily round, men dealt freely and directly with one another. To-day, the everyday relationships of men are largely with great impersonal concerns, with organizations, not with other individual men.

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

In this new age we find, for instance, that our laws with regard to the relations of employer and employee are in many respects wholly antiquated and impossible. They were framed for another age, which nobody now living remembers, which is, indeed, so remote from our life that it would be difficult for many of us to understand it if it were described to us. The employer is now generally a corporation or a huge company of some kind; the employee is one of hundreds or of thousands brought together, not by individual masters whom they know and with whom they have personal relations, but by agents of one sort or another. Workingmen are marshaled in great numbers for the performance of a multitude of particular tasks under a common discipline. They generally use dangerous and powerful machinery, over whose repair and renewal they have no control. New rules must be devised with regard to their obligations and their rights, their obligations to their employers and their responsibilities to one another. Rules must be devised for their protection, for their compensation when injured, for their support when disabled.

There is something very new and very big and very complex about these new relations of capital and labor. A new economic society has sprung up, and we must effect a new set of adjustments. We must not pit power against weakness. The employer is generally, in our day, as I have said, not an individual,

but a powerful group; and yet the workingman when dealing with his employer is still, under our existing law, an individual.

Why is it that we have a labor question at all? It is for the simple and very sufficient reason that the laboring man and the employer are not intimate associates now as they used to be in time past. Most of our laws were formed in the age when employer and employees knew each other, knew each other's characters, were associates with each other, dealt with each other as man with man. That is no longer the case. You not only do not come into personal contact with the men who have the supreme command in those corporations, but it would be out of the question for you to do it. Our modern corporations employ thousands, and in some instances hundreds of thousands, of men. The only persons whom you see or deal with are local superintendents or local representatives of a vast organization, which is not like anything that the workingmen of the time in which our laws were framed knew anything about. A little group of workingmen, seeing their employer every day, dealing with him in a personal way, is one thing, and the modern body of labor engaged as employees of the huge enterprises that spread all over the country, dealing with men of whom they can form no personal conception, is another thing. A very different thing. You never saw a corporation, any more than you ever saw a government. Many a workingman to-day never saw the body of men who are conducting the industry in which he is employed. And they never saw him. What they know about him is written in ledgers and books and letters, in the correspondence of the office, in the reports of the superintendents. He is a long way off from them.

So what we have to discuss is, not wrongs which individuals intentionally do,—I do not believe there are a great many of those,—but the wrongs of a system. I want to record my protest against any discussion of this matter which would seem to indicate that there are bodies of our fellow-citizens who are trying to grind us down and do us injustice. There are some men of that sort. I don't know how they sleep o' nights, but there are men of that kind. Thank God, they are not numerous. The truth is, we are all caught in a great economic system which is heartless. The modern corporation is not engaged in business as an individual. When we deal with it, we deal with an impersonal element, an immaterial piece of society. A modern corporation is a means of co-operation in the conduct of an enterprise which is so big that no one man can conduct it, and which the resources of no one man are sufficient to finance. A company is formed; that company puts out a prospectus; the promoters expect to raise a certain fund as capital stock. Well, how are they going to raise it? They are going to raise it from the public in general, some of whom will buy their stock. The moment that begins, there is formed—what? A joint stock corporation. Men begin to pool their earnings, little piles, big piles. A certain number of men are elected by the stockholders to be directors, and these directors elect a president. This president is the head of the undertaking, and the directors are its managers.

Now, do the workingmen employed by that stock corporation deal with that president and those directors? Not at all. Does the public deal with that president and that board of directors? It does not. Can anybody bring them to account? It is next to impossible to do so. If you undertake it you will find it a game of hide and seek, with the objects of your search taking refuge now behind the tree of their individual personality, now behind that of their corporate irresponsibility.

And do our laws take note of this curious state of things? Do they even attempt to distinguish between a man's act as a corporation director and as an individual? They do not. Our laws still deal with us on the basis of the old system. The law is still living in the dead past which we have left behind. This is evident, for instance, with regard to the matter of employers' liability for workmen's injuries. Suppose that a superintendent wants a workman to use a certain piece of machinery which it is not safe for him to use, and that the workman is injured by that piece of machinery. Some of our courts have held that the superintendent is a fellow-servant, or, as the law states it, a fellow-employee, and that, therefore, the man cannot recover damages for his injury. The superintendent who probably engaged the man is not his employer. Who is his employer? And whose negligence could conceivably come in there? The board of directors did not tell the employee to use that piece of machinery; and the president of the corporation did not tell him to use that piece of machinery. And so forth. Don't you see by that theory that a man never can get redress for negligence on the part of the employer? When I hear judges reason upon the analogy of the relationships that used to exist between workmen and their employers a generation ago, I wonder if they have not opened their eyes to the modern world. You know, we have a right to expect that judges will have their eyes open, even though the law which they administer hasn't awakened. Yet that is but a single small detail illustrative of the difficulties we are in because we have not adjusted the law to the facts of the new order.

Since I entered politics, I have chiefly had men's views confided to me privately. Some of the biggest men in the United States, in the field of commerce and manufacture, are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it.

They know that America is not a place of which it can be said, as it used to be, that a man may choose his own calling and pursue it just as far as his abilities enable him to pursue it; because to-day, if he enters certain fields, there are organizations which will use means against him that will prevent his building up a business which they do not want to have built up; organizations that will see to it that the ground is cut from under him and the markets shut against him. For if he begins to sell to certain retail dealers, to any retail dealers, the

monopoly will refuse to sell to those dealers, and those dealers, afraid, will not buy the new man's wares.

And this is the country which has lifted to the admiration of the world its ideals of absolutely free opportunity, where no man is supposed to be under any limitation except the limitations of his character and of his mind; where there is supposed to be no distinction of class, no distinction of blood, no distinction of social status, but where men win or lose on their merits.

I lay it very close to my own conscience as a public man whether we can any longer stand at our doors and welcome all newcomers upon those terms. American industry is not free, as once it was free; American enterprise is not free; the man with only a little capital is finding it harder to get into the field, more and more impossible to compete with the big fellow. Why? Because the laws of this country do not prevent the strong from crushing the weak. That is the reason, and because the strong have crushed the weak the strong dominate the industry and the economic life of this country. No man can deny that the lines of endeavor have more and more narrowed and stiffened; no man who knows anything about the development of industry in this country can have failed to observe that the larger kinds of credit are more and more difficult to obtain, unless you obtain them upon the terms of uniting your efforts with those who already control the industries of the country; and nobody can fail to observe that any man who tries to set himself up in competition with any process of manufacture which has been taken under the control of large combinations of capital will presently find himself either squeezed out or obliged to sell and allow himself to be absorbed.

There is a great deal that needs reconstruction in the United States. I should like to take a census of the business men,—I mean the rank and file of the business men,—as to whether they think that business conditions in this country, or rather whether the organization of business in this country, is satisfactory or not. I know what they would say if they dared. If they could vote secretly they would vote overwhelmingly that the present organization of business was meant for the big fellows and was not meant for the little fellows; that it was meant for those who are at the top and was meant to exclude those who are at the bottom; that it was meant to shut out beginners, to prevent new entries in the race, to prevent the building up of competitive enterprises that would interfere with the monopolies which the great trusts have built up.

What this country needs above everything else is a body of laws which will look after the men who are on the make rather than the men who are already made. Because the men who are already made are not going to live indefinitely, and they are not always kind enough to leave sons as able and as honest as they are.

The originaive part of America, the part of America that makes new enterprises, the part into which the ambitious and gifted workingman makes his way up, the class that saves, that plans, that organizes, that presently spreads its enterprises until they have a national scope and character,—that middle class is being more and more squeezed out by the processes which we have been taught to call processes of prosperity. Its members are sharing prosperity, no doubt; but what alarms me is that they are not originating prosperity. No country can afford to have its prosperity originated by a small controlling class. The treasury of America does not lie in the brains of the small body of men now in control of the great enterprises that have been concentrated under the direction of a very small number of persons. The treasury of America lies in those ambitions, those energies, that cannot be restricted to a special favored class. It depends upon the inventions of unknown men, upon the originations of unknown men, upon the ambitions of unknown men. Every country is renewed out of the ranks of the unknown, not out of the ranks of those already famous and powerful and in control.

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

We used to think in the old-fashioned days when life was very simple that all that government had to do was to put on a policeman's uniform, and say, "Now don't anybody hurt anybody else." We used to say that the ideal of government was for every man to be left alone and not interfered with, except when he interfered with somebody else; and that the best government was the government that did as little governing as possible. That was the idea that obtained in Jefferson's time. But we are coming now to realize that life is so complicated that we are not dealing with the old conditions, and that the law has to

step in and create new conditions under which we may live, the conditions which will make it tolerable for us to live.

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

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

When you offer the securities of a great corporation to anybody who wishes to purchase them, you must open that corporation to the inspection of everybody who wants to purchase. There must, to follow out the figure of the tenement house, be lights along the corridors, there must be police patrolling the openings, there must be inspection wherever it is known that men may be deceived with regard to the contents of the premises. If we believe that fraud lies in wait for us, we must have the means of determining whether our suspicions are well founded or not. Similarly, the treatment of labor by the great corporations is not what it was in Jefferson's time. Whenever bodies of men employ bodies of men, it ceases to be a private relationship. So that when courts hold that workingmen cannot peaceably dissuade other workingmen from taking employment, as was held in a notable case in New Jersey, they simply show that their minds and understandings are lingering in an age which has passed away. This dealing of great bodies of men with other bodies of men is a matter of public scrutiny, and should be a matter of public regulation.

Similarly, it was no business of the law in the time of Jefferson to come into my house and see how I kept house. But when my house, when my so-called private property, became a great mine, and men went along dark corridors amidst every kind of danger in order to dig out of the bowels of the earth

things necessary for the industries of a whole nation, and when it came about that no individual owned these mines, that they were owned by great stock companies, then all the old analogies absolutely collapsed and it became the right of the government to go down into these mines to see whether human beings were properly treated in them or not; to see whether accidents were properly safeguarded against; to see whether modern economical methods of using these inestimable riches of the earth were followed or were not followed. If somebody puts a derrick improperly secured on top of a building or overtopping the street, then the government of the city has the right to see that that derrick is so secured that you and I can walk under it and not be afraid that the heavens are going to fall on us. Likewise, in these great beehives where in every corridor swarm men of flesh and blood, it is the privilege of the government, whether of the State or of the United States, as the case may be, to see that human life is protected, that human lungs have something to breathe.

These, again, are merely illustrations of conditions. We are in a new world, struggling under old laws. As we go inspecting our lives to-day, surveying this new scene of centralized and complex society, we shall find many more things out of joint.

One of the most alarming phenomena of the time,—or rather it would be alarming if the nation had not awakened to it and shown its determination to control it,—one of the most significant signs of the new social era is the degree to which government has become associated with business. I speak, for the moment, of the control over the government exercised by Big Business. Behind the whole subject, of course, is the truth that, in the new order, government and business must be associated closely. But that association is at present of a nature absolutely intolerable; the precedence is wrong, the association is upside down. Our government has been for the past few years under the control of heads of great allied corporations with special interests. It has not controlled these interests and assigned them a proper place in the whole system of business; it has submitted itself to their control. As a result, there have grown up vicious systems and schemes of governmental favoritism (the most obvious being the extravagant tariff), far-reaching in effect upon the whole fabric of life, touching to his injury every inhabitant of the land, laying unfair and impossible handicaps upon competitors, imposing taxes in every direction, stifling everywhere the free spirit of American enterprise.

Now this has come about naturally; as we go on we shall see how very naturally. It is no use denouncing anybody, or anything, except human nature. Nevertheless, it is an intolerable thing that the government of the republic should have got so far out of the hands of the people; should have been captured by interests which are special and not general. In the train of this capture follow the troops of scandals, wrongs, indecencies, with which our politics swarm.

There are cities in America of whose government we are ashamed. There are cities everywhere, in every part of the land, in which we feel that, not the interests of the public, but the interests of special privileges, of selfish men, are served; where contracts take precedence over public interest. Not only in big cities is this the case. Have you not noticed the growth of socialistic sentiment in the smaller towns? Not many months ago I stopped at a little town in Nebraska, and while my train lingered I met on the platform a very engaging young fellow dressed in overalls who introduced himself to me as the mayor of the town, and added that he was a Socialist. I said, "What does that mean? Does that mean that this town is socialistic?" "No, sir," he said; "I have not deceived myself; the vote by which I was elected was about 20 per cent. socialistic and 80 per cent. protest." It was protest against the treachery to the people of those who led both the other parties of that town.

All over the Union people are coming to feel that they have no control over the course of affairs. I live in one of the greatest States in the union, which was at one time in slavery. Until two years ago we had witnessed with increasing concern the growth in New Jersey of a spirit of almost cynical despair. Men said; "We vote; we are offered the platform we want; we elect the men who stand on that platform, and we get absolutely nothing." So they began to ask: "What is the use of voting? We know that the machines of both parties are subsidized by the same persons, and therefore it is useless to turn in either direction."

This is not confined to some of the state governments and those of some of the towns and cities. We know that something intervenes between the people of the United States and the control of their own affairs at Washington. It is not the people who have been ruling there of late.

Why are we in the presence, why are we at the threshold, of a revolution? Because we are profoundly disturbed by the influences which we see reigning in the determination of our public life and our public policy. There was a time when America was blithe with self confidence. She boasted that she, and she alone, knew the processes of popular government; but now she sees her sky overcast; she sees that there are at work forces which she did not dream of in her hopeful youth.

Don't you know that some man with eloquent tongue, without conscience, who did not care for the nation, could put this whole country into a flame? Don't you know that this country from one end to the other believes that something is wrong? What an opportunity it would be for some man without conscience to spring up and say: "This is the way. Follow me!"—and lead in paths of destruction!

The old order changeth—changeth under our very eyes, not quietly and equally, but swiftly and with the noise and heat and tumult of reconstruction.

I suppose that all struggle for law has been conscious, that very little of it has been blind or merely instinctive. It is the fashion to say, as if with superior knowledge of affairs and of human weakness, that every age has been an age of transition, and that no age is more full of change than another; yet in very few ages of the world can the struggle for change have been so widespread, so deliberate, or upon so great a scale as in this in which we are taking part.

The transition we are witnessing is no equable transition of growth and normal alteration; no silent, unconscious unfolding of one age into another, its natural heir and successor. Society is looking itself over, in our day, from top to bottom; is making fresh and critical analysis of its very elements; is questioning its oldest practices as freely as its newest, scrutinizing every arrangement and motive of its life; and it stands ready to attempt nothing less than a radical reconstruction, which only frank and honest counsels and the forces of generous co-operation can hold back from becoming a revolution. We are in a temper to reconstruct economic society, as we were once in a temper to reconstruct political society, and political society may itself undergo a radical modification in the process. I doubt if any age was ever more conscious of its task or more unanimously desirous of radical and extended changes in its economic and political practice. We stand in the presence of a revolution,—not a bloody revolution; America is not given to the spilling of blood,—but a silent revolution, whereby America will insist upon recovering in practice those ideals which she has always professed, upon securing a government devoted to the general interest and not to special interests.

We are upon the eve of a great reconstruction. It calls for creative statesmanship as no age has done since that great age in which we set up the government under which we live, that government which was the admiration of the world until it suffered wrongs to grow up under it which have made many of our own compatriots question the freedom of our institutions and preach revolution against them. I do not fear revolution. I have unshaken faith in the power of America to keep its self-possession. Revolution will come in peaceful guise, as it came when we put aside the crude government of the Confederation and created the great Federal Union which governs individuals, not States, and which has been these hundred and thirty years our vehicle of progress. Some radical changes we must make in our law and practice. Some reconstructions we must push forward, which a new age and new circumstances impose upon us. But we can do it all in calm and sober fashion, like statesmen and patriots.

I do not speak of these things in apprehension, because all is open and above-board. This is not a day in which great forces rally in secret. The whole stupendous program must be publicly planned and canvassed. Good temper, the wisdom that comes of sober counsel, the energy of thoughtful and unselfish men, the habit of co-operation and of compromise which has been bred in

us by long years of free government, in which reason rather than passion has been made to prevail by the sheer virtue of candid and universal debate, will enable us to win through to still another great age without violence.



Glossary

Labor Question: a late-nineteenth century intellectual debate over how to get workingmen to accept the problems associated with industrialization

Document Analysis

In this speech, Wilson is arguing that American life has (at the time) become increasingly unfair over the previous twenty years because of the problems associated with industrialization, and that if America does not change so as to become fairer again there will be a violent revolution aimed at restoring the prospect for ordinary Americans to improve their economic standing. The language is quite vague. For instance, Wilson makes a direct appeal to working people, without explicitly mentioning trade unions. He mentions socialists—a direct nod to the constituency of the Socialist candidate, Eugene V. Debs—but appeals to their spirit of protest instead of denouncing their specific policies. His goal is to co-opt the spirit of unhappiness related to the Republican status quo, without, however, giving opponents like Theodore Roosevelt any concrete policy points on which to attack him.

The problems that Wilson describes all stem from industrialization. “The life of the nation has grown infinitely varied,” he writes, by which he means that change has come so fast that it has blown past the old structures and constraints that once kept all operating smoothly. Evidence of such changes includes the new relations between capital and labor, under which employers no longer know their employees as individuals. Even more important, the changes in the system have made it impossible for good men to rise within the system as they once could. In other words, corporations have threatened the American Dream. To Wilson, such capitalist aggregations threaten the viability of society itself.

Wilson does not specifically blame Republicans for the changes he wants to temper. Instead, his enemies are corporations. “Our government has for the past few years been under the control of heads of great allied corporations with special interests,” he explains. These corporations, under Wilson’s formulation, are powerful enough to destroy people’s freedom—not just the freedom of employees, but the freedom of all Americans because corporate interests have too much influence over how government is conducted. Wilson is afraid that strong corporations will crush weaker ones, thereby giving them too much power. He is particularly disturbed that the laws of the

United States—specifically, the anti-monopoly laws as currently enforced—do not make that behavior illegal. In this way, Wilson is trying to protect not just working people but small business, as well. The spirit of innovation embodied by smaller businesses can make life better for everyone. Antitrust enforcement, then, is central to Wilson’s political philosophy and his campaign rhetoric.

While Wilson’s positions, so described, may sound left wing-ish to modern ears, the candidate justified them as a way to conserve the core structures that he wished to reform and revive. If the economics became too unequal, he argues, there could be a violent revolution. The popularity of Eugene Debs, then a four-time third-party presidential candidate (1900, 1904, 1908, and 1912; he also ran in 1920), was one indicator of that potential revolutionary development; but in some ways so too was the continuing popularity of Roosevelt, who was often accused of being a political demagogue. “Don’t you know that some man with eloquent tongue, without conscience, who did not care for the nation, could put this whole country into a flame?,” Wilson asks. The question applied to both Roosevelt and Debs at a time of uncertainty regarding national governance and the direction of the nation as a whole. More important, the statement implies that the very system that Wilson revered as a political scientist might check his powers as president, because of ongoing debates.

Wilson used this speech to successfully stake out the political center. Moderate reform was enough, he argued, and, ultimately, voters in 1912 largely agreed with him, making him the only reform-minded Democratic president during a long period of Republican ascendancy.

Essential Themes

Wilson’s rhetoric about the changes brought about by industrialization became increasingly less important over time, as those changes became largely accepted, if not entirely welcomed. Efforts to change the distribution of economic power in the United States gradually rested more on people’s right to live as individuals than on the hardships they experienced. The theme of Wilson’s speech that would be expanded on by the

Democratic presidents that succeeded him was the need for moderate, rather than radical, reform. In other words, Wilson's framing devices concerning the voice of what would become known as "the common man" versus corporate influence proved far more important than any specific policies that he proposed (even though his view of the common man tended to exclude Black citizens).

Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) took up much the same political position during the New Deal. While there was less than is commonly thought that united the disparate policies of the New Deal, FDR told his cabinet in private that his efforts were all designed to promote security for average Americans. During FDR's 1935 speech in signing the Social Security Act, he specifically cited the "startling industrial changes" that "tended more and more to make life insecure" as the reason for creating a new, elaborate social insurance system. This harkened back to Wilson and the New Freedoms. Other Democratic presidential candidates, including Harry Truman and

Bill Clinton, would likewise echo themes first enunciated by Woodrow Wilson in 1912.

—Jonathan Rees, PhD

Bibliography and Additional Reading

- Chambers II, John Whiteclay. *The Tyranny of Change: America in the Progressive Era, 1900-1917*. New York: St. Martins, 1980.
- Cooper, John Milton, Jr. *Woodrow Wilson: A Biography*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2009.
- Link, Arthur S. *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era 1910-1917*. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. "Statement on Signing the Social Security Act." August 14, 1935. The American Presidency Project, University of California Santa Barbara, www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=14916.
- Wilson, Woodrow. *The New Freedom: A Call for the Emancipation of the Generous Energies of a People*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1918.