UCATION
THE
GE-EARNERS

AS DAVIDSON

THE EDUCATION OF THE WAGE-EARNERS

A Contribution toward the Solution of the Educational Problem of Democracy

BY

THOMAS DAVIDSON

Author of "The Philosophical System of Antonio Rosmini Serbati," "The Parthenon Frieze and Other Essays," "Aristotle and Ancient Educational Ideals," "The Education of the Greek People and its Influence on Civilization," "Rousseau and Education according to Nature," "A History of Education," etc.

Edited with an Introductory Chapter

BY

CHARLES M. BAKEWELL

GINN & COMPANY

BOSTON · NEW YORK · CHICAGO · LONDON

814.12

The Athenæum Press

GINN & COMPANY · CAMBRIDGE · MASSACHUSETTS

PREFACE

THIS volume tells how a few lectures that the late Thomas Davidson delivered before the wage-earners on the East Side of New York upon the problems which the Nineteenth Century hands on to the Twentieth led to the formation of a class in History and Social Science, and how this rapidly developed into an incipient "Breadwinners' College," and at the same time became the center of a general social movement for the betterment of mankind. It is the story of an experiment in the education of the wage-earners which is very far from finished, the record of a movement still in process of formation. It introduces nothing sensational or dramatic, offers no easy cure for social ills; it simply tells how the efforts of one man to find among the wage-earners themselves the forces that are tending toward righteousness and truth, and to unite and direct these to a common educational and moral end, were crowned with a measure of success that promises well for the future, and is rich in suggestions for the social reformer, as well as for all who are interested in educational problems.

Mr. Davidson, through a combination of happy circumstances, opened up a mine of enthusiasm and of power for righteousness and self-improvement latent in

the hearts and minds of those whom weary souls and patronizing reformers are wont to call "life's disinherited ones." And the work that he accomplished is unique among modern social movements in that it is a growth almost wholly nourished by the inner vitality of the developing group. In most of our efforts to improve the condition of the struggling and less favored masses, the wealthy contribute, but with their gloves on, the wise aid, but *ex cathedra*, and with a tinge of condescension. At best, noble and devoted men and women, renouncing comfort and ease, cast in their lot with the poor, and with a fine sympathy and loyal devotion become their true friends and inspiring companions. In so doing they discover many practical ways of introducing social reforms, and by carrying these out, as well as by their example, undoubtedly accomplish much good. Yet few, if any, even of these, are aware of the latent power in the hearts and minds of those whom they are helping; and none, so far as I am aware, have made it their main concern to find a way to seize upon this power and to develop and direct it so that it may do its appointed work, and that every individual as he makes progress in his own development may become forthwith, according to his lights, an enthusiastic and efficient helper of others still less favored. Few, if any, have a strong enough belief in the intellectual capacity of those whom they are helping, to employ with them the only sound educational method, which never attempts to make a present of the truth, but ever seeks to elicit it from the self-active minds of the taught.

The agitator and the demagogue, and to some extent even the social reformer, carry their audiences by means of flattery, by appealing to prejudice, and by dealing in vague and ambiguous, if high-sounding, phrases. These are the means by which the unenlightened mind is most easily swayed. We cannot hope to stem the tide of error, which these modern sophists cause, by persuading sober-minded scholars to give occasional lectures to the workingmen. The scholar scorns the sophist's methods, and so he cannot strike home until much preliminary work has been done to lead the workingmen to that habit of mind that puts calm, clear-sighted, and unprejudiced reason at the helm. Even with those who have had the advantage of a good common-school education, with trained students in the colleges, nothing worth while can be accomplished by lectures unless the student follow them up with hard and persistent intellectual effort of his own. Is it not absurd to suppose that those who lack such training can gain truth more easily, can dispense with the hard and slow and painful intellectual discipline that is the condition of all clear thinking? Must we not either frankly confess that the great body of workingmen must remain simply "the masses," shut out from the light of truth, doomed to walk in the darkness of confusion and prejudice, swayed by caprice and blind feeling; or else face the stern fact that there is no royal road to learning for them any more than for others, — and then do our duty by supplying a sound education that shall be within the reach of all who are capable and willing to put forth the effort necessary to win it?

Thomas Davidson appreciated these things, and it is this that makes the record that these pages contain, fragmentary as it is, worthy of the consideration of all who are interested in social questions, and of all who are seriously concerned for the welfare of our country.

Mr. Davidson believed in the workingmen and workingwomen whom he taught. Many of the things that he said to his class, and to its individual members, — and illustrations may be found in the letters printed in this volume, — a superficial and cynical observer would pronounce sheer flattery. But they were not that. Mr. Davidson had a way of seizing what was best in his friends, the ideals which in their best moments they longed to be, and of naming them after these and dealing with them accordingly. This is doubtless one secret of his success: he made the young men and young women feel that the ideal which they were to live up to was their own ideal, their own truer selves; and they were thus put on their mettle to live up to his judgment of them. In this way they acquired a confidence in themselves born of self-respect, and at the same time became more cautious in their judgments. Much of his success was no doubt due to his exceptionally strong and magnetic personality, to his generous enthusiasms, and to his tireless and unbounded loyalty and devotion to his band of wage-earners, — for he gave himself unsparingly for them; much, too, to the fact that he was working mainly with Jews, who, beyond any other race, seem to have a way of keeping the inner fires burning in spite of most untoward outer circumstances. But the main thing, after all, was that he had

discovered a way to bring out and utilize, as the force and life-blood of his undertaking, the energy that was in the wage-earners themselves as organized and directed by their own highest ideals. This is the most encouraging thing about his work. If we can only succeed in this we need not despair of popular education, for we shall at last have found a power adequate to the great task.

I have thought it best to add an introductory chapter, giving a brief account of the author and of his democratic philosophy. This, and the following chapter on "The Task of the Twentieth Century," are reprinted, with the kind consent of its editor, from *The International Journal of Ethics*. In the third chapter, which discusses "The Educational Problems which the Nineteenth Century hands over to the Twentieth," the idea of a Breadwinners' College is developed. This is the lecture that precipitated the movement which the next chapter, "The History of the Experiment," describes. This was the last thing that Mr. Davidson wrote, and it was left unfinished. It is published as he left it. In the fifth chapter are printed in full most of the weekly letters that Mr. Davidson wrote to the central Saturday Evening Class during the summers of 1899 and 1900. These show more clearly than anything else could the relation that existed between him and his pupils, and the spirit that underlay his work with them. I have added a final chapter, continuing Mr. Davidson's narrative from the point where it breaks off, and giving some account of the movement as it has been carried on by these workingmen and workingwomen themselves in

the four years that have elapsed since his death. I have to thank the members of the class for their kind coöperation in supplying material for this portion of the book, and, especially, Mr. Louis Dublin, Mr. S. E. Frank, and Mr. Morris R. Cohen. The bulk of the sixth chapter is taken bodily from the account sent me by Mr. Cohen. I wish also to acknowledge my indebtedness to my friend Professor W. A. Neilson, who has kindly read most of the book either in manuscript or in proof, for his valued advice and encouragement.

In conclusion I would suggest that a reader who is desirous of coming without delay to the story of Mr. Davidson's actual experiment in the education of the wage-earners turn at once to Chapter IV.

THE EDITOR.

Laurel Run, August 5, 1904.

CONTENTS

THE EDUCATION OF THE WAGE-EARNERS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY: THOMAS DAVIDSON AND HIS PHILOSOPHY

By the Editor

When on the 14th of September, 1900, after an unsuccessful operation, Thomas Davidson died in a hospital at Montreal, the world lost a wise and good man whose work and influence were out of all proportion to his general reputation.[1] A writer in the *London*

[1] The list of Mr. Davidson's published books [which conveys no adequate impression of the scope of his powers and influence] includes: "The Philosophical System of Antonio Rosmini Serbati" (London, 1882); "The Parthenon Frieze and Other Essays" (Boston and New York, 1886); "Scartazzini's Handbook to Dante, with Notes and Additions" (Boston, 1887); "Prolegomena to Tennyson's 'In Memoriam'" (Boston, 1889); "Aristotle and Ancient Educational Ideals" (New York, 1892); "The Education of the Greek People, and its Influence on Civilization" (New York, 1894); "Rousseau and Education according to Nature" (New York, 1898); "A History of Education" (New York, 1900). He contributed to *Mind*, *The Philosophical Review*, *The International Journal of Ethics*, *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, *The Educational Review*, *The Forum*, and other periodicals, numerous articles and reviews. At the time of his death he was engaged upon a history of Scholastic Philosophy in which he proposed to gather up the results of his lifelong study in this field. Unfortunately but two chapters had been completed.

Spectator recently declared that at the time of his death Thomas Davidson was one of the twelve most learned men in the world. How that may be I do not know. Certain it is that his profound and varied learning, his portentous memory, his skill in using all languages, and his familiarity with the best that is to be found in all languages — particularly in the lines of philosophy, social science, and literature — were to those of us younger men who came to know him almost appalling. He was learned, and knew that he was learned, above the measure even for learned men. Yet withal he was modest, avoiding rather than courting personal fame. Indeed, he might in truth have said, with Thomas Aquinas, that his motto was *amo nesciri.*

With all his learning Mr. Davidson was, however, the most human of men, approachable by all, old and young, high and low, learned and ignorant; generous to a degree in his relations with his fellow-men, giving of himself without stint to all who sought his help or counsel whenever he thought he could be of any use to them in helping them to a higher life. An Adirondack farmer, whose place he had bought, once remarked of him that his hand was stretched out to meet you farther away than that of any man he ever knew. This was true, literally as well as figuratively. Any one who has had the good fortune to visit him in his Adirondack home, where he conducted a summer school of the culture sciences, will ever remember with the glow of a larger human kindliness his reception at Glenmore. It was Mr. Davidson's custom to have the large lecture-hall bell rung to announce the arrival of

an expected guest. At that signal he would at once drop all work and hasten down from his den in the birch grove some two hundred feet above the main buildings. I can see him now hurrying down the hill, his right hand stretched out to greet me when still a good fifty yards away, his left waving his tam-o'-shanter as he shouts his cheery welcome. The warm handshake that followed, the sincere welcome beaming from every feature of his honest, earnest, sunny, intelligent face, made one feel at once that Glenmore was home.

Mr. Davidson was the most intense man I have ever known, intense in his loves and in his hates, both for persons and for doctrines. It was part of his philosophy that morality consisted, as the Greeks had said, in knowing how rightly to love and how rightly to hate, and, he would have added, in having abundant affections to distribute. He firmly believed that the stronger a man's passions the greater were his possibilities for virtue and victory, if only they could be rightly directed. Rousseau once wrote, "*Il n'y a que les âmes de feu qui sachent vaincre.*" Mr. Davidson was one of those *âmes de feu*, and he held himself in check by an iron will, and knew how to conquer. No obstacles were for him insurmountable. Finding in the course of some of his investigations in Scholastic Philosophy that he needed a more thorough acquaintance with Arabic than he could acquire from the books, he dropped all other work and went to Cairo to live with the Arabs, that he might learn to speak their tongue. He was then just fifty-four years of age. His last published book was written at a time when he was unable

to get more than three consecutive hours of sleep, and when every waking moment was filled with intense pain. Yet his cheerful but profound optimism finds in this book perhaps its noblest expression, and not once does his personal suffering break through to color a single phrase.

Mr. Davidson was absolutely unsparing of himself and of his friends, downright and straightforward and uncompromising. He could never quite forgive a man who had once told him a lie or proved himself ungenerous. He was ever bitter in his denunciation of all forms of pharisaism and of the pride of mere respectability, which consisted, he held, solely of negative virtues. Comfort worshipers, sensuous dalliant souls, and all time-servers were his special aversion. But a keen sense of humor, a hearty, jovial nature, and a broad philosophy saved him from the snares of asceticism and left him, with all his vigorous and uncompromising standards, one of the most sociable of men. He always sought out in all men traces of genuine human worth, and he knew how to look behind appearances for the real substance of worth. Consequently his friends were frequently of rough exterior and rougher manner, and he was often found with publicans and sinners. And to his friends he remained ever loyal.

Mr. Davidson was born in Aberdeenshire, Scotland, October 25, 1840. He received his education in the common schools of his native town, and in the University of Aberdeen, where he acquired, as a second nature, the habit of exact scholarship. What this training meant for him may be inferred from the fact that he

used to say, with a full knowledge of the school systems of all lands, that if he had to be educated over again and could choose his schools and masters, he would go through precisely the same training that he had enjoyed. When still a very young man he came to America and, after a brief sojourn in Canada, made his way to Boston. Later he removed to St. Louis, where he taught for a time in the public schools and where he made the acquaintance of the famous little group of St. Louis philosophers, most of whom became his life friends. But Mr. Davidson was a born dissenter who could not and would not fit into any niche. He chafed under all restraint, and was not entirely contented until he finally found his liberty in the life of a free lance, lecturing, writing, teaching private classes, and in this way earning his modest livelihood while holding himself responsible to himself alone and to his own lofty ideals. Opportunities for university preferment came, but he refused to surrender one jot of his freedom. His mode of life gave him a good six months of every year for leisurely study and frequent opportunities for long visits to Europe, as his studies might call for learning that could there best be pursued. Besides, he had a decided distrust of our universities, which, he held, were still suffering from mediævalism in methods and habits, from formalism, and from an absence of entire freedom and candor. Moreover, he did not regard the students in the universities to-day as the most promising material to work with, holding that most of them were under the dominion of purely frivolous aims, and that even of the more serious

students the majority were animated by no higher motive than the desire to fit themselves to find a comfortable berth for life. In few, if any, could he find an ardent desire for knowledge for its own sake and for the sake of the light it could throw on the purpose and meaning of life. Only in the last years of his life did he succeed in finding a class of students with whom he could work with entire satisfaction and enthusiasm. When he did find them, with characteristic fervor he gave the best of himself and of his time and energy in working for and with them, asking no other compensation for his services than honest and faithful work on the part of his students. These were the students he found amongst the breadwinners in the East Side of New York. After working with them for two years he wrote: "No one who has ever taught a class of intelligent breadwinners will return willingly to academic teaching. It would be well if all college students were engaged in the practical duties of life." Of this work, which at last put his democratic philosophy to the test of practice, this book is the partial record. Before passing on to this record, let us consider briefly the philosophical attitude upon which that work was founded.

We cannot better approach the study of Mr. Davidson's philosophy than by noting in advance the temper of its author's mind as it revealed itself in strong antipathies to some of the more popular currents of contemporary thought. Hegel, with his denial of the principle of contradiction, he held to be the "prince of confusionists." Historically, Hegel's philosophy seemed to him mainly significant as the *reductio ad absurdum*

of modern subjectivism, that is to say, of the modern effort to define the forms of thought so exhaustively that nothing is left for the material of thought. At the same time, however, he held that Kant had rendered inestimable service in pointing out that the real meaning of Hume's skepticism was that it had conclusively proved that the mind is essentially active and therefore does not receive any ready-made impressions, but exercises from the first a determining power in the very creation of the world that it knows; that, consequently, no concepts taken either from common sense or from time-hallowed philosophies can be accepted without being subjected to the most careful scrutiny. Hegel, however, had too easily concluded, from finding the importance of the part played by the thinking activity, that thought was the last term in the description of reality, and so his philosophy gave us a cobweb world, an arid and unreal system which, logically carried out, could but lead to pantheism, from which disastrous result it was saved in the letter but not in truth by Hegel's skill in juggling with such terms as freedom, God, Trinity, and the like, wherein was displayed his ingenuity in pouring new wine into old bottles rather than his zeal in the cause of truth.

The agnostic's position came in for equal condemnation. His whole difficulty comes from the fact that he starts out with a supernaturalistic notion of reality, with a conception, that is, of the absolutely real as, whatever else it may possibly be, never a possible object of experience. The agnostic's conclusion, therefore, that reality is unknowable, is a trivial one, or, to

put it otherwise, is simply another way of stating his fundamental premise, which premise, in its turn, is a downright prejudice.

Those who gloried in the confusion of philosophies and philosophers, in order that they might point a moral as to the presumption and imbecility of mere reason, whether their Pyrrhonism were proclaimed in the interest of piety, as a preparation for faith, or in the interest of a supposed freedom that could not brook even the constraint of reason, or in the interest of a nature worship like that which found expression in Rousseau in some of his more turgid moods, and frequently in Wordsworth in such passages as —

> One impulse from a vernal wood
> May teach you more of man,
> Of moral evil and of good,
> Than all the sages can,

— in short, the defenders of all forms of mere sentimentalism and irrationalism were treated continually and effectually with the scorn that they deserve. After all, there is no blasphemy worse than that which spends itself in dragging in the mire the noblest faculty with which man is endowed, the faculty which distinguishes him from the animals and enables him to lead a moral life. Not that the doctrine to which one must give adherence is a "cold intellectualism," as it is called. No, the knowledge that is the aim of our rational endeavor is, as Mr. Davidson once wrote, "knowledge armed with moral efficiency, knowledge which commands respect and reverent submission. . . . What

turns intellect into a spring of action and freedom is not its power of distinguishing things, but its power of seeing that things have different values, that one thing is better than another, and, therefore, to be preferred to another. . . . This is what is meant by the old saying that not only the thoughts of the head but the thoughts of the heart also must be pure." [1]

Perhaps of all the irrationalists, the philistine misologists, the conventionally respectable men who are superior to philosophy, seemed to him the most immoral and pernicious influence of the time, — the men who contemptuously deny "that every man and woman ought to be a philosopher."

So much does the old habit of authority and convention in matters of intelligence and morals still prevail, so much are men still the slaves of these, that philosophy, which alone can make men free, is still looked upon with suspicion and ill-concealed contempt. One continually hears, "But you can't expect every man to be a philosopher. It takes a long time to learn philosophy, and people generally have other things to attend to. They must sow and reap, buy and sell, eat and drink, and they must have a good time. Philosophy is dull, solemn business." The implication, of course, is that sowing and reaping, buying and selling, and so on, are more important things than philosophy, and this, indeed, is what the world of our time practically believes. The general belief is that the end of life is to acquire material wealth and have a "good time," which means to satisfy the natural inclinations, which our education accordingly fosters and pampers. I say this is the result of a failure to recognize that the aim of man's life is man's perfection, and that perfection consists in perfect insight, perfect love, and perfect freedom. As

[1] "Intellectual Piety," pp. 4, 5. (An address published separately in pamphlet form.)

soon as men see this clearly they will no longer look down upon philosophy, which is but another name for loving insight, one of the essential elements in human perfection. To despise philosophy is to despise spiritual perfection, for clear knowledge is one of the elements of that perfection. There is no duty more incumbent upon any human being than to know, unless it be the duty of loving with divine love everything known, in proportion to its worth, and sternly refusing to be guided by personal feelings and inclinations. A man or woman who is not a profound thinker, seeing the things of the world in their true ideal proportions, and acting accordingly, is a mere dependent, half-enslaved creature, whatever amount of so-called culture, refinement, and kindness he or she may have. Such a person is still a slave to authority and convention, a mere play actor in life, bound to play a traditional, unreal part, without any of the glorious liberty of the children of God, of them who see the Divine face to face, and, in the light thereof, all things in their true worth.[1]

We are dealing, it is plain, with the philosophy of a man who has banished entirely from his world things-in-themselves and unknowables, and, therefore, materialism, supernaturalism, and all other forms of agnosticism, but who at the same time believes that modern idealisms, by singling out one aspect of experience, namely the formal or universal aspect, and regarding it exclusively, have thereby started upon a path that cannot but lead, when logically carried out, to pantheism and the evil type of mysticism.

We can now easily conclude this preliminary orientation of Mr. Davidson's philosophy by the mere enumeration of the objects of his special admiration. These were Æschylus, Socrates, Aristotle, Joachim of Flores, St. Thomas Aquinas, Dante, Kant (with reservations),

[1] *Op. cit.*

Rosmini, Goethe (especially the "Faust"), and Tennyson (especially "In Memoriam"). And of all these undoubtedly the first place was held by Socrates, the genuinely religious dissenter, the confident believer in human reason and almost the only true individualist; the man who, moreover, justified in his life as well as in his philosophy his claim to our reverence for these things.

One more thing must be borne in mind in our effort to understand this philosophy, and that is the predominance of the practical interest throughout its author's life. He comes to his theoretical speculations because of vital practical needs, as could not but be the case with one of his intense temperament and strict Presbyterian upbringing. But he was a born dissenter, and he firmly believed that the times were religiously and socially out of joint, and that it was his duty, as it was that of every man, to do his best to set them right. With this end in view he took an active interest in the founding of the London Fabian Society. The name of the society is significant. Its determined aim was the gathering and disseminating of information that might lead to the amelioration of social conditions, but it was to be committed to no theory in advance. Later, as the organization drifted toward outright socialism, Mr. Davidson lost interest in it. Socialism seemed to him to be indeed the logical enough outcome of the view of life that places its highest values upon wealth, position, and physical comfort; which is, however, a complete inversion of true values. Having its aim centered in these external goods, a reform that looks to them primarily must be mechanical and cramping to the life of the

spirit. He saw, in other words, with profound truth that in social reform the end to begin with is always the individual, and, in the individual, his education; that, furthermore, the aim of this education should be to help its possessor to estimate things more nearly at their true worth and to give him the strength to rise above the rule of animality and rightly distribute his affections.

Mr. Davidson also founded the Fellowship of the New Life, first in London, afterward in New York. This society was organized for mutual help in the cultivation of the life of the spirit, for mutual aid in the discovery of real values, and in living accordingly. It was not a church, not even a Unitarian Church, for it had not the vestige of a creed, unless, indeed, it is having a creed to maintain that there is a higher life for man and that it behooves him earnestly to seek to know what that life is and then to lead it. This organization might be called a sort of Fabian Society of the Spirit. The difficulty with a society of this character is that it is apt to degenerate into sentimentalism, "to mistake" (in the strong language of a recent German writer) "fine feelings for argument, and the expanded bosom for the bellows of divinity." Therefore it, too, soon proved unsatisfactory, and both of these practical efforts toward reform convinced Mr. Davidson that the one thing needful above all else in our day is a definite gospel that rests upon, and needs, no authority save the approval of individual reason, a gospel that must therefore also be a philosophy.

Such a philosophy Mr. Davidson believed he had found through his fortunate discovery of Rosmini. It

was a doctrine of radical, uncompromising individualism that was only saved from the chaos of atomism by including the belief in the absolute, divine, eternal worth of every member of the commonwealth of humanity. So intent was he upon saving his doctrine from any swamping monism that he insisted upon calling his view *apeirotheism*. Certainly there was no room in his philosophy for a God who works by special providence, or distributes rewards and punishments. "The God of the future," he writes, "the just God, gives to each one precisely what with his own efforts he has righteously won, neither more nor less. The man who asks for more is a miserable dependant, sycophant, and beggar; the man who is content with less is a fool."[1]

The method whereby it was sought to establish this philosophy was the epistemological method. Every one who has studied the course of philosophy at all knows that always after the zeal of the first efforts has led to the facile construction of some system or other a rival view inevitably looms up that seems to have quite as strong a claim as the first, and yet contradicts it. So the two doctrines consume each other, and a period of doubt and skepticism supervenes. From the moment this stage is reached one can only make his escape from the intellectual slough of despond by asking, as a prior question in one's philosophy, what *is* knowledge, and how do we come by it? Yet what one finds written in the history of philosophy is also always this: that, when this question is raised, forthwith it is assumed that two antithetical terms are somehow immediately given, and

[1] *Op. cit.*

that knowledge consists in bringing these two terms to unite; but as these terms are always taken to be mutually exclusive, philosophies are hard put to it to effect the union. These antithetical terms are, to take the most common instances, the fixed and the fleeting, subject and object, the universal and the particular, appearance and reality, reason and sense, mind and matter, sensitive tablet and external things. And the puzzle of knowledge is to get one of each of these pairs at its opposite. It is generally assumed that if only, by some sort of philosophical alchemy, one can transfuse these incompatibles, or forcibly collocate them, the problem of knowledge is solved. If this cannot be done, then one of the opposites is usually discarded in favor of the other. Now it is obvious that we should not begin with these terms, as if they themselves required no further scrutiny. We must begin by analyzing the act of cognition and the act of perception as they really appear in immediate experience, and not as they are interpreted by a ready-made theory, such as is implied in the very statement of the problem as it usually appears. Bacon said that our duty as scientists is to interpret nature and not to anticipate it. As philosophers, our task is to interpret experience and not to anticipate it.

The result that is reached by this method I can best give in Mr. Davidson's own words:

> Instead of saying, as has been said heretofore, that the world starts with an inscrutable God, inscrutable atoms, or an inscrutable ether, not one of which can identify itself with our intelligence and so be known, our theory says that the world consists of a multitude of sentient individuals or atoms, whose unity is their

sentience, and that these are essentially related to each other through desire. Sentience and desire are two aspects of the same fundamental fact. There is no desire without sentience and no sentience without desire. . . . Matter itself, so far as we could know it, would have to be groups of feelings. . . . The only possible completely intelligible and moral world is a world composed of essentially distinct feelings or sentiences . . . interrelated through action and passion, two forms of feeling, and yet fundamentally impenetrable to each other. And, indeed, this is the world that we really find ourselves in, or in ourselves. I can feel your action and you can feel mine; but my feeling, or the feeling which I am, is utterly opaque to you, and the feeling which you are to me. I can learn that you have the toothache and even understand it, if I have had one as a modification of my own feeling; but I can never feel the toothache which you feel. As sentient and desiring subjects we are absolutely impenetrable to each other, and, in so far, we are hypotheses to each other. That is the price we pay for being realities, eternal realities, if you will. If you could feel my feelings we should be merged into one and both cease to be individuals. This does not lead to agnosticism, as might seem at first sight. There is nothing in you that I may not know if you choose to be communicative; but your feelings I can never feel. So far, happily, we must be eternally agnostics. That is the price we pay for being anything at all.[1]

Or consider, again, this statement:

Each has only to ask himself, What do I know myself to be? And if he answers honestly he will, I think, say: "I am a feeling or sensibility, modified in innumerable ways by influences which I do not originate. These modifications, when grouped, are what I call the world, or *my* world, for I know no other. I am the sentient unity of a sensible world."[2]

[1] "American Democracy as a Religion," in *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol. X, pp. 30 ff.

[2] "Education as World Building," in *Educational Review* for November, 1900, p. 327.

Just as Schopenhauer had tried to escape from the consequences of the omnivorous thought principle, upon which the German philosophy that preceded him had rested, by emphasis upon the will, so Mr. Davidson tries to avoid the pantheism of both of these philosophies by making feeling the fundamental fact in experience. Now, this is just where one naturally seeks to lay the emphasis if one is intensely interested in developing a pluralistic philosophy, for it is as feeling that we are directly shut within our own worlds, and shut out from the worlds of other individuals.

This doctrine, moreover, in two ways seeks to ward off the charge of mere subjectivism: (1) In accepting as a fact the action, through desire, of one individual upon another, — an obvious *fact*, but one which most idealisms have difficulty in adjusting to their systems. (2) In making room for a moral ideal. Life and education consist in world building, in ordering, classifying, grouping our sensations, and hypostasizing them. "But there are worlds and worlds. Since the human being is a sentient desire, which from its very nature demands the highest and most varied satisfaction, the aim of education must be to enable him to construct a world capable of yielding such satisfaction. . . . The extent and richness of the world which any living being constructs depends upon two things: its capacity for manifold experience, and its power of arranging or classifying that experience. The former of these, again, depends upon the number and acuteness of the senses; the latter upon the force of the primitive desire for satisfaction. . . . Ethical life depends upon the completeness

and harmony of the world evolved in the individual consciousness."[1] A moral world would be one in which objects were stamped with their value for the satisfaction of desire, and loved and made motives for the will, in accordance with that stamping. The spring of all wrong-doing is, as Æschylus said, false coinage, *παρακοπά*. Some worlds are small but well ordered, the world of the ordinary respectable citizen; some small and ill ordered, the world of the parasite and ordinary criminal; some large and well ordered, the world of the saints, heroes, benefactors of humanity, thinkers, statesmen, and reformers, the introducers of ideals; some large but ill ordered, the world of the Macbeths and Napoleons, the great reprobates and criminals. Some worlds again are rigidly bounded, the worlds of the narrow conservative, "old fogy," or of the fanatic of one idea; others are continually expanding, the worlds of the liberal and the reformer. The pessimist is simply the man who continually fails to organize a world satisfactory to his desires, and who proclaims himself a failure in world building.[1]

To students of philosophy the view as thus stated will indeed suggest many doubts and queries. One will point out that this extreme emphasis of feeling, apparently at the expense of intellect and will, would completely shut the individual into his own private world, and, indeed, into the experience, if experience it could be called, of the present fleeting moment, — such expressions as "eternal feelings" being contradictions in terms, — and that we should thus be involved in a

[1] *Op. cit.*

most hopeless form of agnosticism. Another will call attention to the fact that there is a striking resemblance between this doctrine and that of John Stuart Mill, with which Mr. Davidson elsewhere expresses his most emphatic disagreement; for, in speaking of "feelings grouping themselves," one seems to be gliding over the difficulties involved, even as Mill does with his "permanent possibilities of sensation"; and this gradation of values here set up as objectively valid is, after all, left vouched for merely by the individual subjective verdict of the man who has experienced the various forms of life, even as Mill would establish a gradation in the quality values of pleasures by the immediate affirmation of the man who has tried the different kinds. These and similar doubts that might be raised have not, I believe, been fully considered. I mention them not to refute them, nor yet in criticism of this philosophy, but rather to call attention to Mr. Davidson's manner, more like that of the poet than the philosopher, of presenting in strong relief that particular aspect of a situation that, for the time being, absorbed his interest. Such unity as the view possesses is to be sought mainly in the large and rich personality of the man, by holding together the different expressions of his different moods. And, in spite of the attempt to work out this philosophy through epistemological considerations and the analysis of experience, it was established in his own mind mainly by the results of his long and thorough study of sociology and of the history of civilization. The single thread of meaning that to him seemed to run through the drama of history was the independence of the individual.

The struggle of the ages points to the establishment of the individual in all his unique integrity as completely self-dependent, the master of circumstances and of his own fate, neither the creature of things nor yet the creature of an all-inclusive God-consciousness. And the emphasis of the part played by feeling is due to a desire to emphasize this independence, even to the point of isolating the single self in a solipsistic world.[1]

The pluralistic philosophy which Mr. Davidson reached, a brief and summary statement of which we now have before us, he held to be the genuine philosophy of democracy, since it recognizes the individual as the source of all authority, and at the same time regards every individual as animated by a desire that is in truth nothing less than a desire for the highest, and as capable therefore of realizing for himself the highest

[1] Amongst Mr. Davidson's published writings the one that throws most light upon his general philosophical standpoint is the article on "Perception," which he contributed to *Mind*, Vol. VII (1884), at the time when the influence of Rosmini was particularly strong. The fact in experience which he then wished to emphasize was Being. This he thought Hegel, and indeed all idealists, spirited away by regarding it exclusively in its aspect as definitely universalized in thought. Thus Being evanished into a category; the *quod cognoscimus* was taken up into, and consumed by, the *quo cognoscimus*. In the latest formulations of his philosophy we find that the term "being" has given place to the phrases "fundamental feelings," or "substantial feelings," together with "desire" — the active aspect of feeling. The transition is easily understood. Being that is not even conceivably exhaustible in thinking, if it is not to vanish in the opposite direction into a mere unknowable substratum of experience, must find its meaning *in* experience, and, when we turn to experience, that which is there immediately given as real is just feeling. It should be added that Rosmini almost suggests this transition. The phrase "fundamental feeling" is his.

satisfaction. Two things follow as a necessary consequence from this teaching: (1) It should be possible for every individual to share in the inheritance of the ages, in all, that is, that the ages have produced that is of real soul-satisfying worth, in the highest culture of the time. And fortunately there is enough of these blessings to go around, for these are just the things that, as Mr. Davidson used to say, can be multiplied indefinitely without being divided. (2) It should be the duty and privilege of every more favored individual to labor without ceasing in order that he may help his fellow-men into their inheritance. And such help consists not merely in giving them knowledge and culture, and helping them rightly to distribute values, but also in helping to make them more efficient and competent craftsmen. The latter work can only be undertaken by such institutions as the famous London Polytechnic, but every citizen can do his share in the former.

Mr. Davidson accordingly spent his life in the effort to uplift men by supplying a sound, aimful education. To him the world seemed "sadly unspiritual, sadly narrow, ignorant, and frivolous. It has lost the light of reason, and is running after vain shadows." Animated throughout his career by a profound missionary zeal, he early determined to do his share in making the world spiritual again. His efforts, alone and unaided, to accomplish this work were very far from satisfying him, and he went through life hunting for kindred souls, dreaming of the establishment of a sort of Pythagorean brotherhood of the spirit, a community where the actual daily life should be a practical object lesson in the right

adjustment of social relations. Indeed, the dominant aim of his life might be summed up in the words in which he described the purposes of one of the organizations that he effected with that end in view: (1) "To bring men together who really and in all earnestness desire to comprehend the world, in order that they may better it, and who are ready to consider all questions without prejudice or respect for current and conventional opinions or authority." (2) "To disseminate in every way, by teaching, lecturing, printing, and *especially by living*, intellectual and moral truth, and to put a period to living by mere conventionality and uncomprehended dogma."

None of these undertakings proved entirely satisfactory, and it was only toward the end of his life that, almost by chance, he stumbled upon the opportunity to carry on this work in a way that seemed to him altogether encouraging.

In the fall of 1898 he lectured in the Educational Alliance of New York City to a large audience composed mainly of hard-driven laboring men and women from the East Side, upon "Problems which the Nineteenth Century hands on to the Twentieth." At the conclusion of the lecture one man arose and objected that it was all very well to talk about profiting by the culture of the ages, but, as for them, they were ground in the dust and had no opportunity. With characteristic impetuosity Mr. Davidson exclaimed that it was not so; that they had all the opportunity they deserved; that, if they only wanted these things badly enough, they could get them. "For instance," said he, "if you will form a class, and fall to work in dead earnest, I will come

down and meet you once a week and teach you." A large number signified their eagerness to undertake the work, a class was formed which soon numbered several hundred men and women, and Mr. Davidson, always better than his word, went down twice a week, meeting, on his second visit, a class of those who were particularly interested in philosophy. This was the beginning of the movement that the present volume describes.

What Mr. Davidson accomplished with these men and women, and how he accomplished it, forms an interesting and significant chapter in the history of modern efforts for the uplifting of mankind.

At the first meetings of the class doctrinaire socialists, steeped in the theories of Marx, were very much in evidence; but, under the Socratic cross-questioning of their teacher, they were soon put to confusion and, by common consent, it was agreed that the discussion of these most difficult and complex social questions should be deferred for some years, until they had acquired a broader knowledge of the history and meaning of civilization and of the culture which it had produced.

In this band of intensely eager and earnest minds Mr. Davidson felt that at last he had found his family, and the work with them inspired him with a new hope for the future, a hope which he has voiced in the concluding chapter of his last published work:

> If the teachers of the nation, with a due sense of their power and importance, would, without hope or desire for material reward, form themselves into an association for the higher education of the breadwinners, as the teachers of France are doing, and each devote a couple of evenings a week to the work, they would soon

elevate the culture of the whole people, and remove the worst dangers that threaten society. Poverty, vice, and degradation would, in large measure, disappear, giving place to well-being, virtue, and nobility. There is no more patriotic work than this; for it is not amid the thunder of the battlefield, where men slay their fellowmen, that the noblest civic laurels are won, but in the quiet schoolroom, where devoted patriots, men and women, combine to slay misery, meanness, and corruption.[1]

[1] "A History of Education," p. 276.

CHAPTER II

THE TASK OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY[1]

THE task of the ages — if, believing in evolution, we admit that they have any task — is the realization of self-conscious personalities, freely related to each other through the three attributes, knowledge, discriminating affection, and originative will. Such personalities alone can be true ends, since they alone have value on their own account.

This task, though it can obviously have neither beginning nor end, is worked out through a progress marked by epochs, each of which has its own appointed share, so to speak, in the whole. These epochs having no clear lines of demarcation, it is customary to identify them with centuries, and to ask what forms of progress have marked each particular century — century being a perfectly arbitrary division of time.

With a view to determining the task of the twentieth century, it would be well if we should trace as far back as possible the whole course of human development (for each part receives the meaning from the whole); but as space forbids this, we must be content to gain what

[1] An address to the Educational Alliance of New York, delivered, from rough notes, in 1898, and afterward written out for the Society for Ethical Culture of Philadelphia. Published in the *International Journal of Ethics*, October, 1901.

light we can by going back for a few centuries, say to the close of the Middle Age.

The task of that age may be stated in a few words. It consisted in keeping steadily before each individual soul the fact of its own eternity and impressing upon it that its weal or woe, throughout that eternity, depended upon its pursuing a definite course of conduct. So far, nothing could have been better. But, unfortunately, — though, as we may well believe, necessarily, — these things were presented in an external, dramatic way, as arbitrary revelations from an external God, and backed by such awesome sanctions as made the soul feel itself a mere helpless worm of the dust in the presence of an irresponsible omnipotence. It felt that its eternity was a mere gift of grace or charity, utterly capricious, because utterly undeserved (the saints vied with one another in magnifying their own unworthiness!), while its conduct was determined by external laws, supported by a system of purely arbitrary rewards and punishments, such as made obedience a mere matter of slavish, selfish prudence, however it might cloak itself as love to the lawgiver. In one word, human life in this age was entirely regulated by authority, which, though it might produce a certain amount of socially desirable conduct, as even the poorest of motives such as fear or avarice may, rendered all true morality, which depends upon a free, rational determination of the will, utterly impossible. The excuse for such authority was the fantastic belief that human nature, as such, was utterly fallen, degraded, and incapable of self-direction; that, hence, if ever it was to reach its true end, it must

entirely submit itself, *ut cadaver*, to external guidance, that is, authority, or direct inspiration. This attitude of mind is admirably expressed in a hymn still much and reverently sung in our churches:

> Direct, control, suggest this day,
> All I design, or do, or say,
> That all my powers and all my might
> In Thy full glory may unite.

This is, of course, a complete abdication of self-guidance, an appeal to God to be moral for us — that we may glorify Him!

In a system which accepted authority as the guide of life, on pain of damnation, there was, of course, no room for freedom of any sort, freedom of thought, freedom of affection, or freedom of will. And, as a matter of fact, all these forms of freedom were, as far as possible, rigorously suppressed. Free inquiry into the laws and nature of the world gave way to a timid, scholastic discussion of the meaning of authority. The natural affections, though they could not be entirely disowned, were grudgingly admitted to a place in life, and even as late as the Council of Trent, in the sixteenth century, an anathema was pronounced upon any one who should say that the state of virginity and celibacy was not better than the state of matrimony. And this is to-day the position of the Roman Catholic Church. Above all, free self-determination of the will, possible only through free inquiry and free affection, was placed under the ban. The mediæval church, in part directly, in part indirectly through the state, sought to regulate

every thought, feeling, word, and deed of its members, and of all whom it claimed as such. When it was resisted, it shrank from no extremes.

The task of the centuries since the close of the Middle Age has been, gradually to remove this yoke of authority, and to raise men to freedom of thought, affection, and will — in a word, to rational self-guidance, or moral life. This has been done, partly through actual resistance to authority, a resistance necessitated by social suffering, and partly through discoveries in the worlds of nature, history, and philosophy.

The sixteenth century was marked by great advances in all directions. The discovery of America, the proof positive of the earth's rotundity, and the Copernican astronomy utterly broke up the mediæval view of the universe, the science of astrology, and the astronomical ethics depending on both, and thus freed men from a whole load of ignorance and superstition in matters physical and moral. At the same time, the Reformation among the Germanic nations freed northern Europe from papal authority, and introduced the principle of free inquiry (without, indeed, recognizing its full import), while the Pagan Renaissance among the Latin peoples went far to free the south from that nature-distorting asceticism to which much of the church's authority was due, and to make the perfection of human nature, instead of the glory of God, the end of human activity. Under the influence of both these movements, education of a human sort spread rapidly, art revived, and the human mind advanced toward autonomy. The full significance of these advances was, however, yet to be discovered.

The seventeenth century is, unlike the sixteenth, which had been largely a period of destruction in matters spiritual, a period of reconstruction. Not only are the old sciences and philosophies put aside, but new sciences and new philosophies spring up to take their place. And, strange to say, these new sciences and philosophies are all animated by a common spirit utterly different from that of the Middle Age. Just at the time when the earth, man's abode, ceased to be regarded as the center of the physical universe, man himself came to be regarded as the center of the spiritual universe. It is this fact that makes the modern world, as distinguished from the ancient and mediæval. Though the meaning of this fact has been but slowly coming to consciousness, it is now obvious enough to any one who cares to think. It is this: whereas in the older world all truth was tried by an external authority, supposed to be revealed, and human reason was relegated to a thrall's place; in the modern world, human reason is elevated to the first place, and all authority, nay, even the existence of God himself, has to come before its tribunal, and accept its verdict. Thus, truth is no longer dependent upon authority but authority upon truth. If God cannot prove His existence and authority to human reason, then reason — man — will have none of them. It would be impossible to overstate the momentousness of this change. It is not only a change from authority to truth, and from faith to science; it is a change from moral servitude to moral freedom. For man is free only when reason is the ultimate court of appeal.

This great change is due mainly to two men — the English Protestant Locke, and the French Catholic Descartes; but we find it in earlier writers — in Hooker and Hobbes, for example. Both these latter writers place the origin and, therefore, the authority of human society in a social contract, and not in divine appointment, and are thus the parents of Rousseau and the French Revolution. Locke and Descartes, working on different lines, came practically to the same conclusion, namely, that in the human consciousness lie the test and reality of all truth, and, therefore, of all life guidance. From them comes all modern thought, in all its different phases, from the crassest materialism to the flimsiest idealism. To the seventeenth century belong Leibniz and Spinoza, Newton and Galileo, Vico and Grotius — hence the beginnings of modern science in all its branches. To it also belong the first effective movements toward what may be called individualism, which was destined to play such a part in the subsequent world. They take their rise in Holland, England, Scotland, and find their overt expression in the three great anthropocentric movements of the century, the two English revolutions and the foundation of a new order of things, whose very essence is individualism, in the newly discovered continent beyond the Western Sea. In all these changes men are more or less blindly asserting their moral rights, their right to freedom of action, guided by free reason and free affection. If the sixteenth century saw the collapse of external spiritual authority and the rise of rationalism, the seventeenth saw the collapse of external temporal authority and the

rise of individualism, backed too by a philosophy which showed it to be rational and practicable.

In the eighteenth century the movements of the two previous centuries toward freedom of thought and individualism in life were carried to extremes, and a new movement begun, what may be called the movement toward economic freedom. It is *par excellence* the century of down-breaking in all the spheres of life and thought. Voltaire overthrew thrones with a jest, and made belief in revealed authority forever impossible; Rousseau discarded all conventionalities and external repressive institutions, called for a return to nature, and made subjective sentiment the rule of life — individualism with a vengeance! Hume, the friend of Rousseau, supplied a philosophy for all this by reducing all thought to clusters of impressions and ideas, and defying these to get beyond themselves either to a world of objects, or to a subject. Kant, accepting this result, showed how the world that we know, subjects and all, can be built up of these clusters, provided we bring out all that is implicit in them. Goethe, with Titanic nature, showed that man works out his own destiny by casting off his limitations and rising to spiritual freedom among free men — that, as Tennyson puts it, "man is man and master of his fate." Lastly, Adam Smith, devoting himself to a sphere of human action which thinking men had too long affected to despise, demanded freedom in the economic world, asserted that the shackles should be struck from the hands of labor, and that complete freedom of production and trade should be permitted, — *laissez faire, laissez passer*, —

insisting, with perfect truth, that freedom of subsistence is the condition of all other freedom. Meanwhile, individualism, the demand of the individual for recognition as an absolute end, found public utterance in the two great events of the century, the American and French Revolutions, in which men boldly declared that they were the lords, not the slaves or tools of institutions, and that any institution or law which they could or would acknowledge, on pain of denying their manhood, must be the expression of their own reason, a means toward the attainment of their own ends as spiritual beings.

Such, after three hundred years of heroic toil and martyrdom, was the condition of things at the opening of the nineteenth century. One would be glad to be able to say that all the movements toward freedom, begun and carried on in those years, were continued, without interruption, till the present day. Some of them have, indeed, been so, and new ones have been initiated; but others have suffered a setback and a reaction. This was, perhaps, inevitable, and is due to the fact that, in the transition from a theological, theocentric, and supernatural view of the world, to a scientific, anthropocentric, and natural one, and in the hand-to-hand struggle for individual liberty, two things dear to the human heart and essential to its peace were lost, to a large extent: (1) the sense of personal eternity and immortality, and those hopes that go with it — things which had for so long rested upon a supernatural basis, and seemed to vanish when this was withdrawn; (2) that settled and fixed condition of society which had been attained under monarchic institutions, and which

had been greatly disturbed by the inroads of individualism, especially by that great explosion thereof, the French Revolution. The consequence was that, early in the century there set in a strong reaction against individualism, both in thought and practice, a reaction in favor of faith and supernaturalism, on the one hand, and of monarchy and despotism, on the other. In the Latin countries of Europe this took the form of a sentimental neo-Catholicism, whose hierophants were men like Bonnet, de Maistre, Chateaubriand, and of the Napoleonic empire succeeded by the restoration of royalty. In the Germanic countries, and in Russia, it produced various philosophies whose aim was to make the old supernatural religion palatable to awakened reason, and at the same time strengthen the hands of monarchies, ultimately developing some of them into empires, *e.g.*, Germany. America was not sensibly affected by any of these things, except by some of the reactionary philosophies — Scottish Reidism and German Hegelianism. The former, by depreciating human reason which seemed to have led to Hume's skeptical results, found what seemed a vacancy left for revelation, whose content, in some form, human nature appeared to demand; and the result was eagerly seized upon by the friends of orthodoxy, so that not only in Great Britain, but also in America, the Scottish Philosophy became very widely popular. The latter, which frankly called itself a restoration-philosophy, by a firework of dialectics and an impudent distortion of the facts of history, undertook to show that Christianity, or that fairy changeling which it chose to call

Christianity (for it had made away with the real thing), was the absolute religion; and this again has been believed by many champions of orthodoxy both in churches and universities. Hegelianism undertook, further, to show that the Prussian military state, of which, as professor in Berlin, Hegel was an official, was the ideal form of government, and belief in this has, in no small degree, contributed to the building up of the German despotic empire. All this the restoration-philosophy accomplished at a heavy expense — the expense of human individuality, human freedom, human immortality, and even of God. Hegelianism, whatever its author and disciples may say, knows none of these things, being only a framework of logical categories. It has been a great instrument of reaction, not merely in philosophy and politics, but also, and still more so, in economics; for socialism, which is a mere return to feudal economics, is simply Hegelianism in economics. Marx merely substituted for Hegel's dialectic process the process of economic production. But it must be admitted that, besides the reactionary philosophy of Hegel, socialism has another root in the economic conditions of the time, which themselves are a result of advancing science. The application of discoveries in physics to machinery for production, transport, and communication has brought about, in the economic world of the century, a condition of things for which the old economic theories offer no guide, a series of problems for which they contain no solution. The workman no longer owns his tools, as in former days, and thus becomes inevitably in large measure the slave

of the man who does. At the same time it has become possible for all the world to compete with all the world, and since, all other things being equal, the successful competitor is he who can obtain his products at the lowest wages, there is a continual tendency to make wages lower and lower till they reach the starvation point. Of the various attempts to remedy these two evils none can be said to have proved entirely successful, not even trades unions or labor unions. The owners of the instruments of production are still able to exercise a certain amount of tyranny over the workingmen, while the latter still lead a precarious life, and are, in many cases, subject to dire poverty and suffering. Here socialism steps in and says it can solve both difficulties. It calls upon the state to deprive the employers of labor of the instruments of production, and so become itself the employer of labor, in which case, the entire working class, to which then almost everybody would belong, would become state officials, and have their wages regulated equitably (so it is believed) by the state. In this way, economic tyranny, competition, and poverty would cease, and the result would be a "coöperative commonwealth," a blessed Utopia. The propounders of this scheme — mostly persons to whom true liberty does not seem dear — fail to see that, even if poverty could in this way be made to cease (and that is avowedly their chief object), it would be at the expense of some of the noblest privileges of the race, — of personal liberty, enterprise, and initiative, — and that it could hardly fail to be fatal to all the higher manifestations of intellect and affection, — to philosophy, science, art,

and literature. At all events, socialism is distinctly a reactionary movement, of the same nature as despotism in politics, and ecclesiastical authority in thought. In all these there is a retrogression from free variety in harmony to dead monotony in authority.

But in spite of all these reactionary movements, from which we are still sadly suffering, in both thought and life, the nineteenth century has been marked by great and manifold progress toward freedom, in many and many directions. In the economic world, despite all drawbacks, the working class is in every way better off than it was a century ago, and has more opportunity and taste for culture; the power and tyranny of capital has been curbed and regulated. In the political sphere, slavery has been abolished in all civilized countries, and thus the dignity of the individual spirit, as an end in itself, universally acknowledged. France has returned to republicanism; England and Italy have become distinctly democratic; the United States has been confirmed in its devotion to freedom; a strong movement is at work in favor of suffrage and political power for women. Everywhere the reluctance to go to war is growing. In the religious world greater advance has been made toward toleration and freedom of thought than in any period in the world's history. Persecution for opinion's sake is rapidly becoming a thing of the past. Philosophy, science, historic research, and literary criticism have combined to assault the gloomy Bastile of supernaturalism, and it is now as good as leveled to the ground, albeit the news of that fact, with all our newspapers, does not spread very rapidly.

More and more, religion has come to mean a rational ethical life suitable to the nature of free spirits. Education has increased and spread as never before; illiteracy is rapidly disappearing. Even our universities, half mediæval, half ecclesiastical as, for the most part, they still are, have made considerable advance in adapting their instruction to the needs of modern life, and contributing their mite to the cause of freedom. Their number, too, especially in this country, has enormously increased. Of progress in the arts and sciences one can only say that it has been greater in this century than in all the other known centuries put together. It would be well if the same could be said of the science of sciences — philosophy. But alas! it cannot. Philosophy since Kant left it has rather gone backwards than forwards, wandering off either into a crude materialism or an empty, merely formal idealism. At present it has come almost to a standstill, ashamed to go back openly to the absurdities of the old theology and afraid to go forward to pure science destitute of theology. It is in a sore strait, and this largely owing to the fact that its professors mostly occupy paid positions in unemancipated colleges and universities. There are hardly any free lances in thought nowadays, any Brunos, Spinozas, Schopenhauers. Yet there are not wanting signs of better things. Biology, physiology, and psychology, which at present try to usurp the field of philosophy, may justify themselves by asserting, as they may with truth, that they are preparing the material for a truer system of philosophy than any that ever before appeared. If philosophy is the unification

by reason of the world presented to it in consciousness, then every fresh discovery in science, every gap filled in that world, is an advance toward a complete philosophy.

We stand now at the opening of a century, looking backward with mingled joy and regret, and forward with mingled hope and anxiety. What has been done in the past centuries we have glanced at and tried to estimate; what remains to be done, that can be done, in that which is approaching, we must now consider. That is its task. And we may say at once that, since the task of all the centuries is to raise mankind, every member of it, to complete and actual moral freedom, which rests upon insight, just affection, and strong will, realizing themselves in a social order, the task of the twentieth is to perform its share in that. And it can do this only by carrying on those movements toward moral freedom which were set afoot in the past, and doing its best to crush out all reactionary movements toward unfreedom spiritual or temporal.

And, first and foremost, it must begin with a rejuvenated philosophy. Starting from the basis of Kant, from whom, barring a few inconsistencies, there is no getting away, avoiding the mistakes and misrepresentations of his more famous followers, and taking advantage of all that has been revealed by the sciences of evolution, in nature and culture, it must seek to unify the world in the only way possible — through the unity of the human spirit — without assuming any other principle of unity, God, nature, or the like. If such exist, that will appear in the process of unification.

The new philosophy will, of necessity, be an endeavor to account for the world as the evolution of consciousness and its content, or, more strictly, of the world as the content of a consciousness; for such is the only world we can speak of or know. In truth, if we consider carefully, we shall see that the world is nothing more than a complex of feelings grouped and distinguished in time and space with reference to the satisfaction of desire. If we ask how it has been evolved, and what is its moving principle, we shall be compelled to say that it is due to desire, the only prime mover conceivable, seeking its own satisfaction. Desire is the Absolute, the primal fact in the universe, the principle that accounts for the whole. Considering further, we shall come to see that such an Absolute implies a number of individuals, monads of desire, incommunicable, and therefore indestructible, each seeking satisfaction through all the rest, and in so doing, evolving the physical world, which is the result of manifold desires seeking satisfaction through mutual aid. Nay, we may go further, and show that the moral world, with all its institutions, — a world which it has been customary to set over against the physical, as governed by entirely different principles, — is evolved by a continuation of the same process, and that there is no break or gulf between them. We shall then recognize that morality itself is nothing more than the effort to satisfy to the full the desire that we, each of us, have; and since this can be done only through the satisfaction of all other desires, that the completest selfishness is also the completest unselfishness; that hedonism and rigorism, egoism and altruism are the same thing.

I cannot here enter further into the details of this philosophy, though it would not be difficult to work these out into lucidity. I merely wish to show in general its nature, method, and moral results, and to insist that without a philosophy, that is, a completely rational account of the world, eschewing faith, agnosticism, and every form of unintelligence, we cannot make any sure-footed progress at all. Before we can deal confidently with the world and our relations to it, that is, before we can live an open-eyed life, we must understand the world, including ourselves, or, better, ourselves including the world. It is all very well to say that a good life is worth striving for on its own account, and that no philosophy is needed in order to do that; but those who do so forget that without a philosophy it is impossible to say what a good life is, without falling back upon mere popular opinion or prejudice — a poor resort. Thus, then, the first and most fundamental task of the coming century is the elaboration of a philosophy of the world in consciousness. This cannot be too strongly insisted upon; for without it our best efforts are mere gropings in the dark, without clew and without aim; and whatever is without aim is without inspiration. And along with this philosophy must go an utter repudiation of everything that conflicts with it, no matter what authority it may claim. All pretended revelation, all supernaturalism, all unintelligible dogmas and mysteries, all religions that cannot make good their claims at the tribunal of reason, all romantic and sentimental views of life, all agnosticism, must be quietly but resolutely brushed aside. We must live by truth and truth alone.

If it be insisted that without supernatural religion we know nothing of immortality, that must be resolutely denied; for philosophy, when disburdened of theology, is fully capable of showing that the self-conscious being is above time. In continuing to palter with the dogmas of Christian supernaturalism to the exclusion of nobler things, we are disloyal to truth and to all the best interests of humanity. Nay, we are even disloyal to the first principles of the government under which we live. For while supernaturalism finds the source of all authority in a will external to man's, this government finds it in man's. The former leaves man a slave, the latter makes him free. Between the two there is no compromise or truce possible, and the attempt to make such brings only confusion and complication such as retards our progress at the present day. The simple truth is that this republic is, in principle, a religion far nobler, and far more full of promise, than any that has ever before appeared on the face of the earth. It alone acknowledges man to be the source of moral authority, hence to be a free being, the carver of his own eternal destiny. We might, indeed, fairly say that the task of the twentieth century, and of all the succeeding ones, is simply the realization of the ideal of individual freedom, involving self-existence, that lies at the basis of our republic. That ideal implies that the divine is not a single spirit, of which all other spirits, so called, are merely creations, that is, self less phenomena, but that it is a republic of self-existent spirits, each seeking the realization of its desires through love, through intimacy with all the rest, and finding its heaven in such intimacy.

Such a republic ours endeavors to be, and as such it is the expression of the ultimate and absolute religion. For us, and perhaps for us alone, true patriotism and true religion are identical. And this we have half recognized in a curious way. We have disallowed external divine authority in our government, and we have refused to let supernatural religion be taught in our public schools; but yet we have not openly introduced into either the religion of free spirit, the religious ideal upon which all our institutions rest. Thus our state and our schools are without religious sanctions, except such as they surreptitiously borrow from a religion of external authority utterly alien to them in spirit, and continually tending to overthrow them. This sad condition of things it is part of the task of the approaching century to put an end to, wiping out that distracting and confusing dualism of church and state, of religious and civic life, which robs the former of content and the latter of enthusiasm, thus degrading both. In the future American republicanism must be not merely a system of politics, but also a religion, the sole and sufficient religion of every American free citizen. As a religion, it will not only continually labor and tend to validate the rights of every individual spirit, as an end to itself and as a contributor to all other ends, and so to do away with all those pitiful conflicts that, for the sake of half-animal enjoyments, range class against class, giving rise to such morbid phenomena as socialism and anarchism, both subversive of true freedom, but it will also show us that this temporal life of ours on earth is a necessary phase of eternal

life, which will and must be just what we, with our knowledge, love, and will desire that it shall be.

In order that our philosophy may be truly a unified account of the evolving world, we must labor unremittingly to know, that is, to arrange and classify the facts and processes of that world. And this means that one important part of the coming century's task will be to "make knowledge circle with the winds," to turn everybody into a devoted student. It is truly amazing how few people in our time are real students, how many know almost nothing of the view of existence revealed by modern science and philosophy; for how many the world is a meaningless show, full of grim hobgoblins, among which they stagger round in doubt or, at best, in blind faith, or yet blinder agnosticism. At first sight it seems preposterous to say that everybody must become a student, and it is sneeringly asked: How can people who have to spend all their time and energy in earning a bare livelihood find time or energy to be students? And yet that is the only condition on which the ideal of our nation can ever become a reality. This nation owes it to every one of its citizens to see to it that he has time and strength left to be a student. That is simple justice. And one of the tasks of the century must be to make that possible. It is not very long since the notion that every person should be taught to write and cipher was scouted as an impossible chimera. To-day this is almost an accomplished fact, and the state recognizes that, in simple justice, it owes this to its citizens. Now that we have attained universal common-school

education, we must proceed and make universal college education a fact. I do not say that the state should undertake to give this education; far from it! but I do say that the state should insist upon every one of its citizens being raised to that grade of intelligence which renders its own existence, as what it claims to be, a government by and for free men, permanently possible, and should remove all economic and other obstacles that stand in the way of this. Citizenship should be a college degree, and the only degree, and all persons who have not taken it should be denied all share in political power. That is only justice to them, as well as to other citizens; for to put political power into the hands of those who do not understand the purpose and meaning of political institutions is the height of injustice and stupidity.

From what has been said, it must be evident that the educational task of the twentieth century cannot be performed without a great change in our present economic conditions, since under these such education is impossible. They must be replaced by others which will make it possible for every parent to give his children a college education. How is this to be done? The readiest answer will be, By socialism. But we have already seen that this involves the loss of the very thing for which the state exists, — personal liberty. Some other way must, therefore, be found, which shall preserve the rights of free individuality, and yet insure it the material conditions for self-development. And this way, it seems to me, can be reached under the same circumstances that would render socialism possible; that is, when the

majority of the people are convinced that such way ought to be found and are prepared to make the necessary sacrifices. The great economic task of the coming century will consist in bringing this conviction home to the great body of the people and preparing them for the needed progress. And this can be done only by introducing a new ideal of life, and a new valuation of the things that enter into it. This must be the outcome of our new philosophy, which by showing us that the only thing truly valuable in existence is spiritual perfection, and the only heaven the community of saints, that is, the intimacy of free, pure, wise, loving, and beneficent spirits, must induce us to transfer the interest which we now attribute to material wealth to that for which wealth is merely a means. Then people, instead of entering upon business for the vulgar purpose of acquiring wealth for selfish comfort and vain display, will do so in order to obtain culture for themselves and families and to aid their fellows in doing the same. Their aim in the employment of labor will be, not to lower, but to raise wages; or, better still, to give no wages at all, but a share and an interest in their business itself. They will ask themselves, not, How many material things can I possess? but, How many men can I enable to rise to the heights of spiritual culture and to live lives worthy of immortal beings, worthy of the deepest friendship and love? To-day men's chief interest is in things, and not in men; real devoted friendship is a thing almost unknown. But surely there is something exceedingly uncultured and vulgar in the character of people who are willing to

surround themselves with impudent luxury which in no way contributes to their spiritual elevation, while they allow perhaps hundreds of men and women in their immediate neighborhood to struggle on darkly in poverty, ignorance, and vice, which utterly unfit them for all the nobler forms of spiritual intimacy, for all the joys of heaven. There is something truly hideous in all this, and it is only our familiarity with it that prevents us from rising up in indignation against it.

I say then that the economic task of the twentieth century is to convince men and women of the true meaning and function of material possessions, to show them that the real "wealth of nations" is a body of cultured citizens, rich in knowledge, love, and will, not a mass of material things owned by a pack of spiritual boors. When this conviction has been reached, and each man makes the culture of all his chief end, then there will be no need for enslaving socialism; then the conflicts between capital and labor will cease, and with them other minor difficulties, such as the servant question, the land question, and the currency question.

I have thus, I think, enumerated the main departments of the task of the twentieth century. What I have said may be recapitulated in a few words. The task before us is (1) to come to clearness with regard to the nature and destiny of man, by an appeal to science, and an eschewing of all authority however hoary, and (2) having discovered that he is an eternal being, destined to grow forever in knowledge, love, and will, through deeper and ever deeper relations to his fellow-beings, to supply the conditions most favorable to this

growth, by making it the conscious aim of every member of the race. A serious effort to perform this task would initiate a new era in the world's history — the era of divine humanity, the era of the "Eternal Gospel" and of the "Holy Spirit," so long foreshadowed by poet and sage. And let no one say that, in eschewing authority and revelation, we are diminishing the hopes of men, or accepting a lower ideal of heroism and sainthood than has existed in the past. Far from it! We are turning hopes into certainties, and calling, for the first time in the world's history, for true morality — a morality which extends to every faculty of the human being, in all his relations with himself and fellows, and which looks forward to no reward which it can possibly miss, since that reward is itself. Furthermore, let no one say that such a life view leaves nothing to the imagination, makes no place for art or poetry. The very reverse is true. By removing those grotesque and stereotyped imaginings of the future life, which dwarfed and stiffened the fancy, and contracted the field of ideal art, it throws open to imagination and art the entire field of possible spiritual achievement and spiritual bliss, and invites them to construct ever higher and more varied ideals of human nobility and human intimacy. For what is art but the depiction of the triumph of spirit, revealed to enthusiasm as beauty, as that form of existence which needs no excuse?

I suppose there is no difference of opinion with regard to the task of the future: it is to do away with poverty, ignorance, and vice, and to raise men to spiritual culture and freedom, to make of earth what we

would wish heaven to be. But two questions still face us: (1) How shall this condition be brought about? and (2) What sort of social order does it imply? We shall treat them in this order.

As to the former, the task before us demands, first of all, apostles, — earnest, devoted men who, having risen to a clear insight into man's nature and his eternal destiny, and recognized that as the only end worth working for, are ready to devote themselves, body and soul, like Paul of old, to its attainment. But alas! this demand is not easily met. Men of real earnestness in regard to spiritual attainment are to-day rare as perhaps never before. The day of spiritual heroism seems to have passed. Every one is eager to find somewhere to lay his head, some comfortable nook or niche in which he may be free from struggle and the need for great moral initiative. There is moral and intellectual cowardice almost everywhere. There is, indeed, a widely spread sentiment of kindliness, miscalled humanity, which would be pleased to see every human being placed beyond the reach of pain and struggle, beyond the need of strong willing, and the world reduced to an easy-going, thoughtless garden of dalliance; but the fiery enthusiasm for human worth, for the divine-human ideal, where do we find it? And yet that is what must be found ere the task of the twentieth century can begin. Somewhere there must be found a small devoted band of men and women of fearless character, clear philosophic insight, and mighty spiritual love, who, living a divine life in their relations to each other, shall labor, with all the strength that is

in them, to lift their fellows into the same divine life. Forming a "settlement" in some city or town, they must preach and teach and toil, not merely among the poor and needy, but also, and perhaps chiefly, among the well-to-do, until they have impressed upon them the true ideal of life as struggle for spiritual worth — for insight and love and will — and conjured up before them the picture of the new heavens and the new earth, the scene of the ever-deepening intimacy of pure, free spirits. They must make their settlement the very center of the city's life, its school, its college, its university, its church, its ethical society, and its theater, all in one, and all guided by the same lofty aim. They must endeavor to withdraw those that join them from the world that is, with its selfishness, its vanity, its love of show and foolish, aimless amusement, and make them the first citizens of the world that is to come, with its friendship, its simplicity, and its active interest in all worthy things. They must interest themselves in all social movements and endeavor to give them a spiritual turn. They must establish an institution which shall do for the natural, freedom-guided life of the future what the church undertook to do for the authority-awed life of the past. And they will have much to learn from the church, above all, its discipline, and its care for souls, adding thereto the care of bodies. Discipline is the backbone of every gospel that has any chance of success. All great religions, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, have been, above all, disciplines, institutions for training the affections and the will, as well as the intellect. There is no worthy religion that does

not set its followers a great task, demanding self-abnegation and heroic endeavor. Through such task alone does man become aware of his divinity, and blest in that awareness. And, after all, discipline is the nurse of freedom. We have to be trained to be free, in any sense in which freedom has any value.

When our little knot of men and women have fully established themselves in one city, have increased in numbers, and have learned by experience what regulations, forms, and activities are most conducive to their ends, they will send out bands of apostles to establish settlements in other cities, just as the mediæval monasteries did, until gradually the whole nation and, finally, the whole world, is leavened with the new spirit — the spirit that underlies our American institutions — buried, at present, alas, how deep!

As to our second question, relating to the future form of social life, it is not easy to give it a definite answer. That it will be different from the present form is very certain: *that* is already giving way under the pressure of circumstances. The family, living in its isolated abode, with its servants, regarded and treated as inferiors, its private kitchen, laundry, and dining-room, its exclusive parties, and the rest, belongs to an obsolete, inhumane, and un-American order of things, against which the apartment house and the family hotel are clear protests. No less so is the summer hotel, where many families that in winter occupy separate houses meet at a common table, and in a common drawing-room, and seem thoroughly to enjoy it. All this, I think, points to the conclusion that the type of future

life will be the monastery, with the family, instead of the individual, for its unit. Such a mode of life would solve many of our present domestic and social difficulties. It would afford that combination of society and solitude which is best for man; it would enable families of moderate means to share and enjoy much, not accessible to them in their isolation, — good art, good music, good literature, etc. It would be most civilizing and humanizing in its effect. The old, ascetic, other-worldly, nature-mutilating monasteries have almost passed away, with the view of life which gave them birth; but it may be that they will revive under a new form to meet the needs of the higher, humaner, completer life that is to be. Yet all this is merely a suggestion, a surmise. No one can at present tell with certainty what the form of twentieth-century life will be. Only one thing, I think, is certain. The family, as a moral institution, will attain increased significance; as the chief center of the efforts of all its members, the goal of a man's business ambition, and the main outlet for his wealth, it will sink in importance as it ought, and give place to a larger object of interest. The man whose labor and thought are expended altogether on his family is only one step above the man who labors and plans only for himself. A man is often an angel to his family and a demon to all the rest of the world. The diamonds for the wife often cost the bread of the poor. This should not be so.

This is not the first time I have spoken of these things, these aspirations and hopes. They are my daily and hourly companions. But I seldom find that

they meet with much response when I speak them out. They mean toil of mind and body; they mean courage, independence, self-abnegation, a laying down of one's own life and a taking up of that of the world; they mean willingness to undergo obloquy, neglect, derision; they mean dying in order to live. And there are few people, in this morally unheroic and self-seeking time, prepared for these things. Every one feels that his task is the attainment of temporal well-being for himself; and so the task of the centuries, the task of eternity, hardly appeals to him. Nay, he is often fain to forget that there is any eternity, and so is content to live the life of the ephemeron. But this cannot always be so. Even in this matter-ridden time, and even as a reaction against materialism, there must soon arise a few people for whom the interests of eternity shall outbid the interests of time, and an apostolate be found to begin the task of the twentieth century.

Unto each man his handiwork, unto each his crown,
The just Fate gives;
Whoso takes the world's life on him, and his own lays down,
He, dying so, lives.

Whoso bears the whole heaviness of the wronged world's weight,
And puts it by;
It is well with him suffering, though he face man's fate;
How should he die?

Seeing death has no part in him any more, no power
Upon his head;
He has bought his eternity with a little hour,
And is not dead.

For an hour, if ye look for him, he is no more found,
For one hour's space;
Then ye lift up your eyes to him and behold him crowned,
A deathless face.

On the mountains of memory, by the world's wellsprings,
In all men's eyes,
Where the light of the life of him is on all past things,
Death only dies.[1]

[1] Swinburne, "Super Flumina Babylonis."

CHAPTER III

THE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS WHICH THE NINETEENTH CENTURY HANDS OVER TO THE TWENTIETH

A FREE life is the only life worthy of a human being. That which is not free is not responsible, and that which is not responsible is not moral. In other words, freedom is the condition of morality. That is simple enough.

Now, freedom, taken in its broadest sense, is conditioned by several things, such as health of body, wealth, and, above all, education. It is obvious enough that, however wealthy and cultured a man may be, if he has not health, his freedom will be sadly curtailed in its exercise. Nor is it less obvious that, if a man is destitute of wealth, and has to spend his entire time in obtaining the bare necessaries of life, he is to all intents and purposes a slave to his body. Lastly, it is clear enough that the uneducated man, however well endowed with health and wealth, is a slave. In the first place, he is a slave to other people's opinions, as every one must be who fails to think for himself. He who acts upon the thought of another is practically that other's slave. This we see daily in the political world, where the great body of the people, on account of their ignorance, are deprived of their rights, and often of other things, by selfish men who have received

a good education. In the second place, he is continually faced by circumstances, the bearing of which he does not understand, and hence is compelled either not to act at all, or else to act in the perilous dark. Worst of all he is cooped up in a pitiful, beggarly world of facts and interests mostly of a material sort, knowing nothing of the world of science and philosophy, art and literature. The great drama of history is a blank to him. He is not inspired by its lessons, its noble characters and stirring events. He knows nothing of the marvels of literature, — Homer, Æschylus, the Hebrew prophets, Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe, — nothing of architecture, sculpture, painting, or music, nothing of the great discoveries and inventions that cast all the fairy tales into the shadow, and suggest a world of boundless possibilities. Again, he knows nothing of his own nature, origin, or destiny, except, perhaps, certain childish myths that grew up before science was born. The great truths of ethics, politics, economics, philosophy are beyond his ken, so that he hardly knows what the words mean. Thus, on all sides, he is hampered, fettered, shut up in a bare, squalid, narrow world, dark within and dark without. In such a world he has small opportunity for freedom. He is thankful, if he can walk in some beaten track and keep out of mischief. And, indeed, he often fails to do even that. He is, moreover, forced to confine himself to dull, ignorant, perhaps coarse company, and to such low forms of enjoyment as smoking, drinking, gambling, roughness, or even worse vices. And, indeed, what else should we expect from a man shut up by ignorance and

unculture in a dull, monotonous Devil's Island prison? Of all the sad effects of ignorance, perhaps the saddest is, that it cuts its victims off from the society of intelligent and cultured men and women. It is utterly vain to try to make the cultured and the uncultured man meet socially on common ground. With the best of wills they cannot do it. Ralph Waldo Emerson tried to induce his servants to sit at table with the family, and benefit by its cultured conversation. What was the result? The servants after a few attempts absolutely rebelled, so uncomfortable were they, and thenceforth took their meals in the kitchen. One summer, in the Adirondacks, I persuaded my servants to mix with my guests at a house-warming. They put on their best clothes and came; but, though every one was polite to them, they stood it only about fifteen minutes, and then escaped to the kitchen. Thus the ignorant are condemned to associate with the ignorant, and to be cut off from the world of intelligence and culture — from the very influences which they most need. But this is surely a lamentable state of affairs, especially in a democratic country, where intelligent citizenship is demanded of everybody. Are we not, as a nation, unfaithful to our own principles, if we allow it to continue? Are we not endangering the very existence of our free institutions? Are we not, as individuals, guilty of heartless cruelty to our brothers and sisters, in allowing them to be disinherited of their share in the great treasures of spiritual goods heaped up by the labors of past generations? How can any learned and cultured man or woman look his or her ignorant

and neglected brother or sister in the face and not blush with shame?

The practical question is, How shall an end be put to this utterly disgraceful condition of things? In other words, the chief educational problem which the nineteenth century passes on to the twentieth is, By what means shall every citizen in the nation receive such a training for body and soul as shall enable him to enjoy all the treasures of culture won by past generations, and to take part in all the activities of life with intelligence, energy, and beneficence? There are other problems, but they are subordinate to this.

In one respect, the educational problem, in this country, is much simpler than the economic one. The people of the United States may be said to have declared unanimously for socialism in education, without having, so far as I know, set any limits to the education that may be given. Indeed, having adopted the principle, it cannot logically stop anywhere. All our states, I believe, provide for primary and common school education; most of them for high-school education; and many even for college and university education. Indeed, I see no reason to doubt that most of our states would provide for any grade of education for which there was any considerable demand — even for what it might seem their most obvious duty to give, education in statesmanship. That, however, is not the only condition required, and such education must be given under conditions that can be met by all. Now, at present, all these conditions are, to a large extent, non-existent. There is no considerable demand for higher education; the higher education

given to the few is far from being the sort that is needed for the many; and it is not given under such circumstances that all can take advantage of it. Let us consider these points in order.

1. *There is no universal demand for higher education;* for which reason the state does not offer it to all. This is due to several causes. In the first place, there are many families in which there exists no notion of the nature and advantages of higher education, in which there is never a thought of the children's being anything but subordinates and drudges, and in which culture and refinement are regarded with suspicion or aversion. The parents have accepted their own dark lot with a kind of dogged defiance, and they do not see why their children should not do the same. Culture would separate their children from them, and they naturally dread this. These are very difficult cases. The dull, brutish contentment with mean, vulgar conditions, the lack of all higher ambitions, is something very hard to overcome. Again, in many families there is a certain dread of higher education. They think it unsettles children, turns them aside from the quiet, beaten paths of respectability, and makes them question old customs and religious beliefs. Such notions are to be found not only among the poor, but also among the rich, and are frequently fostered by priests and ministers.[1] These are also very hard cases. This stolid,

[1] The head of one of the most fashionable ladies' schools in New York once told me that his pupils came to him "all covered over with padlocks," which he was not allowed to touch; that parents protested the moment he tried to deal with any subject bearing on the conduct of life, or likely to make the young ladies question any of its conventionalities.

contented, immovable respectability, which dreads to be disturbed into life, this owlish orthodoxy, which fears to be forced to think or question, can be removed only by the slow advance of enlightenment, making such prejudices the opposite of respectable.[1] But the main reason why the higher education is not demanded by all is that so many cannot afford the time for it. Families with meager incomes find it impossible to support grown boys and girls while they pursue the higher studies. The young people must "go to work," often at a very early age, in order to make a living for themselves and help their families; and one continually hears touching stories of devotion and heroism among such young workers. "Going to work" means, in most cases, the end of education, nay, even the loss of much that has been already learned. Long, dreary, mechanic working hours, amid cheerless surroundings, coupled with poor food, bad air, heartless taskmasters, and frivolous company, soon degrade the bodies and souls of the young toilers; and thus thousands, yea, millions, of boys and girls that, with education, might have developed into noble men and women, rich in all the virtues of head, heart, and will, sink down into mere "hands," as the cruel term is — hands worked by stunted brains and hungry, discontented hearts.[2] It

[1] See Dante's scornful description of the *vigliacchi* (cowards) in "Hell," III, 31–69; and compare that of the *accidiosi* (easy respectables) in "Purgatory," XVIII, 88–99.

[2] Still, all day, the iron wheels go onward,
Grinding life down from its mark;
And the children's souls, which God is calling sunward,
Spin on blindly in the dark.

E. B. Browning, "The Cry of the Children."

is to these that the problem of the higher education chiefly relates. The educational question of the day is, How shall boys and girls who are both capable and desirous of receiving a higher education, but who are now compelled by poverty to go to work at the age of thirteen or fourteen, be enabled to obtain that education? I shall not undertake to answer this difficult question. It must be handed over to the twentieth century. But I may be permitted to make a few suggestions. In the first place, the question is plainly, in one aspect, an economic one. In the coming century, either parents must be able to make a larger income, or else boys and girls must be able to make a living in such a number of hours as shall leave them sufficient time and strength to devote to education. It may be that both these things will happen. It may be that, in the near future, there will be such an advance in wages, and such a cheapening of products, through mass production and improved machinery, that every family of ordinary working ability shall be able to give its children all the education they desire. In Scotland this condition of things practically exists now. In that country, where the desire for higher education is almost universal, there is not a washerwoman but can send her sons to college if she chooses and if they are fit to go. And many really choose, and many sons go. To be sure, this often involves heroic sacrifices on the part of both; but no one grudges these, and they go far to strengthen character. It is true that in Scotland the path to higher education is smoothed by things that are hardly to be found elsewhere: (1) the parish schoolmasters, being graduates of universities,

can usually prepare boys for these; (2) the universities offer for competition a very large number of scholarships — "bursaries," as they are called there — which not only encourage study, but enable many a boy to go to college who could not otherwise do so; (3) the universities are in session only five months in the year, and these consecutive and in the winter, thus leaving their students seven free months in which to earn money with which to proceed.[1] This arrangement is excellent in many ways. The students, though free for seven months, do not, on that account, interrupt their studies, nor, indeed, are they permitted to do so. A large amount of work is assigned to them for these months, and on this they must pass an examination before they can enter a higher class. Thus they pursue their studies by themselves while earning money for a fresh session at the university. It is not too much to say that for Scotch students the vacation is the most valuable part of the year. Indeed, I know from actual experience that study combined with work is far more fruitful than study by itself, and that study without an instructor imparts to the mind a habit of independence that no chaperoned study can give. In this way higher education finds its way to the very poorest classes of the population, and many of the worthiest names in British literature and science have sprung from these. I know of one man who started life as a hand-loom weaver, and who later became Lord Rector of his Alma Mater, a most honored position. He still lives, full of years and honors, having written books

[1] I am speaking of things as they existed in my time, forty years ago.

which take a high place in the world of science. And hundreds of similar cases might be cited. The case of the "Little Minister" is by no means uncommon. It has even been asserted that six tenths of all the officials in the British Empire are Scotchmen, although Scotland claims but one tenth of the population. Whether the condition of things prevailing in Scotland could be copied in this country, I cannot say; but the facts cited show that there is nothing in the nature of things to prevent the higher education from being shared in by a whole people.

In the second place, it is evident that, if ever the higher education is to become universal in this country, it must be undertaken by the state. As we have seen, the state is committed to this as soon as the demand for higher education becomes general; and it certainly ought not to do so before. The question, then, is, How shall we create this demand?

While the people of the United States have great faith in accomplished facts, they are justly suspicious of untried theories, however specious. We may be sure, therefore, that the state will never undertake to provide higher education for the great body of the wage-earners until it is made evident that they are both capable and desirous of such education, and that they will be more valuable, as citizens, when they have received it. But this can be done only through the coöperation of three classes of people: (1) the wage-earners themselves; (2) their wealthy friends; (3) their scholarly friends. In other words, before it can be demonstrated by fact that the wage-earners are ready

for, and will profit by, higher education, they must supply pupils, the rich must supply conveniences for the imparting of instruction, and the learned must supply teachers. And all three classes will profit by the coöperation; for at present each suffers greatly by reason of its isolation from the other two: the wage-earners from ignorance, unculture, and envy; the rich from conceit, unsympathy, and frivolity; the learned from pedantry, narrowness, and unpracticality. Labor, wealth, and learning must be in full sympathy, before a perfect and truly democratic society can come into existence.

We may now ask, With which of the three classes shall the movement toward popular education begin? With the first, I reply — with the wage-earners. To the young among these, we can say now: "If you desire the higher education which shall make you intellectually, morally, and socially independent, begin now to study with regularity and with system in the quiet of your own rooms. Let each of you in some undisturbed corner have his work table, his books, and his writing materials, so that, as soon as the day's toil is over, and he has had a little exercise and rest, he may be able to sit down, and begin each evening where he left off the evening before."[1] I believe there is little possibility of

[1] When I uttered these words, I was little aware what ignorance they implied and what bitter irony they contained. I afterward learned that a very large number of my young hearers came from homes in which there was not a quiet or retired nook, and in which they slept, three or four in a room, regardless of sex. If they wished to study they had to go to some public reading room, and such places are not very numerous on the East Side of New York. Then I knew why the pool rooms and such places are so well frequented.

study without some such arrangement as this. Well do I remember, when I was only twelve years old, erecting, in a quiet garret, a writing table of old tea boxes, and working from daylight till sunset (it was summer and vacation time — "hairst-play"), in order to learn French, which I was actually able to read at the end of six weeks. I still have the exercises which I wrote at that time (1853), and the books which I used, well fingered and now brown with age.[1] That is half a century ago; but the memory of it is still fresh and delightful. But I have always spoken French with a garret accent!

Again, since study requires not only home conveniences, but also books, we may say to the young aspirants for higher education, "save your pennies and buy books." Fortunately, in this country many good books can be bought for next to nothing, and nearly all scholars have numbers of them, which they are willing to give away to the right persons. Though living in a remote

[1] This is the way I came into possession of the books. Shortly before vacation began, I had gone to the auction sale of the effects of a recently deceased minister. Among these was a large number of books, certain of which I coveted. Having fifteen pence (thirty cents) in my pocket, I began bidding lustily for some of them; but I soon discovered that they were all beyond my means. Though I was ready to cry several times, I stood round till the sale was over, and then I was rewarded. The less valuable books were sold in lots, and in these several buyers found volumes which, for good reasons, they did not care to own, — volumes in French, Latin, and Greek. These they turned over to me, loading me to such an extent that I had to beg a ride in a cotter's cart, in order to reach my home, which was two miles and a half off. That night I was the happiest boy in the fifty parishes: I had got the nucleus of a library, and I have it now. The French books looked very inviting. I set to work at them, and ere the vacation was over, they contained no mysteries for me.

country village, I had a nice little library before I was sixteen, when I went to college.

When a number of young wage-earners have acquired habits of study and surrounded themselves with books, they will begin to demand more favorable conditions for study, — shorter work hours, college buildings, libraries, instructors, — and when the demand becomes strong enough, all these will be accorded. If it were shown to-morrow that the wage-earners' demand for shorter hours was a demand for time and opportunity for self-culture, it would certainly be granted. Indeed the reason why it is not granted now is because there is no evidence that the free time thus acquired would not be wasted in evil ways, greatly to the detriment of the workers and their families. Then, too, the rich will contribute their money, and the learned their time and labor, so much sympathy is there for the toilers struggling for an education.[1] Thus will gradually arise institutions of higher education for the great body of the people, and when these are numerous enough to convince the state that there is among the wage-workers a widespread demand for such education, it will take hold of the whole matter and, with public funds, establish a Breadwinners' College or People's University in every city ward and in every country village or township. Then the cause of the higher education of the people will be won, and democracy placed on a firm basis.

[1] This sympathy is, indeed, not universal. Among certain classes, both of wealthy men and of scholars, there is a snobbish, undemocratic notion that the so-called "lower classes" require no more education than suffices to enable them to earn a livelihood. More renders them discontented!

2. *The higher education offered in our colleges and universities at present to the few is not of the sort needed by the many.* Our colleges and universities are products of the Middle Age, of a time when people were far more concerned about preparation for the idle joys of heaven than for the active duties of earth, and they have never belied their origin. Now, surely no one can object to heaven if it is of a nature to call forth the deepest of human energies, and no one can be a more fervent believer in eternal life than I am; but I am very sure that the best way to prepare for the social duties of heaven (a condition with no such duties would be hell) is to perform our social duties on earth in the worthiest way possible. It is encouraging to note that, at the present day, less and less stress is laid on beliefs and ceremonies and more and more on actions and duties. Originally the universities were chiefly intended to prepare for the church, and were open to all properly prepared comers, however poor. Later they prepared for the four "liberal professions," [1] — theology, law, medicine, and philosophy, — which, being special activities, occupied but a small number of persons compared with the entire population. Thus the higher education had largely a supernatural aim, and was confined to a small number of people who alone were supposed to be liberally educated. And this mediæval condition of things continues, to a large extent, down to the present day. Our universities still retain much of the old supernatural curriculum, and they are chiefly training schools for the so-called "liberal professions," the members of

[1] See Denifle, "Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400."

which arrogate to themselves a position of superiority to all other professions however useful. Even in this most enlightened country, with our six hundred colleges and universities, only one person in a thousand receives a college education. Nor, indeed, can things well be otherwise, so long as our colleges and universities are open only to those who possess means enabling them to devote three or four years to study alone. This has been so clearly recognized that, in recent years, there has sprung up what is called "University Extension." The effort is, indeed, a laudable one; but neither has it been very successful, nor are its aims and methods such as the circumstances demand. It merely undertakes to carry the defective education afforded by our universities, on a reduced scale, into a somewhat wider circle. It is a thing of shreds and patches, without any coherent plan or any idea of rounded culture. A course of lectures upon English literature, then one on chemistry, followed by an illustrated one on the geography of the Philippines, are not likely to form any kind of living, growing whole in the student's mind. University extension we most assuredly need, but not the extension of our present universities, or of their antiquated curricula, in fragmentary or diluted form. Let us try to realize what we do need.

In the mediæval universities, under whose influence higher education still groans, human culture was not aimed at. Their purpose was to suppress the human, in favor of the divine. When the opening of the old Greek, humanity-deifying world led, in the Germanic Reformation, to the rehabilitation of Reason, and in

the Italian Renaissance, to reconciliation with Nature,[1] then the culture of the human, in its two aspects, Reason and Nature, came to be an object, and to call for a new order of studies. Unfortunately the advocates of these studies, instead of founding independent institutions for their diffusion,[2] placed them under the wing of the old universities, and combined them with their curricula. Thus arose the Protestant universities,[3] a class of mongrel institutions, half devoted to supernaturalism and professional training, half to human culture. Unfortunately the training remained on the old supernatural and authoritative basis, and confined itself to the four "liberal professions," while the culture consisted mainly in an acquaintance, often extremely superficial, with ancient Greek and Roman literature.[4]

[1] The mediæval view is admirably expressed by the words which Goethe puts into the mouth of the archbishop-chancellor in "Faust" (Part II):

> Nature and Intellect — they are not named to Christians.
> For doing so, we burn atheists,
> Because such speeches are most dangerous.
> Nature is sin, Intellect is devil.
> Between them they foster Doubt,
> Their misshapen mongrel offspring.

The whole masquerade scene (*Mummenschanz*) is intended to embody the transition from the mediæval world of authority and militarism to the modern world of freedom, reason, nature, and industry.

[2] Lorenzo de' Medici attempted to do this in his Platonic Academy, but he found few imitators. The church was still too strong.

[3] Even the Catholic universities, especially those directed by the Jesuits, were deeply affected by the Renaissance. The Dominican Denifle, in carrying his history of the mediæval universities only up to 1400, fully recognizes this.

[4] With this was coupled, in Italy and elsewhere, an attempt to imitate old Greek morals even in their worst aberrations. See the first conversation between Faust and Wagner in Goethe's "Faust."

This state of things has, to a large extent, continued even down to the present day, and in America as much as anywhere. Here a very large number of colleges and universities are still in the hands of religious sects, or are influenced by them; the education they give is mostly confined to the "liberal professions," while the culture they offer consists mainly in acquaintance with "classical" authors, as they are called.[1]

It is evident enough that no "extension" of institutions of this sort can meet the needs of democracy at the present day. They do not offer the education demanded by the great body of the people. The institutions demanded must, in contradistinction to these, do three things: (1) they must eschew all supernaturalism and authority, and take their stand upon nature and science; (2) they must draw a clear distinction between culture and professional training, and see to it that the former is conceived in the light of a sound philosophy, is suited to the needs, and brought within the reach, of every citizen; (3) they must extend the latter to all professions that need special training, and do their best to blot out the invidious and undemocratic distinction between liberal and illiberal professions.[2]

[1] There are, indeed, exceptions to this rule, universities in which an attempt is made to keep pace with the progress of science and thought; but hardly any even of these are free from the influence of supernaturalism, and not one clearly distinguishes between professional training and culture.

[2] If this cannot be done, the term "liberal" ought to be applied to all those professions that add to human wealth or well-being, and the term "illiberal" to all that do not, — to stock speculation, whisky distilling, gem cutting, and all such as minister to vice or vanity.

It is hardly necessary to dwell upon these three points; they speak for themselves. It is surely clear that the institutions needed in a democracy are such as shall wipe out all the unbrothering distinctions that divide sect from sect, and shall use every effort to secure for the whole body of the people intellectual, moral, political, and economic freedom.

It appears, then, that the People's or Breadwinners' University which our circumstances demand must consist of two parts: (1) a College for Culture, and (2) a Polytechnic Institute[1] for Professional Training. Let us consider the nature of (*a*) the Culture, and (*b*) the Training which these must, respectively, give in order to be truly efficient.

a. Culture

Culture, it is obvious, must extend to the whole human being, body and soul, and to all their functions. It should never be forgotten that it is difference of culture, far more than difference of wealth or position, that separates man from man and class from class.

Body culture includes health, strength, grace, and dexterity, which are acquired, respectively, through hygienics, gymnastics, deportment, and manual training. The whole of these should be taught in the lower schools; but they must be continued in the Breadwinners' University — the first three in the College, the last in the Polytechneum. In the department of Hygienics

[1] Why not say, shortly, "Polytechneum" (πολυτεχνεῖον), as the Greeks do?

pupils will be taught what to eat and drink, how to prepare it, and when and in what quantities to take it.[1] They will be taught when and how to sleep and how to avoid all those excesses which weaken and break down the nervous system. They will be taught how to avoid the evils of unsanitary homes and unsanitary dressing. No one who has not looked into the matter knows how much the working classes suffer from lack of knowledge of the laws of hygiene. Ill-fed, ill-clad, accustomed to breathe impure air, they are unable to do their best work, and are wont to be sour and ill-tempered. Look at many of the young people in the streets and note what complexions they have. That means bad food, bad digestion, bad air, bad care. It may be said that good food costs too much; but that is only half true. There are many inexpensive foods that are excellent; and even dear food is often the cheapest in the long run. All this will be explained in the class in Hygienics. In the class in Gymnastics every exercise will be taught that can impart strength and suppleness to the body, and make it the ready instrument of the soul. The practice of Gymnastics should be continued throughout the entire life, in order to insure readiness of action. What is more unbecoming than high or stooping shoulders, a sideling or rolling gait, a slow, ungainly movement of hands and feet, a general looseness and feebleness of the whole frame? And these things are not only unbecoming, but they also go far to unfit their victims for skilled labor and efficient work. Gymnastics, it should

[1] For the theory and practice of cooking they will have to go to the Polytechneum.

be remembered, are a great aid to hygiene, if they do not degenerate into athletics, which are often extremely unhygienic,[1] not to say brutalizing. In the class in Deportment everything will be done to train the body in ease, dignity, and grace, and impart refinement of manners. It is, to a large extent, the lack of these that unfits the uncultivated man for mingling with cultivated people. In their society he feels awkward and bashful. He feels that everybody is looking at him. He does not know how to act at table, in a drawing-room, in a public assembly, and so on. The man of boorish manners, who talks loud, uses slang, puts his elbows on the table, and eats with his knife, cannot expect to be a welcome guest among refined people. These, no doubt, seem little things and they are; but they are big enough to separate class from class, which is not a little thing. There is no reason in the world why men and women who have to earn their living by manual labor should not be as refined in manners and bearing as any other class of the people. It is, largely, the lack of this refinement that makes so many of them willing to live in squalor and that makes the other classes look down upon them as inferiors, and their employers treat them as mere "hands."[2]

[1] Aristotle told his contemporaries: "It is no slight evidence of the fact that violent exercise impedes growth, that there are not more than two or three examples on record [in 450 years!] of persons having been victorious in the Olympic games both as boys and as men." — "Politics," VIII, 4; 1338 b 44 seq.

[2] Old people in Lowell, Massachusetts, delight to tell of the time, in the first half of the nineteenth century, when the mill workers were ladies and gentlemen. Lowell Island received its name from being their summer resort. Things are different now.

Soul culture must extend to all the three faculties or aspects of the soul — the intellect, the affections, and the will — and be such as to develop these harmoniously to their full extent. Our present schools and universities do little more than attempt to train the first of these, leaving the other two to take care of themselves. The result is that the affections and wills even of those few who receive a university education remain in the condition of mere caprice, undisciplined and misdirected. In the Breadwinners' University not only the intellect, but also the affections and the will must be educated and trained. Let us consider these faculties in this order.

1. *The Intellect.* What sort of education shall the intellect of the breadwinner receive? In attempting to answer this question, I am assuming that all those who desire higher education have already acquired the lower branches which the state socialistically provides in the common schools; that they can read, write, and cipher; that they know something of geography, physical and political, grammar, physical science, music, drawing, etc. What higher studies shall they undertake? The answer seems obvious: those studies which shall show them their place in the great drama of nature and history and the part they have to play in it. This is what we mean by imparting culture. The man who knows what he is, whence he is, whither he is going, how he is related to the world and his fellows, is the cultured man. He may not know Sanskrit or Arabic, or even Greek and Latin; he may know very little of chemistry, botany, or astronomy, and nothing of quaternions; yet he will have the essential things. All the studies I have

named are important, but they are not essential to culture. Now what are the sciences that teach us our place and part in the world? They may all be included under one — the science of evolution. Our place in the world is our place in the process of evolution. What we are consists of what we have done and what we are going to do. But the sciences of what we have done and are going to do are two, — history and sociology, — the former supplying the facts, and the latter the theory of the facts. History includes not merely the evolution of humanity, but the whole course of evolution — the story of the world; and sociology, which is the true philosophy,[1] shows the principles by which this evolution is guided, thus enabling us individually to play our part in it. The facts of history may be classed under various heads, such as natural and cultural; and these again may be subdivided, the former into astronomical, chemical, geological, biological, psychological, etc.; the latter into religious, ethical, political, economic, æsthetic, etc. But all these divisions are made merely for convenience of treatment, and the science of sociology shows that they are all but aspects of one eternal process, in which each of us has an eternal part to play.

I know nothing more inspiring than the world view to which a true and exhaustive sociology leads. It is, in truth, religion made scientific; for what else has religion ever been but a view of man's relations to the society of beings that form his environment and of his duties in

[1] It is to be hoped that the day is past when philosophy could mean a system built up by a dialectic process and imposed upon fact. *Such* philosophy was mere disguised theology, which is but another name for mythology.

these relations? In these days when, in the pitiless glare of scientific research, the old unscientific world views which formed the basis of earlier religions are passing away, it is of the utmost importance that they should be replaced by a scientific one. Unless this is done, religion, which lends to life all the sublimity and consecration it has, must disappear, and life become vulgar, sordid, selfish, and frivolous, as, indeed, it is obviously becoming at present, just for want of such a world view. Kant once said: "Two things move me to ever greater awe: the starry heaven above and the moral law within." There is one thing more awe-inspiring than either of these, one thing that includes them both and much more, — the spectacle of the process of the world through beginningless, endless years, a process which embraces the starry heavens and the moral heavens alike. History, in its full and original sense (*ἱστορία*), is the record of all this, of the gradual ascent from matter to mind, from sense and desire to intelligence and love and will. And the record must be complete if we are to understand ourselves and guide our lives aright. We must first know our relations to the subhuman world, to minerals, plants, and animals of all grades; for, indeed, we are related to them all, and are cousins to birds, serpents, fishes, and apes; then our relations to the starry heavens,[1] and

[1] Man is all symmetry,
Full of proportions, one limb to another,
And all to all the world besides:
Each part may call the farthest, brother:
For head with foot hath private amity,
And both with moons and tides.

GEORGE HERBERT, "Man."

finally our relations to our fellow human beings. We must follow the gradual progress of man up from the earliest dawn of intelligence; from the lowest savage condition, when he knew not the use of fire or weapons, up through the stone age, the bronze age, the iron age. We must follow the growth of primitive societies, at first small and weak, on to ever larger combinations, — villages, towns, cities, kingdoms, empires. We must study the histories of Chaldea, Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Media, Persia, of the Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, and all the rest, down to our own day. Then we shall see that it is all one great drama, in which the histories of those different peoples are but so many acts or scenes. And what a drama it is, with its heroes and saints, its martyrs and conquerors, its merchants and statesmen, its poets and sages, its prophets and messiahs! What interest arises as we watch and comprehend it!

And we are the outcome of all this. We each bear in our bodies and souls the result of the entire process. We are the sum of the whole Past; the whole Past is needed to explain us; and, for that matter, the whole future also. We were born yesterday, so to speak; but our history goes back to the beginning of things. I cannot fully answer the question What am I? without knowing the whole of History and Sociology. I cannot understand or properly appreciate the government of the United States, that flower of the ages, except on the same condition. Why are we so devoted to freedom, and why do we look down upon nations like Russia and Turkey that are not free? History and Sociology alone can tell us. And how inspiring

Sociology is! How instructive it is to follow the phases of religion, ethics, economics, politics, etc., from the dawn of culture to our own day! How interesting each new discovery in archæology, in language, in mythology, becomes to us! In the light of such study how plain the meaning of the movements of the present day is — of socialism, anarchism, and the rest! Were it not that History and Sociology are badly taught in our schools and colleges, taught in a fragmentary, unsystematic, and ungenetic way, these movements would be seen to be mere reversions to primitive conditions. It is quite usual to begin the study of History with the history of the United States, and of Sociology with the works of Herbert Spencer. As well might we begin the study of Mathematics with the differential calculus, or Manual Training with the construction of a steam engine! In the Breadwinners' Colleges of the future these sciences must be taught so as to reveal the whole process of evolution in which alone the different phases are intelligible.

To draw up a course of study for a Breadwinners' College is not easy; but the following may be regarded as a first attempt:

1. Outline of the Course of Evolution, including Philosophy of Evolution.
2. The Circle of the Sciences (*Encyclopædie*), including Doctrine of Method.
3. Outlines of Universal History and Sociology.
4. Comparative Religion, including Philosophy of Religion.
5. Comparative Ethics, including Philosophy of Ethics.
6. Comparative Politics, including Political Philosophy.
7. Comparative Literature, including Theory of Criticism.

8. Comparative Art, including Philosophy of Æsthetics.
9. History and Philosophy of Economics.
10. History of Discoveries and Inventions, and Influence of these.
11. History and Philosophy of Education.
12. Comparative Philology, including Philosophy of Language.
13. History of Philosophy and Philosophic Concepts.
14. Outlines of Psychology, including History of Psychological Theories.

It is obvious, I think, that any person pursuing such a curriculum as this would, at the end, have a fair conception of the process of the world he lives in and of his own place in it. He would, moreover, have his horizon greatly widened, his interests multiplied and deepened, and his life lifted above the narrow, sordid cares of the present. He would no longer be the victim of every social and political quack who had a nostrum to advertise. But, of course, it will be said that such a curriculum is far beyond the intellectual reach of the great body of wage-earners. To this I can only reply that, in my belief, based upon a pretty intimate acquaintance with the working classes, it is a profound mistake. Everything depends upon how knowledge is presented. If the above curriculum were presented in dry academic lectures, I admit that it could not be followed by many of the breadwinners; but that is the poorest way of presenting knowledge, and there is no necessity for so presenting it. As Froebel is never tired of telling us, all true education comes through self-activity. The teacher who does least himself, and makes his pupils do most, is the best teacher. Let an instructor take any one of the above subjects, say the

first, and let him, after a brief, simple, introductory talk, divide it into topics, or subjects for essays, assigning one of these to each of his pupils, and telling him where — in what books or museums — the necessary information may be found. Then, at future meetings, let the pupils read their essays, carefully corrected by the instructor, before the class, and the class freely discuss them, and it will be found that there is no lack of ability or interest among the breadwinners.[1] If the instructor have time — and why should he not? — he will do well to accompany his pupils to museums and galleries, and on excursions into city and country, that they may make acquaintance with facts and nature face to face.

The first essays of the breadwinners attempting to write on scientific subjects will, no doubt, in most cases, be crude and styleless, and their reading indistinct and hesitating; but these defects will soon pass away, and the sons of toil will have learned to write and read, in addition to the science acquired. What is more, they will have learned to take interest in books, in nature, and in social conditions.

The above curriculum, which would extend over three or four years, might be interspersed with other studies in particular departments of literature and science, care being taken that these entered into integral relations with the whole and contributed to a single world-view. Their place in the "Circle of the Sciences" should be clearly marked.

So much for the culture of the intellect.

[1] It is needless to say that, for their sake, all public libraries and museums should be open every evening and every holiday.

2. *The Affections.* How shall the affections of the breadwinners be elicited in such a way that they shall distribute their intensity in proportion to the true, spiritual worth of things? That is the all-important question; for, as the ancients[1] and Dante[2] saw clearly, all moral evil arises from a false distribution of the affections, all moral worth from a true distribution of them. The fact is, the affections or desires are the most fundamental part of us, more primitive than intellect and will; and so long as they are not right, nothing is right. "Out of the heart are the issues of life."

It is a well-known law that every faculty is developed through its proper object or "good," — sight by things visible, intelligence by things knowable, will by things doable, and so on. It follows that the affections are developed by things desirable or lovable, and that, if they are to be properly developed, things must be adhered to or appreciated by them in the order of their desirability, that is, their worth for moral life. The question is, How can this be accomplished? Nobility is more desirable than wealth: how can this be brought home to the affections? This is a very different question from, How can an intellectual apprehension or conviction of this be imparted? Intellectual convictions are feeble motives to action, compared with affections. A man who loves nobility will be far more noble than the man who knows that nobility is lovable. How then

[1] Æschylus attributes all wrongdoing to παρακοπά, false coinage, that is, the impressing of a false affectional stamp upon things. See the wonderful passage in "Agamemnon," 222–224, and cf. "Eumenides," 329.

[2] "Purgatory," XVII, 103 seq.

shall we make people love nobility more than wealth? The answer is, By presenting each in its complete reality. This may be done in various ways, — in the home, in the school, in the course of practical life, — but the most effective way is through art, whose function it is to present things in such a way as to reveal their true meaning or moral worth. Dante's "Hell" and "Purgatory," by showing the true nature of sin, make it very unlovable, while his "Paradise," by showing the true nature of righteousness, makes it most desirable. How we hate hypocrisy after reading "Measure for Measure"; reckless ambition, after reading "Macbeth"; indecision, after reading "Hamlet," and so on! Who can intelligently look at the Laocoön group without hating sensual vice; or at the Praxitelean Hermes without loving the spiritual sympathy that longs to educate?

The modern world has rarely realized the function of art, and hence an infinite amount of nonsense and sentimental twaddle has been spoken and written about it; but the ancients, especially the Greeks, were not so blind. Aristotle saw clearly that art addresses itself to the affections (*πάθη*, *παθήματα*) and is calculated to effect their purification,[1] that is, to free them from disorder, obtuseness, and exaggeration. His notions regarding the place of music in education are only now beginning to be appreciated. I may perhaps be allowed to quote here a few sentences from my book on Greek Education:

"On *Music*, as a branch of study, we have almost a disquisition from the pen of Aristotle. The question that first occupies him is, What is the use of music?

[1] *Περαίνουσα κάθαρσιν*, "Poetics," 6; 1449^{b} 27 seq.

Is it a recreation, an occupation for cultured leisure, or a gymnastic for the soul? It is all three, he replies, and would deserve study for the sake of any one of them. At the same time, its chief value in education lies in its third use. Music imparts a mental habit; about that there can be no doubt. For example, the Songs of Olympus 'render the soul enthusiastic, and enthusiasm is an affection of the soul's habit.'[1] Aristotle reasons in this way: Music is capable of affecting us with all kinds of pleasures and pains. But moral worth at bottom consists in finding pleasure in what is noble, and pain in what is ignoble, that is, in a correct distribution of affection. But in good music the strains that give pleasure are attached to the ideas that are noble, and the strains that give pain to the ideas that are ignoble; hence, by a natural association, the pleasures and pains which we find in the music attach themselves to the ideas which it accompanies. 'There is nothing that we ought to learn and practice so assiduously as the art of judging correctly and of taking delight in gentlemanly bearing and noble deeds. And, apart from the natural manifestations of the passions themselves, there is nothing in which we can find anger, gentleness, courage, self-control, and their opposites, as well as the other moods, so well represented as in rhythms and songs. This we all know by experience; for the moods of our souls change when we listen to such strains. But the practice which we thus receive from rhythms and songs, in rejoicing and suffering properly, brings us very near being affected in the same way by the

[1] "Politics," VIII, 5; 1340ª 10 seq.

realities themselves. . . . There is such an obvious difference between harmonies, that the listeners are affected in entirely different ways by them. By some they are thrown into a kind of mournful or grave mood, *e.g.*, by what is known as the mixed Lydian; by others a sentimental turn is given to their thoughts, for example, by languid harmonies; while there is another kind that especially produces balance of feeling and collectedness. This effect is confined to the Doric harmonies. The Phrygian harmonies rouse enthusiasm. These are correct results arrived at by those thinkers who have devoted their attention to this branch of education — results based on actual experience. What is true of harmonies is true also of rhythms.' "[1]

Let me parallel this by a few quotations from a living author:

"Music has its distinctive place in education, one which no other study can fill. The chief value of music to the child lies in the fact that it opens to him another avenue of expression, revealing to himself and to others new possibilities. The time-worn view which regarded music as an accomplishment only is fast disappearing, and the most progressive educators are beginning to realize the psychical value of music, and to recognize the vital relations it holds to general education.

"In every city throughout the land there are thousands upon thousands of children, woefully ignorant of the wealth and power of their own inner natures, whose dream of happiness is *to have* instead of *to be*. Each

[1] "Politics," VIII, 5; 1340[a] 16 seq. Davidson, "Aristotle," pp. 191 seq.

of these children has a heart-voice which, in its power of expression, may become beautiful beyond belief. . . .

"If, as many thinking men and women assert, modern life is fast becoming too material; if the hopes for the future are in the rising generation, that, in education, increased mental and physical activities may be allied to the higher life-qualities which make for character; and if, as herein suggested, this heart and soul life may be promoted (even in play conditions) by music and song, then indeed music's distinctive place in education is one of the highest distinction. . . .

"Let this series of circles represent the pupil . . . the outer division *his actions — what he does;* the middle one, *his mentality — what he thinks;* and the center *his being — what he is.*

"For many years school education was directed almost exclusively to the middle division, mentality. As a result of such teaching the child is able to plan, to calculate, to contrive, perhaps to scheme. Language is his to reveal himself, but it is also his for concealment.

"To be sure the principles of the kindergarten and the manual-training school have been widely adopted, and many of our pupils are taught *to do* as well as *to think*. In this way their mentality is channeled to the outer light of action — a very wholesome process.

"As yet, however, there has been little or nothing done for the center; that is, no direct action. This center is a very important part of the boy. In it, lying latent, are germs — flower germs and weed germs also — that you his parent and you his teacher are

ignorant of, as far as he is concerned, of which even he himself is unconscious; weed germs that, in the fullness of time and under the stimuli of some sudden temptations, may spring up and even challenge for control of him.

"Now there is . . . a distinct correspondence between the *inner* of music and the *inner* of the boy; between what are known as 'time-beats' in music and the boy's impulses. By cultivating this relationship to vital activity his impulses may be developed; more than this, they may be regulated — steadied if they are flighty, stimulated if they are stolid. . . .

"Song is the vocal utterance of the self, the inner, vital self, complete, individual, unique. . . . I am myself, unique. . . . This is our glory; it is also our responsibility. The utterance of this inner, vital self is song.

"And what is it all for? Not for self, but for others. . . . Music is the voice of love; but the love which music voices is not maudlin sentiment, nor gross desire, nor narrow attachment. . . .

"Art, like love, must be all embracing.

"A few supersensitives gathering themselves away from the common herd may ripen and rot in their selfish culture. This has been proved over and over again." [1]

Here are testimonies (and it would be easy to multiply them), from both the ancient world and the modern, to the power of music in regulating the affections. What is true of music is true of the other arts, in

[1] William L. Tomlins, "Music: Its Nature and Influence, The First of a Series of Lesson-talks on Music in its Relation to the Art of Living."

different degrees. Aristotle, in his "Poetics," has shown the power and function of tragedy, and testimony might be cited in favor of the rest. We all know to what extent modern life is influenced by literature, and especially by novels and stories which appeal to the affections. Indeed, literature, the most comprehensive of the arts, ought to be the great trainer of the affections, and would undoubtedly be such were it not so stupidly taught in our schools and colleges.[1] In brief, if, following Plato, we distinguish in the human soul a rational part and an irrational part, we may say that, while the former is educated by the sciences, the latter is trained by the fine arts.

But, after all, just as science is only distilled intellectual experience, so the fine arts are only distilled emotional or affectional experience. And just as there is, at the present day, a movement to limit book-science,

[1] Some years ago, the University of the State of New York published an Examination Bulletin on College-Entrance English, containing examination papers in English Literature from some thirty colleges and universities. A better display of all lack of sense of the meaning and purpose of literature it would not be easy to find. Here are the questions which one professor puts to his students on *The Merchant of Venice:* "a. Give the sources of the play. b. Give the plot of the play. c. Characterize Bassanio, Portia, and Shylock. d. What part does Launcelot take in the play? e. Describe the casket scene. f. What makes it comedy? g. Explain 'You stand within his danger, do you not?' 4: 1,180. Define the words 'argosy,' 'gaberdine,' 'pageant.'" One wonders how much training for the affections is implied in the knowledge necessary to answer these questions. And they are not worse than many others. Some professors show an ignorance of even elementary English. One asks his examinees to 'correct' 'That is the boy's fault, who is not at school to day.' Why not correct Shakespeare's 'Pour in sow's blood, that hath eaten her nine farrow'?

and to accord a considerable space in intellectual education to direct contact with nature, so the affectional culture derivable from the fine arts should be supplemented by emotional training through direct contact with the life of man. The students in the Bread-winners' Colleges, while emotionally realizing the works of Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe, Phidias, Praxiteles, Da Vinci, and the rest of the mighty, should be using the emotional culture thus gained to penetrate the life about them, its joys and sorrows, its loves and aspirations, and thus to enter into sympathetic, that is normal, relations with their fellow-men. And no one will have more ample opportunities for this than just these students. More than almost any one, they are brought face to face with "life's prime needs and agonies," and thus have a chance for a better education than any one else.[1] There is nothing that is more truly educative, nothing that better insures a correct distribution of the affections, than philanthropic work of the right sort, undertaken, not in a spirit of condescension or missionariness, but in simple loving-kindness, and reduced to a habit. The last clause deserves to be emphasized; for it should never be forgotten that in the training of the affections habit plays

[1] It need hardly be said that only those works of art and literature which are directly dictated by nature appeal to us deeply. Shakespeare and Burns are forever fresh; Milton and Pope, who drew their inspiration from classical literature, are already consigned to the museum of literary history. Human experience is the great art school. "We learn in suffering what we teach in song," said "L. E. L." It is perhaps the greatest drawback to wealth that it cuts its possessors off from the most educative experience.

a very important part. We love what we are familiar with, and what we can do easily.

3. *The Will.* When the body is strong and healthy, when the intelligence is carefully trained through study and contact with nature, and when the affections are distributed in accordance with the true worth of things, then there will be little need to worry over the training of the will. The will, indeed, is little more than the combined expression of the rational and irrational elements in the soul, in other words, the sum of the irrational impulses directed by rational insight. The breadwinner is a privileged being as far as will training is concerned; for his daily labor calls for almost continual exertion of will. If in the Breadwinners' Colleges there is to be a will trainer, his chief function will be to select and assign tasks suited to the intellectual and affectional status of his different pupils. Such tasks will be the more effective in proportion to the amount of patience and self-denial they call for; that is, in proportion as they induce the individual to prefer his all-inclusive, to his all-exclusive, self, and to sacrifice his fragmentary self of the moment to the fully organized self of his entire existence. To live for all men and for eternity is to live a divine life, here and now. So much for Culture and Culture Colleges. There is nothing in the smallest degree impractical in the scheme of Breadwinners' Colleges here proposed. Indeed, we see it in process of realization in France at the present moment. The infamy accruing to that country from the "Dreyfus case" roused three different classes of her people — Wealth, Wisdom, and Work — to ask themselves this

question: What must be the intellectual and moral condition of a nation in which such things can be done and brave publicity. And realizing at once its abjectness and danger, they united in an attempt to put an end to it by diffusing intellectual and moral culture among the great body of the people, that previously had been left in ignorance, or to the tender mercies of the daily newspaper and the priest. Thus have come into existence in a very brief space of time a large number of so-called "Popular Universities" (*Universités Populaires*). What the French have done we certainly can do, and ought to do. If their intellectual and moral condition is fraught with peril, ours is certainly not encouraging. Let us think but a moment of the condition of our chief city, governed by a ring of vulgar adventurers, whose sole aim, by their own confession, is to fill their own pockets; who protect and encourage the coarsest vices that they may fatten on the blackmail levied on their perpetrators; who bribe and are bribed; for whom evil is good and good evil! Where such things can boldly flaunt themselves, there is surely need for popular education. Realizing our disgraceful condition, our better men and women, from time to time, work themselves up into virtuous fury, and demand legislation and other external contrivances to put a stop to it, never realizing that it is impossible to obtain any better condition until the people are better, and that they will not be better until they are better educated. They try everything but the one thing that has any prospect of being effectual. As the people are, so are their rulers. And what sort of rulers are people likely

to choose, a large number of whom live in squalor and poverty, condemned to a mean, beggarly world, occupied with sordid material interests, unillumined by science, art, philosophy, or history? We have but to look and see. Surely, then, it is time for the three classes of the people to unite to found Breadwinners' Colleges.

b. Professional Training

Thus far I have spoken of Culture, which opens up to the worker a noble world, invites him to come in, and renders him capable in body and soul of enjoying it and mingling with the best. It is the glory of our nation that no door leading to anything desirable is closed against the man of culture, be he Jew or Gentile, rich or poor. But on this earth of ours we need not only culture in order to live a normal human life, but also the means of living. We need the former in order to live well, the latter in order to live at all. The higher laws and needs of our being do not abrogate the lower; they come not to destroy but to fulfill. Culture will make good men and women, good sons and daughters, good husbands and wives, good fathers and mothers, good neighbors and citizens, and so on; but it does not make good mechanics, merchants, bankers, physicians, lawyers, teachers, or artists. For these and many other professions, none of which are essential to us as human beings or citizens, there is needed a special training. Much of this may be, and is, imparted in the actual practice of the different industries; but there is much that cannot be so imparted, and demands special

institutions. These are at present demanded for another reason, which cannot but be deplored. The labor unions do their best to prevent apprentices from learning the different trades. In a special report on "Education in the Industrial and Fine Arts in the United States," issued by the United States Bureau of Education in 1892, we read: "The 'Unions' welcome foreign born and bred artisans, but throw every obstacle in the way of training American youths to become skilled artisans. By this policy they force upon the attention of educators and legislators evidences of the pressing need that exists for devising some practical methods whereby the rising generation may have the opportunity hitherto denied them of acquiring definite technical training in skilled industries." [1]

The need of special training schools for the "liberal professions" is universally recognized; but there is no reason why these should be regarded as exceptional among so many.[2] So true is this that, of late years, there have arisen, in considerable numbers, polytechnic

[1] P. 68. In a footnote on p. 67 is the following quotation from the *Washington Post:* "It is rather hard on the average apprentice in this free country that he cannot even begin to learn a trade without all the employees in the shop striking. This is what happened a few days ago at the glass works at Sandwich, Massachusetts. An apprentice was engaged in the cutting department, when the workmen felt aggrieved and walked out. This is both absurd and cruel. An apprentice should be made welcome, and helped to learn his trade as soon as possible. There is no other sensible course to pursue. And as many workingmen persist in denying apprentices a chance to learn a trade, public schools must be established where they can be taught free and unmolested."

[2] In London, England, "there are upward of four thousand separate industries."

institutions and technical schools, offering to certain other professions the needed instruction. According to the Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1896–1897 there were at that time forty-eight such institutions in this country. In addition to this, the majority of colleges and universities give instruction in some of the following subjects: Agriculture, Architecture, Civil Engineering, Sanitary Engineering, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Veterinary Medicine, Pedagogy, Domestic Science, Military Science, Music, Art, Commerce. All this fails to help the great body of the wage-earners; but something has been done for them also. On p. 2279 of the Report just referred to, we read: "In 1896 manual training was an essential feature in the public-school course of ninety-five cities. In 359 institutions other than city schools there is training which belongs in a general way to the same movement. These institutions embrace almost every class known to American education, and the manual features vary from the purely educational manual training of the Teachers' College in New York City to the direct trade instruction of the apprentice schools." The number of "manual and industrial training schools," at the time mentioned, was ninety-nine. It is unfortunate that in this Report no clear distinction is drawn between manual and industrial training, so that we hardly know how many industrial schools exist. But even if their number were greater than it is, they would not meet the needs of the great body of the workers. They are open only during the day, and are attended only by persons who are not engaged in breadwinning. And this brings us to

3. *The higher education in this country is not given under such circumstances that all can take advantage of it.* Nearly all of its institutions — colleges, universities, polytechnic institutes, technical and industrial schools — are closed against the breadwinners, because they are occupied with their work during the day, the only time when these institutions are open. *What the breadwinners need is evening colleges and evening polytechneums.* The feasibility of evening colleges may be seen in the work of the London Polytechnic, of the London Working Men's College, and of many similar institutions in Great Britain — "Mechanics' Institutes" and the like. That evening polytechneums are equally within the limits of possibility, and may even be a great success, is shown by the fact that they are a success in London and elsewhere. It is needless to dwell at great length on this subject, the facts of it, and the way out are so evident. They were known even to Luther, who says: "My opinion is that we must send boys to school one or two hours a day, and have them learn a trade at home the rest of the time. It is desirable that these two occupations go side by side." At present it is clear that the "one or two hours" must be in the evening.

Such are a few suggestions toward a solution of the chief educational problem which the nineteenth century hands over to the twentieth. There is little time left for the consideration of minor problems, such as the training of efficient teachers for all grades of education;[1]

[1] See an admirable article on "School Reform" by Professor Münsterberg in *The Atlantic Monthly* for May, 1900.

the arrangements and coördination of studies in view of different ends; the unifying of the whole course of study from the kindergarten up to the university; the establishment of a National University to give tone and direction to the whole national system of education, etc. The one problem which above all others cries aloud for solution, and which it will be one of the chief tasks of the twentieth century to solve, is the higher education of the breadwinners. This education is absolutely necessary not only for the well-being of the breadwinners themselves, but for the safety of our whole nation and its democratic institutions. A democracy cannot long be sustained by an ignorant demos. This, indeed, is already becoming manifest. Our labor unions have already interfered with the liberty not only of employers and of the public generally, but also, and still more, of the individual workman. Tyranny, socialism, and violent anarchism, with their glittering utopias, are finding adherents among the workingmen. The political boss, with his lying promises and his filthy bribes, finds many of them an easy prey. All these things are fraught with serious dangers to liberty, and they are all due to want of intellectual and moral education. On the other hand, it is to the want of technical training that is due the fact that a very large number of our people are unable by their labor to give to society an equivalent for a decent livelihood, and therefore live in poverty and squalor, which are always powerful incentives to vice, crime, and rebellion. To the lack of the two kinds of education combined is due, in a word, all that we deplore and all that we fear in the condition of the breadwinners.

And for this condition we are all responsible. We leave a large number of them without intellectual and moral culture, and then we despise them because they are ignorant and vicious. We do nothing to refine their manners, and then we complain because they are boorish or brutal. We do not train them in the principles of political economy or sociology, and then we wonder why they become socialists, anarchists, or nihilists. We leave them unacquainted with their political privileges and duties, and then we are indignant because they sell their votes for a glass of whisky. We consign them to dark, cheerless, comfortless homes, and then we berate them because they take refuge in the gilded saloon. We give them no opportunity for the spiritual delights that come from the arts and sciences, and then we scorn them because they seek satisfaction in rum drinking and the other sensual delights of the dive. To offset the saloon, the dive, and the pool room, we open quiet reading-rooms and chaperoned recreation-rooms, and we wonder that they are not attractive to people who have never learned to take delight in reading or in quiet recreation. All these failures and wonderments on our part leave them in a deplorable condition, and build up between us and them a wall of alienation and misunderstanding that not only suggests a "war of classes" in the future, but is narrowing and blinding to both classes now. The rich and the learned are poorer and meaner because they cannot enter into brotherly and sisterly relations with the toilers; and these suffer equally because they are sundered from those. Nothing can bring about that sympathy of classes which is so

essential to a democracy and so beneficial to all classes but the universal diffusion of culture. The true rivals to the saloon, the dive, and the pool room are the Bread-winners' College and Polytechneum, with their lectures, their classes, their exhibitions, and their practical work.

There is money enough and talent enough in this city of New York to give a higher education to all the people if they would but demand it. If but half the money that is spent in preaching old fables, and obsolete, semi-barbarous moralities were devoted to the truly religious purpose of developing the bodies and enlightening the souls of them that sit in darkness, we should soon have a different world about us. To-day we need something very different from, and more effective than, the weekly sermon and the catechism. And, above all, we need to learn that the simple doing of our duty in all the relations of life is the only worthy religion. In that religion there are no sects; there is neither Jew nor Gentile.

Let us all hope that ere the twentieth century reaches its majority there will be in every city ward and in every country township a People's University, consisting of a College for physical, intellectual, and moral culture and a Polytechneum for professional training. So only will it be well with us and our country.

CHAPTER IV

THE HISTORY OF THE EXPERIMENT

In the summer of 1898 I was asked by the director of the New York People's Institute to give four lectures in the course of the following winter before an audience assembling in the large hall of the Cooper Institute — an audience composed chiefly of working men and women. I agreed to do so, on condition that the lectures should be given before the New Year, as I did not expect to be able to give them later. There seemed, at first, to be no obstacle to this arrangement; but, later, the director wrote to me saying that he found it impossible to fix dates for my lectures before the New Year. I replied then that I must decline to give them. He then wrote to me, asking whether, if the question of dates could be satisfactorily met, I would be willing to give them elsewhere than in the Cooper Institute. I answered that I had no preference in the matter of location. Thereupon it was arranged that I should give my lectures on four Wednesday evenings in December, in the auditorium of the Educational Alliance, a large Hebrew institute on the lower East Side of the city — an institution attended chiefly by Russian, Polish, and Hungarian Jews. I was warned that I should find there a very critical audience, made up largely of socialists of the Marxian type, anarchists, single-taxists, and the like, who, at the close of

each lecture, would subject me to a rigorous examination, and try to draw me into a dispute.

Being naturally averse to wrangling, and having been thus forewarned, I thought it would be wise to avoid disputable assertions in my lectures, and confine myself, as far as possible, to the statement of questions and problems. I therefore chose as my subject "The Problems which the Nineteenth Century hands over, for Solution, to the Twentieth." I flattered myself that I ought to be able, with such a subject, to impart a certain amount of classified knowledge, arouse some thought, and yet remain as innocently and impregnably ignorant as Socrates. I resolved to devote my first lecture to a consideration of the social conditions that mark the close of the nineteenth century; my second, to the economic and political problems rising out of these; my third, to the educational problems; and my fourth, to the religious and philosophic problems.

When my subject was announced, several of my wise friends thought it their duty to reason with me on the obvious folly of treating such questions before such an audience. "You don't mean," they said, "to talk philosophically before a lot of people from the sweat-shops, most of whom have but recently arrived in the country, and hardly understand English. What they want is a course of lectures, profusely illustrated with stereopticon, on Dewey's victory at Manila, the sinking of the *Maine*, the charge of the rough riders at Santiago de Cuba, the destruction of Cervera's squadron, or else on the Yosemite Valley, the Falls of Niagara, or the big trees of California. These are the things they care for and can appreciate."

"The trouble about that," I replied, "is that I don't know anything about the subjects you suggest, except what I read in the newspapers and magazines, which are as accessible to my prospective audience as they are to me. Some of them, I understand, are keepers of news-stands. I don't wish to do at second hand the work of the periodical press. I must deal with the things that I know something about, and I prefer to deal with such as impart instruction rather than amusement. I am not a very good instructor; but I should be altogether a failure as a master of amusements. As to talking philosophically, I am afraid I don't know when I do that; but I shall try to impart to them the highest truth I know in the simplest terms I can find." "But you don't expect," urged my friends, "that an audience of foreign work-people will be interested in the questions you propose to talk about." "That I do expect," I said; "I have had some acquaintance with work-people in more countries than one, and I have always found them as intelligent with regard to all vital questions as anybody. They are less sophisticated and prejudiced than most people, and respond more heartily to the truth. Besides, the reason why I was asked to give this series of lectures is that, in spite of all prophecies to the contrary, I managed last winter to interest a large popular audience at the Cooper Institute when I talked on 'Greek Democracies,' a pretty remote subject. During the hour and a half which my lecture occupied, no one scraped, hissed, whistled, or went out." At this my friends left me alone, not knowing, apparently, which to admire more, my vanity or my folly.

On the occasion of my first lecture, the director of the People's Institute, in introducing me to the audience, kindly endeavored to secure me their interest and attention by telling them that I was the originator of the Fabian Society[1]; that I had never, in my life, received a penny of profit, interest, or economic rent; and that I had taken the stump for Henry George on the occasion of his first candidature for the mayoralty of New York. The director's endeavor was successful, but it placed me in a somewhat false position. My audience concluded that I was a socialist, that I was a foe to interest and profit, and that I was a single-taxist, — all of which was incorrect. I had to explain that I was too much of an anarchist to be a socialist and too much of a socialist to be an anarchist; that my practice in regard to profit, interest, and rent was purely a private matter; and that my support of Henry George was due to my admiration for the man's sterling character, and not to his advocacy of the single tax. The fact that they now did not know what I was, made them curious to find out, and still further secured me attention.

Being still afraid of an audience reputed to be so critical, I took care, before opening my lecture, to say that I had not come to teach them anything, or to solve any problems, but merely to enumerate, classify, and explain the problems which it would be the task of the coming century to solve; that, if I had the solution of any of them in my pocket, it would be wicked of me to allow them to pass on unsolved to a new age. A friend

[1] This is not true in the sense that I am responsible for its principles.

afterward remarked that I spiked all their guns before I began; and that was just what I meant to do.

But, for all that, I did not escape questioning. The lecture, given before an audience of about two hundred and fifty persons of foreign aspect, — nearly all Jews, as I afterward learned, — lasted about an hour and a half, and went off quietly. Then followed a shower of questions, all serious and all perfectly good-natured, to which I replied as best I could, sometimes openly avowing my ignorance, which indeed was no matter of mere strategy. But how glad I was that I had made no dogmatic statements! If I had, I should have been ground to powder. Before we broke up, I had learned that my audience, though, indeed, critical, was completely serious and deserved to be treated with the utmost consideration; and that, if some of its members had allowed themselves to be carried away by specious theories and sentimental appeals to self-pity, they had done so in perfect good faith. I saw clearly that they cared for truth above all things, and that, while they would treat with scorn any one who came to them with an air of authority, they would take to their hearts any one who came to help them to discover truth by which they might live. My first lecture had been given from notes, and was somewhat incoherent. I resolved to write the others out at full length, and I did. I was sorry, too, that my wise friends had not been present. They would have learned something.

My second lecture, though treating of subjects about which there was the greatest difference of opinion among my audience, went off quietly. Questions were numerous,

as before; but there was no caviling and no speech-making. My third lecture, as I could easily see during its delivery, carried my audience, which had now more than doubled, with it, and it was applauded at the end. Then followed questions more numerous and eager than before. In the midst of these, a young man stood up and said something like this: "It is all very well to talk about education for the breadwinners; but how can people like us, who work nine or ten, and sometimes more, hours a day, who come home tired, who have no convenience there for study, few books, and no one to guide or instruct us, obtain any liberal education?" The question was greeted with applause, which I took to mean that it was asked by the whole audience. And I felt that, of all questions, it was the one best deserving to be asked there and then. Feeling that I was ready with no answer to it, in an unguarded moment (or shall I say a moment of inspiration?), I replied: "That is just the chief educational problem which the nineteenth century hands over to the twentieth. Of course you do not expect me to solve it. But one thing I can do for you of a practical sort. I cannot procure for you shorter hours, or make you less tired at night; I cannot supply you with home conveniences for study or with books; but one thing I can and will do, if you care to have me. If you will organize a club of people who are really in earnest, and who will work with all their might, I will devote one evening a week to it." "That's talking," some one said, and then came a storm of applause.

When the questions were concluded, a number of the young people came upon the stage, eagerly asking if

I really meant to take charge of a club, and expressing their desire to belong to it if I did. I assured them that I should keep my promise to the letter. Then the superintendent of the Educational Alliance, coming forward, said: "If you will lead a club, we will give you a room." "That's all we need," I replied; and, turning to the young people, I said: "Now we have everything — pupils, class room, teacher. When shall we begin? What evening is most convenient for you?" "Saturday," was the reply. "Since next Saturday is Christmas Eve, and the following New Year's Eve, we had better avoid these and begin on the 7th of January," I said. This seemed to please everybody, and so we parted.

My fourth lecture was attended by over six hundred persons, and roused no opposition, though it was unsparingly radical.

Before the 7th of January came I had another visitation from some of my wise friends, whose mission in life seemed to be to scare others from doing whatever they didn't do themselves. This time, however, I was ready for them. I knew the elements that would compose my class. "Do you know what you have undertaken?" asked my friends. "Yes," said I. "Then you know that down there they are mostly socialists, anarchists and nihilists?" "Yes," said I, "and that's just what makes them interesting. One good thing about such people is that they generally have done some thinking on their own account, and that is the very best of all preparations for serious study." "But," persisted my friends, "you will never be able to preserve

order among them. They will orate, and dispute, and 'claim,' and make motions, and you will never be able to get down to serious work." "They will do nothing of the sort, more than one evening," said I, "and we shall get down to work almost from the first." "Well! well!" said my friends, and gave me up as a hopeless case.

Meanwhile, I was investigating the conditions and needs of the members of my prospective class, and trying to lay out work for them. I found that they ranged all the way from the news-stands and sweat-shops to the City College, the Normal School, and Columbia University, and that their needs were as different as their conditions. It was obviously difficult to find work in which all the members of such a class could share with profit; but it did not seem impossible, since they were all interested, in more or less intelligent ways, in History and Sociology. "My first object, therefore, in taking up the class, was to induce its members to study and think out carefully the great problems of Sociology and Culture, in accordance with the historic method, and so to impart to their minds a healthy attitude toward society, to do away with the vengeful sense of personal or class wrong, and to arouse faith in individual effort and manly and womanly self-dependence. I desired, moreover, to give them such an outlook upon life as would lift their lives out of narrowness and sordidness, and give them ideal aims. Finally, I wished to train them in the use of correct English, both written and spoken."[1]

[1] Quoted from my report to the Trustees of the Educational Alliance.

With a view to these things, I resolved, after gaining the confidence of my class, to make *them* do as much of the work as possible, while I confined my efforts to imparting impetus and direction. Further, I resolved to divide the work into two parts, devoting an hour at every meeting to each.

The *First Part*, by means of which I hoped, gradually and imperceptibly, to build up in the minds of my pupils a panorama of social evolution in all its phases, intellectual, moral, religious, political, economical, artistic, literary, consisted of essays, maps, and recitations. It would have seemed to an outsider rather miscellaneous and unsystematic; but there was method in it. It stood as follows:

I. *Biographies:* (1) Aristotle; (2) Bacon; (3) Kant; (4) Herder; (5) Goethe; (6) Mirabeau; (7) Fr. Lieber; (8) Emerson; (9) Tennyson; (10) George Eliot.

II. *Definitions:* (1) Society, People, Nation; (2) Sociology; (3) Socialism; (4) Institution; (5) Person and Individual; (6) Duty; (7) Religion; (8) Nature; (9) Progress and Evolution; (10) Science.

III. *Maps:* (1) Egypt; (2) Babylonia; (3) Assyria; (4) Persia; (5) Palestine; (6) Greece; (7) Italy; (8) Phœnicia; (9) Macedonian Empire; (10) Roman Empire.

IV. *Races, Epochs, and World Religions:* (1) Turanians; (2) Semites; (3) Aryans; (4) Savagery; (5) Barbarism; (6) Civicism; (7) Humanism; (8) Buddhism; (9) Christianity; (10) Islam.

V. *Recitations:* (1) Portia's Eulogy of Mercy, from "The Merchant of Venice"; (2) "Love thou thy Land" (Tennyson); (3) (4) (5) "In Memoriam," CXVIII, CXX, CXXVIII (*id.*); (6) "Is it come?" (Frances Browne); (7) Psalm XIX; (8) "The Present Crisis" (Lowell); (9) "A Psalm of Life" (Longfellow); (10) "Days" (Emerson).

Here were five headings, with ten subjects under each, making in all fifty subjects, calling for home work on the part of the pupils. Together they seemed to offer a sort of bird's-eye view of the scene and course of human evolution, including some of its most efficient agents and concepts. The Biographies, the Definitions, the Races, Epochs, and World Religions were to be treated in essays of about two hundred and fifty words each. The Biographies were those of philosophers, poets, and statesmen mentioned in the early pages of Henderson's "Social Elements."[1] The Definitions were those of terms frequently used in dispute by young people without being understood, hence causing endless confusion. The Races, Epochs, and World Religions seemed to cover the chief facts in the world's history. The Maps, together, included the whole ancient world, while the Recitations were calculated to rouse an interest in social life, its virtues, hopes, and fears. I hoped that, when the fifty subjects were pieced together, there would result a kind of unitary world in which the young people would feel at home, and a kind of drama in which they would not only feel interested, but also recognize their own places and rôles. I hoped, too, that thus they would come to see the burning social and economic questions of the present day from a point of view which would enable them to see these justly, and in their true proportions, to escape being the victims of crude social and economic theories, and to recognize the grandeur of the institutions under which they live.

[1] See below, p. 106.

The *Second Part*, through which I hoped to satisfy the desire, evinced by so many of the young people, to discuss social problems, took for its basis a single book, Henderson's "Social Elements," which I hoped to have discussed chapter by chapter. The book was well adapted for our purpose, offering a comprehensive view of the whole field of sociology, and treating every part with simplicity and good judgment. Taking account of these two parts, I called the class *A Class in History and Sociology.*

When the class met for the first time, on the 7th of January, 1899, I showed that I had made careful preparation for it, and this at once produced an excellent effect. There were fifty-six persons present, of ages ranging, as afterward appeared, from sixteen to fifty-eight. Only a small proportion were girls. I began work by distributing slips of paper and asking each person present to write down (1) his or her full name; (2) age; (3) native country; (4) present residence; (5) occupation; (6) number of hours employed daily; (7) object in joining the class. When the slips were all collected, I began to lay out the work. After distributing the fifty subjects of the first part among as many volunteers, and explaining how I wished them to be treated and at what length, I passed on to the second, and told them that the purpose of it was to give them such a view of the evolution of social institutions as would enable them, in the end, to form a correct judgment regarding the value of such schemes as socialism, anarchism, single-taxism, and the like. "At present," I said, "the most of you are as unfit to deal with these

subjects as a man who has just learned the multiplication table is to deal with analytic geometry or quaternions. If, after a careful study of the history of human society in all its phases, you still remain socialists or anarchists, I shall, of course, have nothing to say except that you now hold as science what you formerly held as mere prejudice resting on ignorance or sentiment. It will be a very freeing and widening experience for you, whatever conclusion you may reach, to be able to view the problems of the present from the standpoint of universal history, and so to see just how things have come to be as they are. Most of our utopian schemes, upon which so many generous spirits waste their energies, are children of ignorance and misplaced pity. What we need is a scheme that shall rest upon a broad basis of historic science and human psychology. You need to study before you begin to dispute; and perhaps when you have studied you will find little room or desire for dispute. Indeed, disputation usually aims at victory rather than truth." I then went on to reassure them that I had no intention of teaching them anything, my aim being merely to direct them to the sources of truth and in the methods of correct thinking. The teaching they would have to do themselves. When we parted at ten o'clock I flattered myself that I had placed the main occasions for dispute at a safe distance, and that perhaps they would never be reached. And they haven't yet.

When I reached home I examined the slips that had been handed in, and was almost discouraged when I saw of what heterogeneous elements my class was composed. The handwritings were almost uniformly bad. One

thing, however, gave me hope. There was evidently but one motive for joining the class, and that was a burning desire for knowledge. Given that, I felt I could go on. "My first part," I said, "contains something for everybody."

The following Saturday the class met again with increased numbers. The proportion of girls was visibly greater than before. A number of essays were handed in; but, as I had no opportunity to examine and correct them, none of them were read. We began work with a couple of recitations: (1) Emerson's "Days," (2) Portia's Eulogy of Mercy, from "The Merchant of Venice." Both were fairly well given, the latter with a very foreign accent. Discussion followed in each case. The meaning of the former piece, whose imagery was dwelt upon, was shown to be this: that every day is a manifold opportunity which may be either seized and used to scale the highest heaven, or wasted for the sake of "a few herbs and apples" — just as each one pleases. I could see that this made a deep impression, and it gave no cause for dispute. It was otherwise with the second piece. When the relation of mercy to justice came up, several young men rose and made speeches in true debating-society fashion. I made no objection, but took notes as they proceeded. When they sat down, they found to their surprise that, instead of being answered, they were going to have to explain their speeches. Such an experience was new, but they faced it bravely. "Just what do you mean by 'justice,' about which you have spoken so eloquently?" I began. Not only the speechmakers,

but several others, in turn, tried their hands at definitions, each beginning with "I claim." All of these I treated in Socratic fashion, adducing instances that came under the respective definitions, but were not covered by them, and asking if they were just. As they plainly were not, it soon became clear to every one present that the speechmakers had been talking copiously about things they did not understand. I never had to listen after that to a speech, and I never again heard "I claim." The class had learned one lesson, at any rate, — a lesson in caution. I learned afterward that several socialists, who had come with the intention of proving that socialism was a synonym for justice, were discouraged and postponed their exhibition. So passed the first hour without a jar, and in the most good-natured way. In the second hour, we took up the Introduction to Henderson's "Social Elements," which deals with "The Basis of Society in Nature." I began by asking, "What do you mean by 'nature'?" Everybody thought he knew that, and many attempted definitions. These differed widely from each other, and the result was a general feeling of uncertainty and ignorance. I then asked, "Who will write a paper on 'Nature' for next week?" Two young men volunteered, and the matter dropped for the time. We then took up the notion of history, and, from the various definitions, brought out the facts that there are several kinds of history, and that, in modern times, history tends to be less and less a genealogy of kings and a record of wars, and more and more an account of the life and culture of the people. Several histories were cited

as evidence of this. In such discussions the second hour passed to the evident delight of everybody. My difficulties were over.

The third, fourth, and fifth Saturdays I was absent from the class on account of severe illness, and my place was taken by two good friends. When I returned to it, I found the interest undiminished.

I cannot continue the history of the class in detail. It steadily increased in numbers, and advanced in quality of work. We soon needed two rooms instead of one. Essays, biographies, detailed definitions, and epitomes of important books were written, read, and discussed in the kindliest spirit; poems were recited; maps, some of them very good, were brought in. I carefully corrected, down even to the commas, all the written compositions before they were read. During their reading, I took note of all false pronunciations and emphases, and, at the close, pointed them out. The epitomes of books proved extremely valuable. Many of them, such as that of Max Müller's first series of "Lectures on the Science of Language," were admirably done, and contributed to open up wide and comprehensive views, and to make the phenomena of culture fall into surveyable groups. But what excited most interest and discussion were the definitions, especially when they were felt to be needed to clear up a certain point. One young man having declared, with evident self-satisfaction, and some applause from the class, that he was a materialist, I said, "So am I — a materialist of the worst kind. Of course, you know what you mean by 'materialist'; suppose you tell us." The answer involved the terms "force" and

"matter." Then I called for a definition of the latter. As I expected, everybody was ready with one. Matter! — of course, everybody knows what matter is. But, at the end of some twenty minutes, it was evident to all that nobody knew. This was, plainly, a surprise. The young people moved about uneasily, as if to shake a definition out of their heads; but none would come. I must say, I enjoyed their surprise and defeat. After a little I began to ask them what they knew about matter. "Matter," I said, "means to you just what you know about it," which was self-evident. "Well, I know it's hard," said one. "Yes," I replied; "but when is it hard? Is it hard when you are not touching it?" There was a moment of silence and reflection, and then a general agreement that it was hard only when somebody was touching it. "So hardness," I said, "implies a toucher, somebody to feel it?" A general "Yes" came rather slowly and reluctantly, but inevitably. There is no need to repeat the whole conversation. It soon became evident that everything which anybody knew about matter involved a sentient, and even an intelligent, mind. Thus, in about half an hour, by means of simple questions, and without any assertion on my part, I brought the class to what may be called the idealistic view of the world. From that day to this no member has again boasted of being a materialist, and to-day every one knows that any world that anybody can intelligently talk about is a mental construction. Such conversations made a deep and lasting impression, opening up a new world and banishing many hobgoblins from the mind.

The class met once a week for four months, and did a great deal of good work. To a casual visitor this might have seemed chaotic, but it was not. During the whole time, though young men and women sat mixed up together, the behavior was exemplary. I never had to utter a word of reproof or caution. On the contrary, their whole attitude was a continual inspiration to me, and made me feel that I got more than I gave. During the latter part of the time, many of them visited me at my rooms, giving me an opportunity to become acquainted with their characters, conditions, and aspirations. Thus there grew up between us a friendship of the most delightful sort. At our last regular meeting ninety-eight persons were present. At the very end, before I left for the country, they gave me a delightful "send-off," in the form of a reception, at which they presented me with a lantern for the woods, and an album with their names and expressions of the most kindly feeling. On that occasion I made a short address, encouraging them to continue their meetings during the summer, to write essays and epitomes, and after sending them to me for criticism and correction, to read and discuss them. I promised to write them a weekly letter, if they would keep me informed of all that took place at their meetings, which they agreed to do.

They kept their word royally. Throughout the entire summer, notwithstanding the frequent heat, they held their meetings every Saturday evening, and reported their work to me. They likewise sent me their essays and epitomes, which I corrected and returned. I need

not say that I never neglected my weekly letter.[1] The subjects of their essays were drawn from Martineau's "Types of Ethical Theory," and Freeman's "Comparative Politics," which I had recommended to them. The epitomes covered a wide range of reading. One young man, a bookkeeper, sent me the epitomes of Darwin's "Origin of Species" and "Descent of Man," Drummond's "Ascent of Man," and Max Müller's "Lectures on the Science of Language" (First Series), all most carefully and intelligently done. I must plead guilty to having felt a certain amount of pride when I found that the class could go on without me, — that I had rendered myself practically superfluous. Besides my correspondence with the class as a whole, numerous letters passed between me and individual members of it. I was consulted about all sorts of things, — about the duty of friend to friend, about the expediency of marrying, about how to get a college education, about immortality, etc. The question most frequently put to me, and the one which I felt least able to answer, took this form: "How shall we, who have outgrown orthodox Judaism, deal with our orthodox parents, who insist upon our observing all the laws and ceremonies of their faith? Shall we openly disobey or be hypocrites?" Several added that, if they disobeyed, their parents would disown them, and cast them out of the family;[2] and one young man sent me, in the form of an essay, a passionate

[1] These letters were manifolded and distributed among the members of the class by one of themselves. I am frequently reminded of statements I made in them. [They will be found below, Chapter V.]

[2] I have been told of several cases in which this was actually done.

appeal to parents not to force their children to be hypocrites or liars. In reply, I generally impressed upon the writers that the law of love has claims, as well as the law of truth; that, while hypocrisy and lying are forever forbidden, they should deal very tenderly with their parents, and try to avoid bringing matters to open conflict; that, if they believed their faith to be superior to that of their parents, they should show this, not in words or boastings, but in superior conduct and increased thoughtfulness. I sometimes added that they ought to devote themselves to the study of ancient Jewish literature, especially of the prophets and psalmists, about whom I found they knew very little.

In the course of the summer, several members of the class visited me in my mountain home, and proved very delightful company. I learned a great deal about their characters, conditions, needs, and aspirations. In view of these, I tried to devise a scheme of work for the coming winter. The Educational Alliance, having come into possession of the Hebrew Free School Building on East Fifth Street, agreed to give me the use of it for five evenings every week. I resolved to utilize its nine rooms for such classes as might seem most necessary and for which I could find suitable teachers. I made up my mind to take Goethe's "Faust" as the basis of my own immediate work, and wrote to the class to make preparation for that.

During an illness which confined me to bed for several weeks in New York in September and October, members of the class visited me every day, sometimes walking a distance of five miles in order to do so. No

sons or daughters could have been more loyal. When, toward the end of October, I was able to return to the class, it gave me a royal reception, and insisted upon celebrating my birthday, which it did in the most delightful way, presenting me at the close with a laurel crown! On that occasion I learned, to my surprise and great joy, that, during my absence, its membership had increased to about a hundred and fifty.

We resumed work in November with eight classes in place of one. We had classes in Latin and Greek, taught by a distinguished Harvard graduate; classes in Algebra, Geometry, and Universal History, taught by a very gifted member of my class, one who had spent the summer with me; a class in Comparative Religion, taught by the superintendent of the Alliance; a class in Natural Science, taught by an able young physician; and, finally, my own class in "Faust." Each class met once a week. Later in the winter other classes were opened. Many of the young people being foreign born, and having resided in this country but a few years, spoke English imperfectly, with incorrect pronunciation and emphasis. In order to remedy these defects, which stood in their way, I raised a small sum of money and, therewith, engaged the services of a first-class reader and elocutionist, who gave to five of them twelve lessons in voice culture and reading. Two others joined the class, paying their own fees. It was agreed that, at the close of the course, they should all open classes, and teach what they had learned to their fellows. This they faithfully did, so that during the latter part of the winter we had seven classes in elocution with an aggregate

attendance of about fifty. At the same time, classes in stenography, freehand drawing, and higher mathematics were opened by members of the original class. The attendance at some of these classes was small; but every one of them was useful, meeting a practical need. Early in February, at the urgent request of about a score of young men, mostly students attending the City College, I opened a class in the History of Philosophy, which met on Sundays[1] from 11 A.M. to 1 P.M. In course of time, this was joined by a number of young men and women, not college students.

As I am but imperfectly acquainted with what went on in the other classes, I shall speak only of my own two.

In opening the "Faust" class, I gave a short address, pointing out, in a general way, the plan of the poem, its historic and philosophic import, and its relation to the other great religious poems of the world, — "Job," the "Oresteia," and the "Divine Comedy." Further, I gave notice that we should give one hour each evening to reading and expounding the poem in detail, and the other to the reading and discussion of essays on subjects connected with it. I then called for volunteers for a large number of essays, — essays on the life of Goethe, the historical Faust, the legendary Faust, Marlowe's "Dr. Faustus," the history of the blood-pact with the devil, the origin of the name Mephistopheles, the character of mediæval culture, the Renaissance, the Reformation, Religion, Culture versus Religion, the great thinkers (Jewish, Christian, and Muslim) of the Middle

[1] It must be remembered that my pupils were mostly Jews, and that, as Hegel said, *Denken ist auch Gottesdienst.*

Age, Goethe's theory of art as expressed in the first prologue to "Faust," Aristotle's theory of art as set forth in his "Poetics," etc. All these subjects and many more found candidates, and all were actually treated. Many subjects were also given out later.

It is needless to say that I do not remember distinctly all the essays, though I read and corrected every one of them, and afterward heard them read; but a few of them were so good that they made a deep impression on me. Such were the essays on Aristotle's Poetics, the Renaissance, Religion, Culture, and Averroës. The first of these, written by a young woman from southern Russia, who makes her living with her scissors and needle, was admirable and occupied us, in the most profitable way, four or five evenings. At the end, we had reached some pretty definite views as to the meaning and purpose of art and literature. The essay on the Renaissance, by a student of architecture, was a most comprehensive presentation of the whole subject. That on Religion, by a clerk in a hat factory, was full of earnestness and showed that the author had grasped the heart of the matter. I am inclined to believe that the writing of that essay, involving, as it did, considerable reading, made an epoch in his life.

In expounding the text of "Faust," I had five aims in view: (1) to cultivate in the class a taste for true poetry; (2) to show how a great work of literary art should be studied so that its informing idea might be seen in all its ramifications; (3) to bring out clearly the central idea, or problem, of "Faust," viz., the transition of the human mind from supernaturalism, faith, and authority,

embodied in the institutions of the Middle Age, to naturalism, science, and freedom, which are struggling for embodiment in those of the present; (4) to conjure up gradually a picture of mediæval life, as contrasted with modern, and to emphasize the distinction between the ethics of authority and the ethics of freedom; (5) to help the young people, who, amid many difficulties and misgivings, are crossing the desert from the Egypt of spiritual bondage to the Promised Land of freedom, to find their way, and to settle down to a worthy life after their arrival. I paid but little attention to the grammatical side of the work; but I found many opportunities of showing that Goethe had sounded the deepest intellectual and moral problems of the "little world," and had in some cases given the solution of them in a few words. As I went on, I could not help seeing that there was growing in the minds of my class a consciousness of the drama of modern life, its meaning, and direction.

Though we had twenty-eight sessions, we did not get beyond the first part of the play, which deals with man's two primitive instincts, — hunger and love or lust. At our last meeting I read an essay on the Gretchen episode, which needs tender handling.

In undertaking a class in the History of Philosophy my chief purposes, apart from communicating a general outline of the facts, were: (1) to trace the course of reflection from naïve common sense up to philosophy; that is, from that attitude of mind which finds and, without question, accepts a world of things, through that which reduces things to one or more simple principles, up to that which realizes that, if they are to be

comprehended, they must be expressed in terms of actual experience; (2) to impress the conclusion, thus made evident, that mind is the essential condition of any knowable world; and (3) to draw the corollary that, since all experience is individual, the world is made up of a multitude of individual minds acting and reacting upon each other; in other words, that it is essentially spiritual, social, and moral. I felt that, if I could attain this result, several important questions, such as those of individual immortality and free will, would have answered themselves, and a solid basis been laid for a worthy, rational life.

I assigned, as the basis of our work, Schwegler's compendious "History of Philosophy," at the same time giving a list of longer works to be consulted when necessary, — Hegel's, Zeller's, Byk's, Fairbanks', Ueberweg-Heinze's, Erdmann's, Windelband's, etc. My method of instruction was the same as that pursued in the other class, — essays and discussions. I refused to admit to the class any one who could not attend regularly and do all the reading and writing assigned to him. I did this on the ground that philosophy must be a rounded whole, and not a heap of fragments. I opened the class with a brief talk on the meaning, method, and function of philosophy, its relations to tradition, to science, and to life, and its chief epochs. We then proceeded, after a few words on Hindu philosophy, to take up the reflective thought of the Greeks, and I gave out a series of subjects for essays, including: The Social Conditions which gave rise to Reflection; Nature versus Convention; The Origin of the term "Nature"; Theology versus Science;

The Different Schools of Philosophy, their Distinguishing Characteristics and their Interrelation; The Chief Philosophers, and their Special Tenets; The Converging Lines of Thought that prepared the Way for the Sophists; Sophistry and the Sophists; Socrates and his Relation to the Sophists; The Socrates of Aristophanes, of Xenophon, of Plato; The Transition from Objectivism to Subjectivism accomplished by Pre-Socratic Thought; The Relation of Pre-Socratic Thought to Social and Political Life, etc. Most of these subjects were treated in well-written essays, which were read and discussed in the class. Some of them showed remarkable powers of thought, especially those on the puzzles of Zeno. Up to the time when I left for the country, our work covered the evolution of Greek thought from Thales to Socrates, that is, the first period in the advance of Western Reflection from naïve objectivism to subjectivism, and to the conviction that the explanation of the world lies in the self, which thus becomes the grand reality. I was surprised to find how easily the fundamental position of idealism was grasped by some of the young men, and with what readiness they perceived its consequences for life and morals.

From what has been said it will be evident that, in the few months of its existence, the class acquired a certain amount of intellectual and moral insight. But that was not my only aim in carrying it on. I had two others: (1) to train as many as possible of the young people for active philanthropic work; and (2) to banish from their hearts all class feeling and social hatred. I have long believed that intellectual and moral culture

is of comparatively little value, unless it expresses itself in wise active work for the good of others, and that little work of this sort can be done by people who cherish in their hearts a sense of wrong, or of hatred to any class in the community. I was, therefore, extremely glad when, about the middle of the winter, I received from a little knot of our young men the following letter. (I omit superscription and signature.)

In your letter of May 23, 1899, to the class, you mention how pleased you would be to have us form into a society for practical work on a basis of right knowledge and right will.

Trusting we have discovered (very largely through your aid) a spark of right knowledge and more of right will, we the following four, namely (here follow the names), decided, as one in heart and one in purpose, to take the initiative step toward forming such a circle, the plan to be drawn by you. To avoid the first step being taken wrong, we, therefore, must look to you to map out our duties, especially in the beginning. I was, therefore, appointed to apprise you of our earnest good will and desire to do some good beyond ourselves, and also to request you to give us some consideration.

L——J—— expects to call on you this Friday about 4.30 P.M. in reference to this. I trust you will give him the encouragement we look to receive from you.

However, if you may consider us yet unripe, we will be repaid through your advice how to become fitted for such an undertaking which you define truly as "very difficult."

We have the will — show us the way.

Wishing you much improved in health, I am very truly yours,

X——Y——.

As soon as my health permitted, I invited the young men to spend an evening in my rooms. They all came [1]

[1] Two of them were engaged in a hat factory, one was a bookkeeper, and one a student in the City College.

and we had a most enjoyable evening. They were full of quiet, almost solemn, enthusiasm, and eager to begin work. I advised them for the present to begin no practical work, as a club, but to do what they could individually, and, at the same time, to unite in studying the needs and conditions of the East Side, their own capabilities, and the possible methods of reaching the ends they had in view. I offered to lend them some books that might help them, and then added, "If you devote the next six months to finding out what needs to be done, and what can be done, it will be time well spent. Next winter you can begin work." I strongly advised them to be slow in adding to their numbers, and to be sure that their new members were in full sympathy with their spirit and purpose.

The little club followed my advice. They set about gathering information from all quarters, interviewing the men and women engaged in charitable and educational work, visiting saloons, pool rooms, etc. They made regular written reports of what they saw and heard, and held weekly meetings to discuss methods and ideals. They spent a second evening with me, telling me what they had done and what they proposed doing. They have added two to their membership.

While some of the young men were thus engaged, a certain number of the young women were doing philanthropic work individually, taking reckless girls off the streets and inducing them to read and think, or giving instruction to those whose education had been neglected or who had but recently arrived in the country. By my advice these formed themselves into a club,

which now works in harmony with the young men's club, without uniting with it. Each will probably find a special sphere of action. The members of the young women's club were soon in great demand to take charge of "circles" and "classes" which were opened in the neighborhood. So much for philanthropic work.

With a view to breaking down class feeling and social hatred, I arranged a couple of social meetings, to which I invited a number of wealthy and cultured people, both Jews and Gentiles. The first of these meetings was held in the large handsome studio of one of our best known sculptors, which proved too small for the occasion. Nevertheless we spent a most enjoyable evening, with music, recitations, addresses, and conversation.[1]

[1] Mr. Davidson's account of the movement breaks off abruptly at this point. A continuation of the story of its development, furnished by members of the class, will be found in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER V

THE UNDERLYING SPIRIT AS SHOWN IN THE WEEKLY LETTERS TO THE CLASS

HURRICANE P.O., ESSEX COUNTY, N.Y.
May 4, 1899.

TO THE CLASS IN HISTORY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, IN THE EDUCATIONAL ALLIANCE, NEW YORK.

Dear Friends: In leaving you last Saturday evening I felt I was parting not so much from a class as from a family. You have all become very dear to me, and, whatever the future may bring, your welfare will always be my deepest interest. Your parting gifts are among my dearest possessions.

I am hardly settled here yet, and so shall not be able to write you a very long letter this week, but I cannot let a Saturday pass without sending you a word. From eight to ten on the evening of the 6th I shall be with you every moment. I trust you will come together that evening, and every succeeding Saturday evening till I return, and that you will earnestly pursue the good work we have begun together, — the work of endeavoring to be simple, upright, pure, heroic men and women, rich in knowledge, in sympathy, and in wise helpfulness. You know that, if the study of History and Social Science do not lead to that, it is all in vain. When you meet, therefore, you will do so as friends,

who have each other's highest good at heart; as earnest workers who, having a common end, need each other's sympathy and aid. You will avoid all wrangling and disputes and cavilings, and do your best to help each other to arrive at truth and to embody it in life. Nothing is more frivolous than a debating society, nothing more serious than a meeting of souls bent upon discovering truth to live by.

And, after all, if we will but lay aside prejudice and superstition, truth is not so hard to find. Indeed, every one who is completely honest with himself, and is not swayed by tradition or passion, may truthfully say: I am the truth; for the truth is but the expression of our deepest nature. What I am and how I am related to my fellows, — that is the sum of the truth for me.

You will perhaps think that I am laying out a mighty task for you, a task far above your powers and aspirations; but it is not so. Every great change in individual and social ideals — and we are on the verge of such a change — begins small, among simple, earnest people, face to face with the facts of life. Ask yourselves seriously: Why should not the coming change begin with us? Why should not we be the first to give expression to the new ideal in individual and social life? And you will find there is no reason. The new world, the world of righteousness, kindliness, and enlightenment, for which we are all longing and toiling, may date from us as well as from anybody. We have only to be true to ourselves and the future is ours. To be sure we do not count among the great and the mighty

of to-day; but if we are but faithful and brave, the future will judge us differently.

We see dimly in the Present what is small and what is great;
Slow of faith, how weak an arm may turn the iron helm of Fate.

It may be *our* weak arm if we so will it. Will you will it? Then go to work bravely and uncomplainingly, looking for no reward but the reward of being good men and women, of weighing heavy in the scales of power. Do not be greatly troubled about money making, or about mere economic justice. Money is but means, and economic justice can never come till men are just through and through. Let us labor then for justice, and begin by being just ourselves. Let us remember that, until we love each other in all sincerity, we cannot be just to each other. Therefore, let us love each other. Away with all hatred, envy, and jealousy!

I shall try to write to you every week, — a few words to be read aloud to the class when it meets. I shall try to suggest work for you, and next week I shall send you a list of books for summer reading. This week, I suggest that some one read or recite Lowell's poem, "The Present Crisis," and that the class discuss it. It is a poem that every one should learn by heart and lay to heart.

Let me hear from you all as often as you can. Tell me about your work, and send me your essays and exercises. Those of you who have already written to me shall hear from me as soon as possible. I shall be completely settled in a few days, and then things will move regularly.

I wish I could tell you how beautiful these mountains are and what peace reigns here. But you must come and see for yourselves. I look forward to your visit with much pleasure and longing.

I am always your friend and brother,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, May 9, 1899.

My dear Friends: I am happy to know that you had a good meeting on Saturday night. I was with you every moment.

You did well to discuss Socrates, that greatest of moral heroes, the inventor of freedom and ethical life. He is one of the mighty, and it is well to live with the mighty. Before him, men had obeyed a law imposed from without; Socrates sought, and found, the source of the moral law within. The outer law enslaves because it is not our law; the inner law frees because it is our law. By obeying myself I become free. The moral law is nothing more, but also nothing less, than the law of our being in the broadest and deepest sense, — the law of harmony within and harmony without. When all the parts and faculties of our being are working together, and in full energy, no one standing in the way of another, then we are truly moral. But this is impossible unless we are likewise in harmony with the world about us, or, to speak strictly, the world organized in our consciousness. If I hate or envy my neighbor, there is disharmony in me; I am weak and suffer. If I allow my feelings or passions to get beyond the

control of my reason, there is disharmony in me; I have lost my integrity and I am no longer an integer. I am a chaos of fragments, and, with such a chaos, no true life can be lived. If I pursue the means of living with such devotion as to forget the end, I am once more in disharmony with myself. I am leading an utterly immoral life. One of you wrote in the album, "Out of the scattered knowledge within me you have made a cosmos." I hope I am not vain enough to make any such lofty claim; but the friend who wrote that saw into my deepest intent, and grasped a principle which will guide all his life henceforth. He will ever strive to be a cosmos, and that is what each of us should be, — an ordered world. Each of us should be able to say, I and the world are one. Be an integer; be a cosmos! — that is the fundamental moral law.

No one ever saw this truth more clearly than Socrates; none ever lived up to it more unflinchingly. He was all peace within. Neither life nor death had any terrors for him. The world that for others was a chaos was a cosmos for him because there was a cosmos in him. No one could prevent him from knowing rightly, loving rightly, and willing rightly, and so he could smile at the worst his chaotic enemies could do against him. They triumphed for an hour. He triumphs forever; and even they will one day share in the triumph. He is the father of freedom and of science (the two are inseparable), and you could do nothing better than study his life — not as an authority, but as an example. His great vision was misinterpreted and marred by his two great successors, Plato and Aristotle, but, through all their clouds of

dogma and formalism, we can still see the true Socrates, simple, sincere, heroic.

I send you, herewith, a list of twenty books for summer reading, — a list compiled without any attempt at order, but with the view of suiting every taste.[1] It would be a fine thing if you would take Martineau's "Types of Ethical Theory" and devote an hour each Saturday evening to a discussion of it, chapter by chapter. Let the chapters be distributed among the class, to be epitomized and presented in succession for consideration. You will find such work extremely stimulating and enlightening, and I will do all I can to help you.

I send you also a little essay of mine, written twelve years ago, but still substantially representing my views on education — "The Conditions, Divisions, and Methods of Complete Education." Some Saturday evening, when you have nothing better to do, you might read and discuss it. Several of you, I know, intend to be teachers,

[1] Following is the list of books referred to: (1) Schwegler, "History of Philosophy" (German or English); (2) Herodotus, "History" (Rawlinson's translation); (3) Cox, "The Greeks and the Persians"; (4) Dickinson, "The Greek View of Life"; (5) Montesquieu, "Spirit of the Laws"; (6) Freeman, "Comparative Politics"; (7) White, "History of the Warfare of Science with Theology"; (8) Baldwin, "Mental Development in the Child and in the Race"; (9) Müller (Max), "Biographies of Words"; (10) Ruskin, "Unto this Last"; (11) Wundt, "Grundriss der Psychologie" (German or English); (12) Martineau, "Types of Ethical Theory"; (13) Rogers, "Six Centuries of Work and Wages"; (14) George Eliot, "Romola"; (15) Tennyson, "Idylls of the King"; (16) Davidson, "Rousseau, and Education according to Nature"; (17) Darwin, "The Descent of Man"; (18) Stallo, "Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics"; (19) de la Saussaye, "Manual of the Science of Religion"; (20) Huxley, "Lay Sermons," "Addresses and Reviews."

and I should like them to consider what can be done to reform our educational methods and ideals, which we all feel to be defective and far behind the needs of our time. Perhaps some day we may be able together to found an educational institution such as I have sketched, and so to meet a crying need. Several institutions of the sort already exist in England, as you will see if you read M. Demolins's work, "L'Éducation Nouvelle." I think it would be entirely possible to improve upon these in America, and to found institutions which should really express and cultivate the national spirit of free individuality.

You see, I am expecting great things of you. I want you to feel that there is just as much chance for heroes, saints, and prophets at the present day as there ever was. All the divine that ever was in the world is in it still. The world did not look any more heroic in the days of Isaiah, Simon Maccabæus, or Cæsar than it does now. But they were heroes, all the same, and so you can be if you will. Most of you have stood, or are still standing, "face to face with life's prime needs and agonies," and that is an education for goodness and greatness such as it is impossible to match. All depends upon yourselves. You can be pygmies or giants, just as you please.

I shall be with you next Saturday evening, and am always,

Affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, May 17, 1899.

My dear Friends: Nothing could give me greater pleasure than to know that you are conducting fruitful meetings in my absence. The sooner a teacher makes himself useless the better. It is a great fault with some teachers that they remain always necessary. I do not wish to count among these, but hope to be obliterated in a short time. It has always been my aim to make my pupils self-directing at the earliest moment.

Some of you, I understand, do not agree with my views regarding Plato and his socialistic "Republic." I am very glad to hear that, and hope you will oppose them with all your might, taking care, however, to inform yourselves carefully as to what Plato really taught. I think I once recommended the "Republic" to the class as a book to read. In combating views, you will, of course, do so in a spirit of earnestness and fairness, refraining from all personalities and all asperity. If you can show me that my views regarding Plato are wrong, I shall be proud to learn from you, and shall alter my statements in the next edition of my book. Will not some of you tell me what views of mine you think incorrect, showing me the passages in the "Republic" which are opposed to them? We can then have a very profitable discussion.

In Plato's time people in Greece were beginning to think seriously about social institutions, which had previously been accepted as a matter of course. As always happens under such circumstances, they found their ideal in a socialistic state, in which everything was to be regulated, and every one's place fixed, with

mathematical exactness. All immature thinking tends to be mathematical. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when men for the second time were beginning to think critically about social institutions, numerous schemes of ideal socialistic states were proposed by Campanella, More, Bacon, and others. But, in all cases, mature thought rejected these youthful schemes, and recognized that human institutions are governed by laws that set at defiance the imagined Utopias of any one man. Plato himself, toward the close of his life, practically discarded his ideal socialistic "Republic," and worked out a scheme far more in accordance with reality. It is very instructive to compare the "Republic" with the later "Laws."

Various attempts were made, in ancient times, to realize Plato's "Republic" (for example by Plotinus); but nothing ever came of them. The only realization it has ever found is the Roman Catholic Church of the Middle Age, whose constitution I should advise all admirers of Plato to study.

I sincerely trust that the socialistic members of the class, if there be any, will not imagine that I have any prejudice against them. Far from it. It is true, I do not find it possible to be a socialist myself, but many of my friends are, and I believe that the socialist movement has done much good in arousing the world to a sense of the injustice due to present social arrangements, and also that it is a step toward something very much better, — something which, while giving an opportunity to every human being to attain the highest development (which is also the highest happiness), will leave

individual liberty and initiative uncurtailed. The discovery of that higher *something* is really the problem of the present day. Which of you can think out a scheme which shall embody all the advantages of socialism combined with all the advantages of anarchism; all the blessings of material well-being combined with all the blessings of liberty?

In trying to do so, you must bear in mind that your scheme must not be stationary, but progressive, — must leave room for evolution. The scheme of Plato, and those of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, were all stationary, leaving no place for progressive change, — for evolution. Indeed, the notion of evolution, in its modern sense, had not yet dawned upon men. *Now* it is the most important and fruitful of all notions. No social system can be permanent without being fatal. Every one must change by evolution, or revolution. All life is change. Our very bodies, if they should cease to change for one minute, would die. What is all legislation but formulated social change?

Another thing must be carefully borne in mind, viz., that any scheme, to be of use, must be realizable; and this implies two things, first, that it take full account of present conditions, that is, the conditions which have to be transformed; second, that it pay due regard to all the demands of human nature, since these are the very things which the new conditions have to satisfy. It is easy to see that our present conditions are such that no scheme of pure socialism, or pure anarchism, has any chance of realization, no matter how ideally just it might be. Again, a scheme which provided only for

man's material needs, important as these are, would have no chance of success. Human nature demands more than food, clothing, and shelter, no matter how rich and elaborate these may be. Indeed, the higher human nature rises, the more do these lose in comparative importance. What good man or woman would care to remain on the vulgar level of fashionable society, to belong to the "Four Hundred" who revel in economic wealth, but in higher respects are beggars? A scheme to place all the people of New York on the level of the "Four Hundred" would fail, as it certainly ought to do.

I am glad to hear that you are going to discuss my little pamphlet, and that Professor G—— is going to lecture for you.

I am always affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, May 23, 1899.

My dear Friends: I am much pleased to learn that, at your last meeting, the idea of forming yourselves into a society for practical work was mooted. That is the result I have been aiming at; for, after all, it is by its practice that any association is finally judged. If our meetings and studies do not result in noble lives and beneficent work, we have met and studied in vain.

I am glad you like the programme of the "Fellowship of the New Life" which I sent to several of you. Ere it could become the basis of your society, several things in it would have to be removed, or modified.

I could point these out; but you would do well to consider it sentence by sentence and clause by clause.

To form a society that shall accomplish permanent good among mankind is, as I know from experience, very difficult. If the first steps be false, all will be false and vain. Two things, above all, are requisite, — clear insight into what is needful and possible, and single-minded determination to realize the same; in a word, right knowledge and right will. No association can do permanent good which does not understand human nature, human society, and the forces which govern them, or which does not clearly realize the nature and conditions of human well-being. The same is true of any society which has not the purity and strength of will to set aside all merely personal interests, and devote itself to the task which it recognizes. The great requisites are scientific insight and apostolic fervor. With these, wonders may be done. Your society, therefore, should aim at knowledge, through study and experience, and at enthusiasm and self-forgetfulness, through sympathy and love. You should begin with yourselves, making sure that your society is one in heart, and one in purpose. In a word, you must love one another as brothers and sisters, and as citizens of a republic that doth not yet appear, but which you are determined to create. Love is boundless power. It has been said "God is love," and I suspect that it is the only correct definition. He who has true, unselfish love in his heart is inspired by God, has God dwelling in him. Having learned to love one another, you will find it is not so hard to love other people, even

those who are now repellent to you. Compassion will take the place of alienation, and your only thought will be, How can we help these poor, unlovely souls to truth and goodness? You must remember that these souls are parts of your world, blemishes which, for the sake even of your own souls, you must remove. One of you spoke of the East Side as a "hell." If that be true, then each of you has a hell in his world. Are you willing to have that? Think how much more glorious your lives would be if the East Side were a heaven? Christians have, for nearly two thousand years, been praying to God, "Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven," and earth is not a heaven yet, and will not be until we substitute earnest work for prayer, — until, with knowledge and enthusiasm, we form a league, a conspiracy against ignorance, selfishness, and wickedness. Your society must be such a league.

We have already done something to increase knowledge among ourselves, and the result, I am happy to think, has been a growth of enthusiasm. We are on the right path, and I think I see how we can advance farther on it. I think we are even now where we might begin some practical work in a quiet, unobtrusive way. The question is, What work? Perhaps you can answer that question better than I can. You know the needs and conditions of the East Side better than I do. One thing is certain, — you can all be in your own lives models of kindness, helpfulness, and strength. You can each be a living light in dark places. You can overcome evil with good, and make the evil ashamed of itself. Perhaps each of you knows of some one lonely, suffering,

or erring soul that would be glad of sympathy, help, or counsel. Give that soul what it needs; win it over to friendliness, contentment, and goodness, and you will have done a good work. Perhaps you know of some family in which the father is dissipated, drunken, or out of work, and the mother is slaving her life away, unable to take care of her children or her home. Go and offer her your help, simply and sweetly, as if she were your sister. Take care of her children for an hour, wash them, comb their hair, and amuse them. Put her home in order; scrub the floors if necessary; clean the windows. Make her feel that angels of light are entering when you "dawn through the doorway." Remember that no work, however menial or coarse, is degrading, if performed in the spirit of love. Perhaps some of you could gather a few of the children out of the street, for an hour or two, into your homes, and instruct them. To the older children you might read. If you do work of this sort, your own lives will grow in interest and happiness, and you will find those whom you help ready to listen to your truth. Truth practiced before spoken is very impressive.

When we have advanced a little farther we shall, I hope, undertake larger tasks; but those I have mentioned form an excellent preparation. If I am strong enough next winter, I hope to give a course of Sunday lectures at the Alliance, and, in these, to sketch a plan for practical work. But I can say now, that any plan worth undertaking must rest upon a new view of the world and of man's relation to it, — a view based upon the most comprehensive science and philosophy. That

view will tell us that we, instead of being mere created things subject to divine caprice, are ourselves divine, and that, instead of worshiping God, our business is to live God. It will call upon us to do for ourselves and others what we formerly besought God to do; in a word, to bear ourselves as gods, to be holy, pure, righteous, merciful, helpful. Moreover, it will call upon us to make a heaven here on earth. Where there are divine beings there ought to be a heaven, and we are divine. Our suffering and erring brothers and sisters too are divine, and there can be no perfect heaven for any of us until all are citizens of it. If we could only look upon ourselves and our fellow-men in this light, how we should be inspired to work for the realization of heaven! How all selfishness, hatred, vanity, envy would disappear! How love, sympathy, blessedness would grow! It is no wonder that when man regards himself as a fallen being, an outcast from Eden, a worm of the dust, he should behave himself as such. Let him believe that he is a god in the making, and he will behave accordingly. He will feel what is due to his own divinity, and will be ashamed to stoop to selfish or unworthy deeds. I shall have much more to say of this hereafter, when we are again together.

I am sorry that my pamphlet on education is out of print; but I send you the few copies that remain in my possession.

I am very glad that Dr. E—— is going to lecture to you. He lives the life that I should wish you all to lead. Like a divinity, he is doing his best to make a heaven upon earth. I trust you will often have the

opportunity of listening both to him, and to Professor G——, who will be with you next Saturday.

I am longing to see you all again. But, while I am away from you, I am made very happy by the thought that you are looking forward to earnest work.

I am always affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, May 31, 1899.

My dear Friends: I was greatly pleased to hear about Professor G——'s lecture, and about the hearty reception you gave him.

I have no doubt he enjoyed meeting you very much. I *know* that Mr. A——, who accompanied him, did; for in a letter he says: "I had my eyes opened to new conditions. I have not met so earnest a body of young women and men in a long time." That is the report I want to hear. Give me earnestness, and I can do anything.

I am happy to know that my dear friend Dr. W—— is going to talk to you. He will prove worthy of his name, I have no doubt. He is a man with a great future.

As I sit here on my veranda, in these beautiful woods, facing the sunset, I think of you all in the hot city, with its dust and noise and ugliness, many of you engaged in uncongenial occupations, and I feel almost ashamed of myself for not being with you. My only comfort and excuse is, that I am doing my best to gain strength and lay plans to be more useful to you in the future. Not an hour passes but I think of you, and wish

I were with you. And yet I rejoice to think that you are doing such good work without me. You are not dependent upon any man or men.

I have no doubt there is many an hour when you feel that your lives are cramped, and that you have not the opportunities for self-development that you ought to have. That is a right and a worthy feeling. I have felt it many a time, for there is not one among you whose circumstances are more adverse or unpromising than mine were in boyhood and youth. I have had to fight single-handed for everything: for livelihood, for education, for culture, yea, for moral life. My sympathies, therefore, go out to you in all your toils, struggles, and aspirations. I am one of you, and am proud to be one of you.

I tell you this because I think my long, hard fight, and partial victory, have taught me the way to overcome adverse circumstances, and make life not only worth living, but the greatest of blessings. Perhaps I may best express the results of my experience in a few numbered sentences, or aphorisms:

1. Rely upon yourself and your own energies, and do not wait for, or depend upon, other people.

2. Cling, with all your might, to your own highest ideals, and be not led astray by such vulgar aims as wealth, position, popularity, etc. Be yourself.

3. Remember that your worth consists in what you are. and not in what you have. What you are will show in what you do.

4. Never fret, repine, or envy. Do not make yourself unhappy by comparing your circumstances with

those of more fortunate people; but make the most of the opportunities you have. Employ profitably every moment of time.

5. Associate with the noblest people you can find; read the best books; live with the mighty. But learn to be happy alone.

6. Do not believe that all greatness and heroism are in the past. Learn to discover princes, prophets, heroes, and saints among the people about you. Be assured they are there.

7. Be on earth what good people hope to be in heaven.

8. Cultivate ideal friendships, and gather into an intimate circle all your acquaintances who are hungering for truth and right. Remember that heaven itself can be nothing but the intimacy of pure and noble souls.

9. Do not shrink from any useful or kindly act, however hard or repellent it may be. The worth of acts is measured by the spirit in which they are performed.

10. If the world despise you because you do not follow in its ways, pay no heed to it. But be sure your way is right.

11. If a thousand plans fail, be not disheartened. As long as your purposes are right, *you* have not failed.

12. Examine yourself every night, and see whether you have progressed in knowledge, sympathy, and helpfulness during the day. Count every day a loss in which no progress has been made.

13. Seek enjoyment in energy, not in dalliance. Our worth is measured solely by what we do.

14. Let not your goodness be professional; let it be the simple, natural outcome of your character. Therefore, cultivate character.

15. If you do wrong, say so, and make what atonement you can. That is true nobleness. Have no moral debts.

16. When you are in doubt how to act, ask yourself, What does nobility command? Be on good terms with yourself.

17. Look for no reward for goodness but goodness itself. Remember heaven and hell are utterly immoral institutions if they are meant as reward and punishment.

18. Give whatever countenance and help you can to every movement and institution that is working for good. Be not sectarian.

19. Wear no placards, within or without. Be human fully.

20. Never be satisfied until you have understood the meaning of the world, and the purpose of your own life, and have reduced *your* world to a rational cosmos.

These are the precepts by which I have tried to guide my life. It is needless to say that I have often failed to obey them; but I can say that I never did so without deep regret and suffering. They have made life very glorious. It could do you no harm, I think, to try to live by them.

Now good-bye. I may see you sooner than I thought.

I am most affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, June 7, 1899.

My dear Friends: I was very sorry to learn that Dr. E—— was not with you last Saturday, for I was sure you would enjoy listening to him. I hear that some of you objected to certain statements in my little pamphlet on education. Probably I should now do the same thing, for I have learned some things in the last ten years, and it is more than that since the pamphlet was written. I shall be satisfied if it has given occasion for a good discussion on the meaning and scope of education.

I learn that the question of your doing something as a club was again up before you. That is a most encouraging sign, and I hope you will go on till you find an appropriate task. I believe that all true association has for its bond a task, — something definite to do. The question you have to put to yourselves is, What is there needing to be done that we can do? Having answered that, you will do well to consider whether you can work best individually, or as a club, or both ways. You must see around you much that needs to be reformed; perhaps some of you are fitted for one thing, some for another. Let each undertake what he can do best, and compare notes with all the rest.

But there is one task which you certainly can undertake now with reasonable hope of success, and that is, the establishment of ideal relations among yourselves. There is nothing that the world of to-day needs so much as a new order of social relations, — a new feeling between man and man. We may talk and teach as long as we like, but until we have a new society, with ideal

relations and aims, we have accomplished very little. All great world movements begin with a little knot of people who, in their individual lives, and in their relations to each other, realize the ideal that is to be. To live truth is better than to utter it. Isaiah would have prophesied in vain, had he not gathered around him a little band of disciples who lived according to his ideal. "The formation of this little community," says one of our greatest scholars, "was a new thing in the history of religion. Till then no one had dreamed of a fellowship of faith dissociated from all national forms, maintained without the exercise of ritual services, bound together by faith in the divine word alone. It was the birth of a new era in the Old Testament religion." It was out of this little community that Judaism with its law and its world-wide significance grew. Again, what would the teaching of Jesus have amounted to, had he not collected a body of disciples who made it their life aim to put his teachings into practice? To nothing, we may be sure. These disciples were called "saints" (ἅγιοι), and we possess a very early description of their mode of life in a letter addressed to some of them. Here are a few sentences from it: "Ye were all lovely in mind and free from arrogance, yielding rather than claiming submission, more glad to give than to receive. . . . Then a profound and rich peace was given to all, and an insatiable desire of doing good. . . . Ye were sincere and simple, and free from malice one toward another. . . . Ye mourned over the transgressions of your neighbors; ye judged their shortcomings to be your own. Ye repented not of any welldoing,

but were ready for every good work." These are ideal relations, worthy of saints.

I might easily multiply examples, but these two will suffice to show the extreme value of ideal association. But you will perhaps say, "Yes, but, in both cases, the society was bound together, not only by a purpose or task, but also by a series of ethical precepts, and by certain supernatural beliefs," and you will ask, "What can we have in the place of these?" The statement is correct, and the question pertinent. I think it would be quite possible to frame a new series of ethical precepts which should do for our time what the Deuteronomic law did for the time of Isaiah, and the Sermon on the Mount for that of Jesus. There would be no harm in your trying to do so. Again, the place of supernatural beliefs must now be taken by scientific and philosophic truth regarding man's nature, origin, and destiny, and I believe the latter is quite able to fill that place. Faith never promised us anything which science cannot assure us of. What a fine thing it would be if, in a quiet, reverent spirit, "free from arrogance," you were to consider together, first, the moral law demanded by the present; second, the scientific bases for those truths which are required to give life a meaning, and to make the world a cosmos. The effect of such discussions, carried on earnestly, would be most edifying and ennobling, especially if you steadily endeavored to agree with each other, instead of trying to differ. You will perhaps say, "Such things are too high for us." Let me answer in the words of the eighth psalm, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast created power."

When, after careful consideration, you have framed a new moral law, such as you feel ought to prevail, the next thing is, to bind yourselves to live up to it. That will, no doubt, require a considerable amount of discipline, and to this you must enthusiastically submit. All new life ideals have been reached through discipline, much of it painful. Are you ready for this?

If you undertake the task I have suggested, you will soon find that it involves many others. Your new Torah (תּוֹרָה) will inevitably entail upon you many duties and tasks. Just think of the effect of such a commandment as this, "Be all that thou canst be, and do all that thou canst do, at every moment;" or this, "Thou shalt hold thyself, in thy degree, responsible for all the evil and suffering there is in the world;" or this, "Forget not that the more wicked and vile a man is, the more he needs thy kindly care."

Think these things over, and believe me

Affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, June 14, 1899.

My dear Friends: I am much pleased to know that Dr. W—— was with you last Saturday; but I fear you were not quite sympathetic toward his ideas. I must confess that I am, as you can see from my lecture published recently in the *American Hebrew*. I have there given my reasons for favoring Zionism.

I think the objections to Zionism are due mainly to a misunderstanding of its aims. Some people seem to

think that it aims at removing the whole of the Jews to Palestine. This is an entire mistake. Others think that Zionism has its origin and meaning in the old prophets. This is again a mistake. Some of you think it would stand in the way of more universal schemes. I cannot see why it should. Some of you, who favor universal leveling, are afraid that any distinction between peoples would stand in the way of that. In my opinion, universal leveling would be a great calamity, a degradation. All evolution goes toward unity and harmony *in variety*. For the highest order of being the variety is just as necessary as the unity. To reduce all men and peoples to a common type would be like playing a piece of music on one note. This would be admirably simple, but utterly monotonous and dreary. For my part, I should like to see the Hebrews retain their characteristics, just as I like to see my own countrymen do. Even the climatic conditions of our globe make differences of race characteristics a necessity. If the Jews should be absorbed now, this would mean that they would become Christians, which in my opinion is very undesirable. The Jewish religion is far more rational than the Christian, and, indeed, Christians, as they advance, come nearer and nearer to Judaism. No doubt, in the future, all traditional supernaturalism and miraculism will disappear, and men will meet upon a common scientific and rational ground; but that day is far off, and even when it comes it will not blot out race differences. The Jews owe it to themselves and to humanity to hold their own against the all-devouring dogmatism of Christianity. They have done a great work in the past, and they can do a great work in the future.

Different religions and social types belong to different grades of mental and moral development. To think that we can impose one type upon all men is utterly chimerical. One should be too religious to profess any one religion; too social to be content with any one type of society. As time goes on, men will, no doubt, understand each other better; but unless the interaction of different ideals, so necessary to progress, is to cease, wide differences, both individual and racial, must forever remain. The very interest of life is due to its variety. Though I should like to see the Jews drop their supernaturalism, I should be very sorry to see them lost in the great sea of Christian society. It must be clearly borne in mind that universal human well-being does not mean universal leveling, or the obliteration of all institutions but one. Plato tried to make the state all in all; but he lived long enough to see the impracticability of this. And just as the family must continue to exist in the state, so, I hope, the Jews will continue to live in the great family of the nations. I do not believe that anything would be gained by merging the states of the American Union into one. But I have expressed all this better in my lecture, which I hope you will read.

When I was talking to you in the winter I tried to show you that there is not much use in striving after impossible ideals, or of seeking reform without taking due account of that which you desire to reform. We may cherish utopian ideals in our bosoms as much as we like, placing them in a far-off indefinite future, where they really belong; but we only waste time when

we try to realize them now. Humanity's progress is slow and painful. When it seems to take a great leap at once it generally falls back to its previous position, and then begins its slow progress as before. This was strikingly exemplified in the French Revolution. France is not one whit farther advanced than if the Revolution had not taken place. She grasped at too much, and lost all. Every great social change presupposes a great change in the moral status of the individuals composing society, and such change is necessarily slow and hesitant. All change is, primarily, inner change. The outer changes follow upon these. But there lingers in many minds the notion that by some kind of miracle man can suddenly be transformed, and fitted into a ready-made scheme. Such schemes have been propounded since the days of Plato; but not one has ever come near realization. The forest is continually asserting itself against the landscape gardener. Mankind is too large to be fitted into any scheme. "*Gesetz ist mächtig, mächtiger ist die Noth*," says Goethe. And, after all, utopian schemes are meant to satisfy the needs of some one man or body of men. Plato writes his "Republic" to show what social arrangements would make him happy. Of course being a philosopher, he makes philosophers the governing class.

It takes a very profound knowledge of history to enable one to see what is practical and what is not, and to be patient with the slow movement of mankind. When we are young, we believe in social and other miracles; as we grow older, we learn that there are no

such things, and content ourselves with attempting the possible. I believe Zionism is possible *now;* universal human regeneration is not. But Zionism is a step toward that regeneration.

Good-bye, dear friends.

I am always affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, June 21, 1899.

My dear Friends: I have received letters from many of you this week. You must not be impatient if the state of my health compels me to defer answering them for a few days. I will answer them as soon as I can.

I am sorry that Mr. F—— has resigned the presidency of the club. I trust he is still loyal to us and our cause, and I hope he will soon be here. I am comforted by the knowledge that he has been succeeded by an earnest man.

It is a great joy to me to know that the club is increasing in numbers. I trust that therewith there will come no disharmony, and no attempt to draw the club off into side issues. It is far more important that the club should be harmonious, and that its members should lead a noble life, than that they should profess any creed capable of formulation. We should be men and women before we are anything else. You can do far more by presenting to the world the example of noble social relations than by enumerating any set of principles. Deed, and not creed, is the great thing. Know all you can, love all you can, do all you can, — that is the whole duty of man. How large and

beautiful the world becomes, when one earnestly tries to fulfill this duty! How all littleness, meanness, and unhappiness disappear!

If you want to be socialists, be such in this way,—hold whatever you own as a trust for the use of all. State socialism is at best a long way off; but there is a socialism that you can practice now without any loss of liberty. Make yourselves acquainted with each other; learn each other's needs; be ready with sympathy, and when possible with a helping hand. No one is humiliated or degraded by the help that love gives. There is much that you can teach each other; there is many a sorrow that you can alleviate for each other. Be friends, in the truest sense, to each other. There is nothing in all the world like friendship, when it is deep and real. And yet how rare is friendship in our modern world! And how barren is the world because of its absence! The greatest of ancient thinkers said, "Without friends no one would choose to live, though he possessed all other blessings." Is it not a wonder that so many people choose to live? Aristotle, who uttered the above words, devotes two books of his "Ethics" to friendship. What modern writer would think that necessary? Imagine a world in which every human being were a joy to every other! Would not that be heaven? Is it not worth while trying to realize that heaven in your own little circle? The last evening I was with you I had a foretaste of heaven, just because the sight of every one of you was a joy to me. Why should not our entire lives be like that evening? Can't you help to make them so?

If you examine the records of the past, you will find that all great movements have had two characteristics: (1) they have begun with a little knot of earnest people; (2) they have broken with the life of the past. There is no method of reforming the whole world at once, or of transforming old institutions. We must appropriate the whole experience of the past, and begin anew. This is the method of philosophy and of life. We shall preach reform in vain till doomsday, unless we show reform in our own lives and relations. A living example is worth a thousand precepts. The world is moved not by doctrines, but by lives. Among the minor works of Goethe is a sort of allegory called *Das Märchen*, in which he has symbolized the new movement in a striking way. See if you can interpret it. It occurs in the *Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten.*

When I think what life is for most, and what it might be, I am struck with horror and amazement. There is no reason why this world should not be a paradise, and life full of joy and certain hope. And why are things so bad? Simply because we devote our attention to our little selves, and not to our large selves. My little self is this creature bounded and burdened by a body; my large self is the whole universe, or, for practical purposes, the whole of mankind. If every human being sought his good in the good of all, how blessed the world would be! Can you not exemplify this spirit in your own little circle? That would be far better than preaching universal leveling.

Though I am very much opposed, as you know, to placards and creeds, yet every society must have certain

definite aims, and those aims involve certain principles. In the past, the leading principles of life have been supposed to be miraculously revealed; at present, they must be derived from science, or rather from philosophy, which is the science of sciences. When we have truth, we need no placards. No sect calls itself the Mathematicians, or the Logicians. Placards always imply absence of science. If Christian truth were universally accepted, nobody would think of calling himself a Christian. *Humanity* needs no placard, but only that which is less than humanity. If, then, you wish to found a permanent society, you must look for its principles in philosophy, in demonstrated truth, or, if you prefer, in human nature as understood. You must be able to tell whence you came, what you are, whither you are going, and how you can reach your goal. You must not begin your life programme with "I believe," but with "I know."

And now good-bye. I wish I could be with you, or you with me. I am glad, for your sake, that the weather is cooler. Take plenty of outdoor exercise, to keep your bodies and minds in healthy condition.

I am affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, June 28, 1899.

My dear Friends: I find I am threatened with a scolding if I don't give you an account of the state of my health, and as I am not fond of scoldings, I will tell you a little about it.

I am very far from well; I am suffering from a malady which has been growing on me for nearly ten years, and which, I fear, cannot be cured without an operation of a dangerous sort. I am suffering a great deal from nervous depression, and am greatly impeded from my work, but I keep up my courage and hope for the best. I do what I can do, and do not worry about what I can't do. If the worst should come to the worst, I am not afraid. Death cannot interrupt my activity, but I should be sorry to leave you just when I am learning to love you and to appreciate your goodness and your heroic struggles. I should like to be with you a few years yet, and I sincerely trust that I shall be. Don't worry about me. Write to me, and send me your essays, and I will do the best I can for you. I may not reply or return the essays immediately, but I will do so as rapidly as my strength permits. Your letters and essays are among my chief delights in these invalid days.

I am asked about my plans for next winter. It is impossible for me to say much about these until I know what the Trustees of the Alliance are willing to do for me in the way of rooms and appliances, and what aid I can get from outside. I want, of course, to do all I can, and I think I can get the assistance of several friends. I hope I may be able to give a series of lectures on Sunday afternoons, and to carry on my class on Saturday evenings. I am thinking of taking up, as the basis of my work in the latter, Goethe's "Faust," and dealing with the great problems involved in it. It is the great poem of the modern world, and a liberal education in itself. I hope you will all read the poem either in

German or in English during the summer, so as to be ready for the winter's work. I hope your new president will be able to pay me a visit here, so that we may talk matters over and make out a programme.

One of you has sent me an excellent epitome of Darwin's "Descent of Man," which I hope will be read to the class.

I entirely approve of your effort to organize your summer work, and would suggest that you make Martineau's "Types of Ethical Theory" the basis of it, writing essays on the different types and presenting them on successive evenings. You will find that very instructive and elevating. Another suitable book is Freeman's "Comparative Politics." You will do well to read a poem every meeting. Among those most suitable for your purpose are:

Lowell, "The Present Crisis"; Tennyson, "Palace of Art," "Lady Clara Vere de Vere," "Rizpah," "Locksley Hall," and "Vastness"; Emerson, "Boston Hymn," and "Ode sung in the Town Hall, Concord, July 4, 1875"; Mrs. Browning, "Cry of the Children"; Swinburne, "Super Flumina Babylonis"; Byron, "Prisoner of Chillon"; Burns, "Man was made to mourn."

You will find many fine pieces in Palgrave's "Golden Treasury" and in Emerson's "Parnassus."

I should like if one of you would read Lewes's "Life of Goethe," and another of you Dünzer's (translated), and each write an essay on the poet's career. Goethe was the great seer of the century, and you ought to know all about him. Those who know German should read *Wilhelm Meister* and *Hermann und Dorothea*, and write

papers on them. It would be well if you would all commit a good many poems to memory as treasures for after life and exercises in English.

I wish I knew your individual needs more than I do, so that I might the better serve you. I hope, too, that you will enter into each other's lives more than is generally done at present, and be like guardian angels to each other. You never know till you try how much life is sweetened by intimate friendships.

Let me know what you would like me to do next winter and I will try to do it. I should like to live on the East Side if I could find a quiet place, write my books, and see you often. We might, I think, form a little society of which Isaiah or Plato would not be ashamed — a society which should be known for its high moral aspirations and its good works — a kind of divine commonwealth of which each member should try to live a divine life. This, I know, seems a high-flown idea, but it is strange what ideals men can attain when they are really in earnest. Jesus undertook to establish a "kingdom of heaven" upon earth, and, if there had been more like him, would, no doubt, have succeeded, but there were not, and so his efforts ended in a — church. Cannot we renew that effort with better success, helping to realize all that prophets and sages have dreamt of?

I am, my dear friends, in life and in death,

Always devotedly yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, July 11, 1899.

My dear Friends: I am most glad to learn that Dr. E—— has been with you, and that he has expressed views similar to mine in regard to university education. I am also pleased to learn that you think of taking the work into your own hands, and that you are going to attack Martineau's book on Ethical Theory. You should have Mr. F—— read to you his epitome of Darwin's "Descent of Man." It is well worth hearing and discussing. I have two other essays which I hope to be able to return soon.

Mr. C—— and Dr. B—— are both here, and we are discussing plans for the future. We are to have the Fifth Street house next winter, and a certain sum of money set aside for our purposes. What now remains is to arrange a plan of work, and to find men to carry it out. Both these things I shall try to do in the near future. Thus things look promising for next winter. I hope to get a course of lectures on Evolution, one on Universal History, one on the System of the Sciences, one on Economics, one on Art, one on Comparative Religion, and so on. We must, of course, begin small and grow in a natural way. There must be no forcing.

I am beginning to hope that we may have, besides lectures and classes, social gatherings for conversation and mutual help. For want of proper intercourse we remain strangers to each other, finding no outlet for our best feelings, and no joy in our lives. We must try to bring about such intercourse. We ought to be a living Providence to each other.

I am asked what I mean by saying that "we are eternal," and that "we are here forever." I mean just what I say. I mean that our career does not end with the death of the body. It is only a false philosophy that could ever make us believe that it did. My aim has been to lead the class up to a true philosophy, which should make it evident that death is but an incident in an eternal career. Until we see that clearly, we cannot invest life with its true dignity or importance. What is a life of seventy, or even a hundred, years compared with eternal life? What a pitiful life this is for the mass of mankind if it all ends in the grave! I realize perfectly that it requires much thought to convince us that we are eternal. I cannot make it evident to you in a few words; but I hope, in course of time, to make it as clear to you as noonday that

> Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
> Was not spoken of the soul.

Until we learn our true nature, and live our lives in accordance with it, we need not hope for any improvement of social and economic conditions. It is because we do not know ourselves that we live false and unsatisfactory lives. When we do know ourselves and our own possibilities, we shall rise to heights that we have now no notion of.

If I can find the proper teachers, I shall try to arrange classes to prepare for college; but I am not sure that I shall succeed in that. I must not attempt too much at once. I shall be happy when members of the class are able to give instruction. Indeed, I think some of them

could do so now. For example, if Mr. K—— were willing to undertake it, I am sure he could successfully carry on a class in Latin. You know, I am sure, that the more you do for yourselves, the better it will be. My greatest satisfaction it will be when I am no longer of any use to you.

One thing you must all try to do, and that is, to get complete command of the English language. You must read a great deal; you must listen to good speakers; you must write essays and letters and articles; you must practice declamation and reading aloud. Some of you write and pronounce well; but many of you do not. And that is not to be wondered at, seeing that the language is not native to you, and that you have not the best opportunities of hearing it spoken.

In a letter received some time ago I was asked where the knowledge could be obtained that would enable one to believe one thing or another. I did not answer the question because it was too momentous. The fact is, you cannot find such knowledge anywhere. You must think it out for yourselves under proper guidance. You must realize that we are, at this moment, passing through a crisis, when not only the old faiths, but the old philosophies and the old life-ideals are passing away, and giving place to new. I have been trying to lead you up to that newer view, and shall try still more earnestly in the future. When you reach it, the world will be transformed for you. The meanness and littleness of the present aspect of life and of the world will vanish from you, and an aspect so glorious will rise before you that you will almost shout for joy, as I am often inclined to

do. I wish I could make you feel that, with proper earnestness, you might become the heralds and examples of a new civilization, blessing all mankind to all eternity.

Good-bye. I am,

Most affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, July 18, 1899.

My dear Friends: To-day I have received letters from three members of the class, and I cannot tell you how happy they have made me. I have read them one by one and slowly so as to enjoy them fully. To-night I seem to be with you.

Dr. B—— has been here and we have had several good talks. Things look promising for the winter, if only my health would improve, as I trust it will. I want to be strong again for your sake. Professor A—— also has been here, and shown great interest in our class. He is very anxious that we should start a "Culture Institute" on the East Side on a large scale, and thinks it could be done. I am in favor of beginning small and growing gradually, and I am quite sure we can do that. Nevertheless, I am busy working out a scheme for a Culture Institute, and that will be useful to us, I hope, as an ideal, in any case. I hope we can get a lecture or two from Professor A—— next winter, and it is well to have his countenance and help.

Now that we are virtually sure of the Fifth Street house, I can begin to arrange for classes and teachers. I sincerely hope we shall be able to have a rounded

culture-course, calculated to make you all feel at home in the world.

It gives me great pleasure to know that you are reading your own essays. I returned two last week, and hope to be able to return two more this week. I am greatly pleased with them all. I have still several letters to answer, and that shall be done as soon as I am able to do so. I am longing to be back with you, and glad that every day brings that event nearer.

I am rejoiced to see that you remain earnest, and do not turn to small or frivolous things. In a letter received a few days ago, Professor G—— says: "I spent a most charming evening with your class. They are indeed deeply earnest young people, and it is a pleasure to work with them." I am glad to hear such things of you, and I trust that they will always be true. I hope that, in course of time, you will form yourselves into a society, whose name shall everywhere mean all that is best and truest and noblest. I hope you will be known for wisdom, for kindliness, and for helpfulness. Many of you, I know, cherish a lofty ideal, and I trust I shall live to see it realized. In this, most blest of lands, we have complete liberty, and there is no high goal which we may not reach, if we are determined to do so. In my opinion, the ideal of American democracy is the loftiest religion that has ever appeared on this earth.

I wish I could have given you a more satisfactory answer than I did last week to the question regarding human immortality. But it was impossible to give an adequate answer off-hand. The clear insight into immortality rests upon a view of existence, which is by no

means common, and which cannot be communicated in a letter. Among the things I hope to do next winter is to gather you into a little circle once or twice a month, and, in quiet, friendly conversation, to show you the deep things of existence — among them the fact that we are eternal beings, with an eternal and ever-widening task before us. If I succeed in this, you will suddenly find life become so earnest and sublime that you will seem to be listening to the thunders of Sinai — only they will come from within and not from without. I believe it is impossible to reach a better social and moral condition, until we have rationally adopted an entirely new view of life and its meaning — a new philosophy, truer and deeper than any that has gone before. This philosophy will afford us an outlook so inspiring that our little temporal difficulties will seem as nothing to us, and we shall advance on our eternal journey with a joy and a courage of which few people have at present any conception. And I think you are all ready for such a philosophy ; in fact, I know that some of you are hungering and thirsting for it.

I was extremely glad to get Mr. M—— 's paper on the "Warfare of Science with Theology." I wish it were possible for the whole of you to read the book from beginning to end. You would find it most instructive and enlightening. Perhaps you will be tempted to read it after you have heard Mr. M—— 's paper. I think you will find Mr. F—— 's paper on Darwin's "Descent of Man" also very illuminating.

I am afraid that you will think that the Bible of the religion of the future is going to be a pretty large book,

and you are right. It will include all science, and all art, of every sort. Its votaries will live in an atmosphere of truth and of universal interests, in which it will be impossible for them to know weariness or satiety. It is, indeed, nothing but our own blindness and stupidity that prevents us from making a heaven of this world. If we would only discover the truth, and live according to it, we should find ourselves in paradise, here and now.

I am very thankful to Mr. C—— for undertaking the presidency of the class, and I am sure he will do himself credit in the place. His clear utterance makes him especially fit for it.

I am, always most affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, July 25, 1899.

My dear Friends: All that I hear from and about you delights me, and I have the best hopes for the future. I am asked about the relation of women's ability to men's. The question is a complicated one, and I am not willing to dogmatize about it. That, on the average, women are physically smaller and weaker than men is obvious enough. Their heads and their brains are smaller. They are, and must be, different in many respects, for they have different functions. But it by no means follows that they are inferior. Intelligence does not depend upon size of brain. Byron had a very small brain and so had many able men. As in most things, quality counts for more than quantity. You might, in this connection, read my two articles in the

Forum, "The Ideal Training of the American Boy" (July, 1894), and "The Ideal Training of the American Girl" (June, 1898). There is a very noble passage on the relations of men and women in Tennyson's "Princess" near the end. It begins "Blame not thyself too much." You might read it in the class next Saturday. I am sure you will agree with it, and learn it by heart. I hope you are all free from the leveling mania which possesses so many people, and that you do not wish to see women become like men. All excellence is not one excellence. The perfect woman must always be different from the perfect man. The chief delight of existence is its variety. Uniformity is poor, monotonous, and tedious.

I do not believe that there is any more danger to women than to men from "over-education." Of course, there is considerable danger in both cases. Intellectual labor is an enormous drain upon the system *always*. Persons of very great intellectual power very often have no children at all, or children of very mediocre ability, *e.g.*, Plato, Plotinus, Locke, Descartes, Leibniz, Spinoza, Hobbes, Bacon, Shakespeare, Milton, Hume, Kant, Humboldt, Goethe, Washington, etc. It is perhaps well that such persons should not marry. I think it is probably true that women, as well as men, if greatly devoted to intellectual pursuits, would not be the best of parents. But there is the greatest difference between sustained intellectual labor and high culture. The latter, I am sure, never hurt any one, whether man or woman. I know very many women, graduates of colleges, who are admirable wives and mothers. I am not sure that what I have said will be satisfactory to you;

but it is the best I can do. I would add that I don't think marriage universally obligatory.

I was very glad to have Dr. B—— here, and I am pleased to know that he liked my place. I sincerely hope he will come again, later on. Mr. C—— seems to be very happy here. The life in the woods is new to him, and I think he enjoys it. He is learning Latin, reading Hume, felling trees and doing other work. He is looking strong and well. I wish I were rich enough to bring you all up here; it would do you good.

I am looking forward to next winter's work with much hope. It is such a comfort to me to think that you have kept up the class during the summer. Many of the essays and abstracts that have been sent to me are most creditable. I have several now before me, and hope to return them soon. I am sorry to say I have not a copy of Martineau's book here, but I have received Mr. J——'s essay on the first chapter. I will try to return that this week, with some remarks, which may be useful to you.

You know I have never wished to dictate to you, or to impose my views upon you. I could propose many things for next winter; but I should prefer to have you make out a plan for yourselves, and then I will see how far I can help you to carry it out. Cannot you discuss this matter, and let me know the result?

You will be glad, I think, to know that I am feeling better now than I have done for a long time, and, though I am not able to do much work, I have good hopes of improving as time goes on. If the doctor and my health would allow me, I should like to live in the

midst of you next winter. I think I could be useful to you, and you could be useful to me. I am fain to believe that we might together start a movement in favor of culture, that would have great results. I believe that the only way to make the future better than the past is through education, and the gradual moralization of all classes, rich and poor. I have no faith that, as long as men and women remain as they are, any new, merely external arrangement of society can greatly benefit us. When men and women are better, then society will be better.

I do hope that those of you whose letters I have not answered will be patient with me. Do not think that my silence means neglect or thoughtlessness. It merely means want of strength.

Good-bye. I am,

Yours most affectionately,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, August 2, 1899.

My dear Friends: I am asked to give my opinion on the question, how far a man is influenced by environment. That is a very large question, and I can give only a summary answer. It depends a good deal upon the man. One man is the mere football of circumstances, another treats them as so many footballs. Near the beginning of my recent book on Rousseau, I have drawn a distinction between the "willers" who bully circumstances, and the "dalliers" who are bullied by them. Our circumstances constitute an environment, or world,

which is the field of our activity. But, as I have often tried to show you, my world is not one thing and myself another. I and my world are one. What I call my environment is simply the sum of my own determinations, and, therefore, fundamentally within my own power. The more a man is master of his determinations, that is, the more self-determined he is, the more of a man he is. The more his determinations (circumstances) are beyond his control, the more of a weakling he is. You should read, in this connection, Enid's song in Tennyson's "Idylls of the King." It begins, "Turn, Fortune, turn thy wheel, and lower the proud."

"Should philosophers have any dealings with politics?" All great philosophers have looked upon politics as a sphere of truth, and, therefore, open to them. Many great philosophers have taken an active part in politics with good results. I should even say that a man who stands aloof from politics cannot be a true philosopher. The end of all philosophy is conduct, and the broadest field of conduct is the political. Many people have the curious and completely false notion that the philosopher is an utterly unpractical being, aimlessly dreaming about abstractions having no relation to the things of earth. The true philosopher is simply the man who thinks profoundly and correctly on all subjects.

You ask me about the average man and woman. I am sorry to say that I have never met these personages, and, therefore, know nothing about them or their capabilities. All my acquaintances are distinct personalities, each different, and with different capabilities, from all the rest. Each is for me a great world which I am

anxious to explore, and before which I stand in reverence. Is any one of *you* an average man or woman? If so, how do you know? Does one know all the rest so thoroughly as to be able to strike an average, and say, "I correspond to that average"? Just think what that would imply!

I have not heard anything of our brother F—— for some time; but I left word with the doctor to send him up to me as soon as he was fit to be removed from the hospital. I must again inquire about him.

Miss R—— is here and seems very happy, and I may say the same of Mr. C——. They are both great favorites and I am delighted to have them. I am only sorry that my health does not permit me to do as much for them as I should wish.

What you tell me about Mr. K——'s talk and Mr. M——'s essay is most encouraging. My heart warms to you when I think that you are occupying yourselves with such earnest things, and I long to be with you. I am trying to make plans for next winter, and shall be most glad to hear what you would like to have done, and, moreover, what you would like to do. For, after all, our work must result in *our doing.* We must not only know the truth: we must also live it. And we can live it only by establishing noble and wise social relations. We must be individually great and good. Only thus can we be blessings to all around us, as we ought to be. Let us devote ourselves, body and soul, to welldoing; and, though we may not immediately see the fruit of our labors, the fruit is sure to ripen in the days to come.

I suppose I shall return to New York, for medical treatment, in the early part of September. If the treatment is successful, I hope to be again a strong man, and to do much work. I shall, I hope, return here for a short time, to pack my books before coming down for the winter.

We are having beautiful days and nights now. Our walks in the woods and our quiet conversations in lovely spots, affording views of the mountains and valleys, are most inspiring. I hope to see you all here some day. I expect Mr. F—— and Mr. C—— in the next few days.

And now, my dear friends, good night! It is nearly midnight and I must go to rest. The light in Mr. C——'s tent is out, and he is probably asleep. You see he is celebrating the "feast of tabernacles" all the time. He is in the "wilderness," but I think the "promised land" is before him. He has done a great deal of solid work here, and Miss R—— is following his example.

I am, affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, August 16, 1899.

My dear Friends: I am greatly pleased to know that you are discussing Martineau's "Types of Ethical Theory," and not altogether disappointed that you are drawn thereby into purely philosophical or "metaphysical" questions. Indeed, we cannot discuss ethics to any good purpose without so doing. We must clearly understand what a being is, before we can say what the

rules for his conduct shall be. Moreover, you cannot direct a man who does not know where he is going, or who does not want to go anywhere. If we are mere animals, with only animal wants and aspirations, we shall have one rule of conduct; if we are beings with ideal ends and eternal purposes, we shall have quite another. Moreover, inasmuch as all ethical conduct aims at good and a good life, we must clearly understand what good means. Is there any good for a stone or a shadow? If not, why not? Is there any good for a nation other than the good of the individuals composing it?

I should strongly advise you to discuss these things carefully, especially the meaning and the conditions of the good. Then ask yourselves: Who is the good man? Who is the good citizen? and you will, I am sure, find the answers interesting. You should then discuss the meaning of "ought," and why we feel it to be authoritative. Of course, there can be no ethics except for a being that has freedom of choice: there is no ethical possibility for a thunderbolt or an earthquake. It will be well for you to consider the nature of freedom.

If, in discussing the ethical theories of different philosophers, you become acquainted with their systems as wholes, that will be a great gain. You cannot have too many ways of looking at the world. Indeed, culture consists largely in being able to see it from many points of view. And each philosophy is a point of view.

I am much pleased to find that the class is increasing in numbers, and I sincerely trust that the new members will be as good as the old, and will be pervaded by the

same seriousness. I hope, also, that you will form a society bound together by love and respect. I hear good accounts of you from all sides, and I hope I shall always do so.

I recognize that my last letter gave but sketchy answers to the questions taken up in it; but space did not permit me to do better. Besides, I am not, in the least, anxious to impose my opinions upon you. I wish to give, here and there, a hint, and allow you to follow it up yourselves. If you come to my conclusions I shall be pleased; if you don't, I shall be pleased also.

I should be very sorry to have you accept the doctrine of immortality as a dogma; and yet I should be very glad if you could see that it is, and must be, true — that only an eternal being can think and will. In any case, it can do you nothing but good to exercise your intelligence in dealing with the question, which is a very important one, both theoretically and morally. Some persons, who have not done much accurate thinking, tell us that it is selfish to desire personal immortality, that we should be content with the immortality of humanity; and sacrifice our personal longings and aspirations to it. But surely, it cannot be selfish to desire to be, for ever and ever, a beneficent being, to be for one's fellows all that it is possible to be. If it is noble to wish to serve our kind for fifty years, it surely cannot be ignoble to desire to serve it for five hundred, or five thousand, years. And if we do not live to serve our kind, is it not ignoble to live for one hour? Again, "humanity" is a mere abstraction, for which no one can live or die. For it is merely a short term for all

men and women, past, present, and future. But it is obvious that we cannot live for past men and women. "To live for humanity" must, therefore, mean to live so that the men and women of the present and future shall be better for our living. And, if these men and women are all ephemeral beings, it must mean that each brief life is to be a sacrifice for other brief lives like itself, and that no one ever gathers the fruit of all this sacrifice. I cannot imagine anything more foolish and disheartening, unless it be the notion that, after a man has toiled to build up a character rich in knowledge, love, and beneficent action, he is suddenly blown out, like a candle, and his power to bless brought to naught. If this be true, then life is a brutal mockery, which it would be well to end at once.

But I see clearly that it is not true, and I should be glad, for your sake, if you could see it too. I am well aware that the belief in immortality, in the past, has been so closely connected with supernaturalism that one is almost ashamed to hold a doctrine which has kept such bad company. But we ought to get over this, and treat the doctrine on its own merits. Will you do this?

There are four members of the class here now, and, as far as I can see, they are all well and happy. Mr. C—— lectured here to-day in a manner that made me very glad. I must not say more, though there is more to say, about this. It would be an insult to praise him.

Good night, dear friends.

I am, affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, May 17, 1900.

My dear Friends: I am not going to tell you how hard it was to leave you. You know how glad I am to be with you, and that must be the measure of sorrow at parting. You know, too, that our parting is a mere bodily affair. We are not parted in spirit. And in this instance bodily parting is good. For the next few months you will manage your own affairs and conduct your own discussions and practical work. Nothing could be better for you; and nothing could give me more pleasure than to see you succeed. I am sure that whenever you come together there will be order, dignity, and earnestness. The poodle and the monkey will not be found among you. Your sole aims will be truth and righteousness.

Of my journey as far as Westport I know very little. After that it was delightful. We started in an open conveyance at four o'clock, in the pale dawn, and drove by clear brooks, tenderly leafing trees, green meadows, and solemn mountains for just four hours. The air was balmy but bracing, and, as we kept ascending, there gradually grew upon us a sense of freshness and health and expansion that belongs only to the mountains. The sun came out in due time, and ere we reached home we were in paradise. The far, snow-capped mountains stood out blue against the horizon, while the near slopes were green and brown of every shade. Over all swept the cloud shadows in joy. Since we arrived it has been every kind of weather. It has thundered and lightened, and poured in torrents. Fog and sunshine have been playing at hide and seek all day. And now, at

eight in the evening, the heavy mists lie over the mountains, the woods are dripping, and the streams roaring. In spite of all this panorama, I have arranged my library and unpacked my traveling books, and now I am sitting at my desk in the wilderness writing to my blessed boys and girls. I hope this may reach you on Saturday.

You are doubtless aware that, in taking possession of our new quarters, a new phase in our existence has begun. Thus far we have mainly sought self-culture; in the future we must go out and impart the blessings of culture to others. We have been preparing an instrument, now we must use that instrument. Nor must we forget that it is in imparting culture to others that the highest culture comes to ourselves. We never really live our own lives till we live with the lives of others. You must now daily ask yourselves of what use you can be to those about you in the way of instruction, sympathy, example, encouragement. If you reflect you will find that there are a thousand ways in which you can be of service to old and young, not only in your individual capacity, but, also, as a class, and as forming clubs within the class. I cherish the greatest hopes that from our new home will radiate such beneficent influences that its name shall be a synonym for all good works, and that to belong to it shall be considered the greatest of honors.

There is another point in connection with our new departure that requires some consideration. Thus far the class has drawn its members from those desiring instruction. It has held out no other inducement. Now it has other things to offer, and so you may expect

to find persons of a different sort from yourselves suing for admission, — persons seeking a place to lounge or to engage in idle conversation. It will be well to provide against the admission of such. It would perhaps be advisable, after a complete list of the present members has been made out, to admit no new members, except on the recommendation of three actual members, and after the approval of the house committee, or of a special committee on membership. This, of course, does not mean that anybody should be excluded from the classes and meetings, — far from it, — but merely that unknown persons should have no voice in the management of the club, and no right to use the club rooms for lounging or talking frivolity.

I am well aware that among the members of the club there are not a few who cherish very radical ideas on social and moral reform. This is certainly as it should be, provided due care is taken that the ideas are at once practicable and just. You know that I am neither an anarchist nor a socialist; but you perhaps do not know that I think there are both a spirit and a power in our class that give promise of accomplishing what socialism and anarchism have attempted in vain, — the spirit that recognizes humanity as the true self of each individual, and the power to give effect to that recognition. If society is reformable, why should not the saving impulse proceed from our little band as readily as from elsewhere? Why should we enroll ourselves under the banners of aliens and call ourselves by their names, thus sacrificing our own freedom of thought? Let us stand for ourselves, and for the most generous principles we can attain.

Let us inscribe "Social Truth and Righteousness" on our banners, and then follow them wherever they may lead. And they certainly will not lead to class hatred, to envy of the rich, or to contempt for the poor. Nor will they lead to loud-mouthed declamation about "natural rights," or to schemes for the use of dynamite. The bearers of them will find their programme in the opening verses of the forty-second chapter of Isaiah:

> Behold my servant whom I uphold,
> My chosen in whom my soul delights;
> I have put my spirit upon him,
> He will set forth the law to the nations.
>
> He will not cry aloud, nor roar as a lion,
> Nor cause his voice to be heard in the street.
> A cracked reed he will not break,
> And a dimly burning wick he will not quench.
>
> Faithfully will he set forth the law;
> He will not burn dimly, nor be crushed in spirit,
> Till he have set the law in the earth,
> And for his instruction the far countries wait.

I sometimes think that this ideal of the grand old prophet will be realized through you, that in you will find expression the divine spirit, enabling you to set forth the law of righteousness to the nations. Keep these words continually before you, and do your best to make them true. Even those of you who have cast away the coarse outer husks, that so long have hidden the kernel of the prophet's message, can certainly find it easy to accept this teaching. And this is all that prophecy means; the rest is mere clothes, which must be changed to suit times and seasons.

And now, my dear friends, good night. May you grow daily in knowledge, in sympathy, and in helpfulness.

Yours with a love that will not tire,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, May 23, 1900.

My dear Friends: It is just a week since I parted with some of you at the station, and it seems a year. How many years will it be before I see you again, at this rate?

Your secretary's good letter came on Monday, and brought me good news of you. Your discussion of "Eating, Drinking, and Sleeping" seems to have been profitable. At any rate it must have drawn your attention to a very important matter. I trust that you will all put the truth you learned into practice. "Simplicity and regularity" should be your motto in the matter of eating. Each of you should have, at least, eight hours' unbroken sleep every night. I fear some of you are in the habit of sitting up too late. You seem to have said nothing about drinking, — a fact which is both characteristic and encouraging. I hope at some future time to arrange a series of lectures on hygiene for you.

Your discussion with regard to a name for our class interests me greatly. That we must now have a name seems clear, and the question what it shall be has exercised me a good deal. We must, of course, avoid all pedantic names, and names that would commit us to anything but truth and righteousness. You know that

my ambition has been, and is, to see our little enterprise develop into a Breadwinners' College. I think I said so in my report to the Educational Alliance last winter. The chairman of the house committee, and, indeed, the committee generally, have suggested that we adopt that name at once, and I am not sure but that is the best we can do. Before doing so, however, you must see that there be no objection on the part of the trustees of the Alliance. I understand that steps have been taken to insure their concurrence. The name, at our present stage, may seem a little arrogant, but whether or not it shall really be so depends upon you. If you adopt it you must realize that you take a solemn pledge to make it mean what it says. If you are reluctant to do that, then choose another name. Furthermore, if you resolve to be a college in all seriousness, then we must try to conduct the whole of the higher education undertaken by the Alliance. I think the trustees would allow us to do this, if not immediately, in course of time. I am chairman of the committee on literature and science, and I should be glad to work in that direction, if you feel equal to the task. That there is sufficient ability among you to carry it on successfully is very certain. Everything depends on your will and enthusiasm. Now, consider all this carefully, and then make up your minds. Here is a glorious field for you!

I am glad you are to have a lecture from Dr. H——. Give him my kindest regards when he comes. Make him tell you a great deal about the character of the Boers, and about the manner in which they treat people of a faith different from their own.

You cannot be too grateful to Mr. F—— for being willing to give up a third evening every week to the interests of the class. If you become a college he will make an excellent head of the æsthetic department. I could name several other heads of departments, and so can you.

While waiting for your list of books (to be bought), let me suggest two: (1) "Open Sesame" (Ginn & Company), for those who are going to undertake to teach classes of young boys and girls; (2) Rossetti's "Dante and his Circle." This contains an almost faultless translation of Dante's "Vita Nuova," a book which every one of you ought to read. It is the purest love story that ever was written.

Let us be in no hurry to use up all our book fund. Let us leave something to get the books we may need for actual use from time to time. For the present let us buy standard books. Of the books of the day we shall get many presents, I am sure.

Our map of the ancient world can now be hung up on the wall of the room where Mr. C——'s history class is held. There is an historical atlas by Freeman which you ought to possess. You might also get Kurtz's "Geschichtstabellen."

As many of you as can conveniently join the Sunday morning philosophical class should do so. Its work for the summer is Plato, and every one of you ought to know about him. He is one of the masters of the world's thought, and though he was vastly mistaken in many important things he cannot be neglected.

To my great sorrow, I find I have lost, or mislaid, the list of the names and addresses of the class. Another

should be made out as soon as possible. I suppose the treasurer is attending to that for his own sake. I shall be glad to have a copy of the new list.

I need not tell you how glad I am that you are progressing so rapidly, and that you are managing your own affairs so successfully. Now is the time for you to form yourselves into little knots for the pursuit of different kinds of good work. You would do well to form relations with other clubs that are doing good work, such as the Hebrew Benevolent Association, which I hear highly spoken of. Indeed, the more relations you can enter into, the more useful you will be.

But, with all your doing, do your best to avoid overwork and overstrain. Live rational lives, as far as it is possible for you to do so. Avoid late hours and all sorts of excitement. Few of you, I am sure, care anything about frivolous amusements, and in that you have a great advantage over many people who are better situated than you are.

And now, dear friends, good night.

I am always affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, May 30, 1900.

My dear Friends: I am much interested to hear of your discussion in regard to the name of our new enterprise, for new it is. We cannot any longer call ourselves a Class in History and Sociology. We have outgrown that name, and must have a new one. The question is, What shall it be?

Some time ago I expressed the hope that we might develop into a Breadwinners' College. Nevertheless, I was somewhat surprised when the house committee wrote to me saying that they thought we ought to assume that name at once; and I advised caution and reflection. I said that, unless the class felt that they could in a short time make the name a reality, they had better not assume it. Since then, I have thought a good deal about the matter, and have received an account of your discussion from several of you. The more I think of it the more it seems advisable to adopt the name, and the less weighty appear the objections urged against it. There seems to be no objection to it on the part of the Alliance.

That a Breadwinners' College is greatly needed on the East Side no one, I suppose, doubts. The question is, Is there ability and enthusiasm enough among you to carry one on? My own belief is that there is; but you know best. There is certainly a glorious opportunity offered you to do the most beneficent work for your fellow-men, — work whose influence would be far-reaching and eternal. Many of you, I know, are eager for such work and are asking where it can be found. Here it is, almost thrust in your faces. Of all philanthropic work, education is the noblest and most effective. It is that which best diffuses truth and righteousness, the lack of which is the cause of nearly all human ills. But it is no light work, and I can well understand your desiring to think twice before undertaking it. The word "college" seems to frighten some of you, and make you begin to think of examinations and degrees,

and all the other formalities of our present institutions. There is no reason for such dread. You will never be expected to enter the lists against colleges which do this. It is just because our present colleges are so unsatisfactory, so unsuited to the great body of American people, that colleges of a new sort, Breadwinners' Colleges, are necessary. We want to educate the breadwinners better than our present college men are educated. We want to make them better men and women in all the relations of life, — pure, high-minded, public-spirited, generous, cultured. The day has come when the toiling millions who have so long been denied their share in the treasures of art, science, culture, and freedom, won by the men and women of past ages, must come to their inheritance; and they can do so only through education. We are engaged in a new movement, one of the most momentous that the world has ever known, — the spiritual elevation of the vast majority of mankind. A century ago, it was the bourgeois class that fought for, and won, its freedom. To-day, it is the working class that is fighting for the same thing, — the breadwinners. It is they who are demanding culture and freedom, and colleges where these may be learned. Are you going to take a leading part in this glorious movement, or are you not? That is the question. Are you going to be heroes and heroines in the cause of the last great emancipation, or are you going to fold your hands and leave yourselves and your fellows in bondage? If you feel brave enough to embrace the former alternative, then form yourselves into a Breadwinners' College, and vow to yourselves, in the silence of your own

breasts, that you will do your share in banishing ignorance, sin, poverty, and misery from the face of the earth. The freeing movement must begin somewhere. Why not with you? If you found a Breadwinners' College now, and make it a success, you may live to see a copy of it in every city ward and in every country village. Think of it! Think how full of interest and joy your lives would be if you felt that you had taken the first great step in the emancipation of the millions of toilers that now groan in ignorance! A little knot of earnest Jews has turned the world upside down before now. Why may not the same thing — nay, a far better thing — happen in your day, and among you? Have you forgotten the old promise made to Abraham, — "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed"? You can bring the promise to fulfillment if you will. A little heroism, a little self-sacrifice, and the thing is done.

The working classes of France are to-day founding "Popular Universities" by the hundred. Are you afraid to found one Breadwinners' College? Take this into consideration.

If you decide to adopt the name, we must, of course, begin on a small scale; but if our institution meets a popular need, it will grow with incredible rapidity. Think well on this.

I am pleased to know that the discussion on "Cleanliness and Exercise" was conducted with vigor. Why did Mr. —— fail to perform what he voluntarily undertook? Is he unwell? I am sure these discussions, by calling attention to many important questions in

practical ethics, will do great good. Your conclusion in the present instance leaves nothing to be desired. I hope every one of you will live up to it.

I wish you were all here in this glorious world. Never were the mountains more beautiful. I shall be glad to entertain any of you for a week, if you can find your way up here. I feel almost ashamed to be luxuriating in this paradise, but I am laying up strength for work with you next winter. I hope to return to you in health and vigor.

I am writing a history of the class and its ideals. I hope you will all live up to these ideals.

I am always affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, June 5, 1900.

My dear Friends: I am glad to know that you are having serious discussions, and trust that they are carried on for the sake of truth, and not in a contentious way, for the sake of victory.

The suggestion that we should call ourselves The Breadwinners' College came, as you know, immediately from the house committee. It took me by surprise at first, but the more I thought of it, the more it seemed to me to present an ideal which you could be glad to realize, to offer an opportunity for the very noblest kind of work. But I had no thought of imposing it on you, or of committing you to anything that you did not feel equal to. It may be that my confidence in your earnestness led me astray. I do not know any

legal objection to our calling ourselves a college. My reason for preferring "college" to "institute" was that the latter is too vague and might mean a polytechnic school, as the Stevens Institute is. I had hoped to add to our college, some day, such a school. Use your own best judgment, and come to your own decision. It is your affair.

I am sorry to learn that a disputatious spirit, a tendency to wrangle over little parliamentary points, has begun to show itself among you. It would be truly sad if this were to continue, and I am fain to hope that such childish frivolity came from some outsiders who had been unwarily admitted and who had not acquired your earnest spirit. I pointed out to you, in a previous letter, the need of care in the matter of fresh admissions. You will now understand why I did so. I think it would be wise to allow none but members to take part in the discussions. Otherwise you will be in danger of continual disturbance from people who have not reached your standpoint. I trust you will all aid your worthy chairman in putting a stop to such unworthy exhibitions.

Your treatment of the dress question seems to have run into somewhat strange channels. It is interesting to find any one citing Paine's unintelligent remark, and funny to think of Paine's accepting the fig-leaf story as historical. He had n't then reached the "age of reason." Carlyle's statements must always be received with caution. His extreme prejudice led him into extraordinary blunders. I am glad you decided that not every industry which affords employment is morally justified. I wish some one of you would make a list of immoral industries.

The moral significance of dress you do not seem to have touched on. Did you ever ask yourselves: (1) What connection is there between dress and intelligence, and why do the lower animals not dress? (2) What connection is there between the use of dress and the use of tools? (3) How far does dress express character? (4) How far is it hypocritical? Consider these.

And now I come to a question I have done my best to avoid, — the question of socialism. You know what my views are, and you know that I have never tried to impose them upon you. I wished to put off the whole question until such time as you should have gained sufficient knowledge and sufficient experience to answer it. I hope you will pardon me if I say that at present you have neither. After it arose in my mind in 1865 it took me twenty-six years of study and experience in various countries to come to a definite conclusion regarding it, to realize its full meaning, to see its moral implications and its relations to liberty. There is no reason, therefore, why you should feel hurt if I say that at present you are not ready to answer it. You will all be wiser twenty-six years hence than you are now, else it will be sad indeed.

I did not wish you even to give much attention to socialism at present, and my reason was this. I knew that a certain number of you, on the basis of very slender knowledge and experience, had already drawn a conclusion, and placarded yourselves socialists. That certainly was no fit frame of mind for undertaking the study. I hoped that when, owing to our studies together, you should have seen reason to doubt the justice of your

conclusion, and recovered your impartiality of judgment, we might take up the question together in connection with the masquerade scene in the second part of "Faust" where it is admirably treated. I shall be sorry if you cannot wait until next winter when we shall take that up. We may not be able to answer the question even then, but I think we shall be able to put it correctly, which is no small step forward. Meanwhile, I trust you will drop your socialist placards and try to obtain an unbiased frame of mind. In saying this, I am merely pleading for scientific coolness of judgment. I merely wish you to lay aside all passion and sentimentality, and let science do its perfect work. I see from several letters, which I have received within a week, that some of you have considerable difficulty in doing this.

Your secretary makes you say, "We see reason enough why we should be socialists." I wonder whether the whole class would have been willing to subscribe to this. If Marxian socialism is meant, I know that some of you would have declined. Only if socialism is taken to mean enthusiasm of humanity, a fervent desire for, and endeavor after, the highest welfare of every human being, would all of you have subscribed, I am sure. In that sense I hope I am a socialist of the most ardent sort, but in no other. It is unfortunate that the term "socialism" has been degraded from its true significance, and made to mean an economic system in which the state shall own all the means of production and private capital be prohibited. Such socialism is a matter of kitchen and scullery, and I doubt seriously whether many of you profess it. Those who do have certainly

accepted it on faith and not through reason. I do not, of course, presume to interfere with anybody's faith; that is his own affair; but faith, which makes sects and sectarians, should not be confounded with science, which makes free and universal men and women. Those who placard themselves socialists are simply sinking down into a sect and abandoning the glorious universality of science. I have managed to live nearly sixty years without wearing a single placard, and all the best that is in me, including my interest in and love for you, is due to that fact. Placards narrow one's influence and paralyze one's hands. How many men do I know whose lives have been sterilized and travestied by the early adoption of some placard, philosophic or religious!

Once more your secretary makes you say: "We are sure that, so far as the end is concerned, you agree with us, so far as the means we differ; we all have the same idea, and we are approaching it each (in) his own way." I am glad to believe that that is true, but it certainly is not so if what you are made to say immediately before is true, viz.: "We hope to utilize all the good you have taught us toward the attainment of such a form of government where true worth and position will consist in honor and fitness, where every individual will be the concern of the state, and where the state will see to it that all things good, true, and beautiful are enjoyed by all to the full extent of their value. This to us is socialism." Now, if this is the end you are aiming at, it is certainly not the one I am aiming at. This is to me not socialism, but superstition, and the saddest form of it.

In the old, prescientific days men, through their imaginations, formed images of gods, and then bowed down before them, in fear and terror, cowering before their own products. We look down upon such people; but how much better are we than they if, misusing our intelligence, we set up such abstract idols as the state, and then expect it to do everything for us? The state is a pure, helpless, inactive abstraction; you and I and our fellows are the only reality which can effect anything. Take us away, and what could the state do? The state is a mere abbreviation for a certain number of individuals acting together in a certain way for a certain purpose. It is the individuals that do everything, and it is to them that you must look if you wish anything done. What is true of "state" is true of "government," and all similar terms. When taken for realities, they become mere idols, and all reliance on them is practical idolatry and crass superstition. What you are trying to do (if you are correctly reported) is to set up new idols and look to them for help and paternal care; what I am trying to do is to induce you so to develop your own powers that you shall be able to help and care for yourselves. I wish to see you free and independent, not bound and dependent. Then you yourselves "will see to it that all things good, beautiful, and true are enjoyed by all," without waiting for your abstract idol to do it for you.

Your setting up the state as a helpful idol shows, in the clearest possible way, how much preparation, even of a philosophic sort (for the error is a philosophic one), you need, before you can hope to deal successfully with

such questions as that of socialism. Goethe says, or rather makes Mephistopheles say,

> Am Ende hängen wir doch ab
> Von Kreaturen die wir machten.

That is true so long as we are in the power of Mephistopheles. In one sense, all the evil of the world has come from our worshiping the "creatures which we have made," — gods, state, government, etc. The whole aim of modern philosophy is to clear away these creatures, idols, and phantoms that have so long deluded and enslaved us, and to show us that we ourselves are the true reality on which everything depends. This was my main purpose in opening the class in philosophy.

Your secretary further makes you say, "We even go so far as to adopt the theories of political economy, proposed, after many years of unceasing, untiring, true philanthropic labor, by Karl Marx." When I read these words I could not believe my own eyes; and, frankly, I do not believe they are true. I cannot believe that the class which I have known for a year and a half would "adopt" theories from anybody, however untiring or philanthropic. I cannot imagine anything more alien to the spirit which I have tried to evoke than bowing before any man's authority, or "adopting" untried theories on any account. I had hoped to see each of you work out his or her own theories, and not be a mere play actor of others' theories. So only are you free. Was I altogether wrong?

Still further on you are made to say: "A Marx Circle has been organized to meet (on) Sunday mornings

from 9 to 11. We intend to study his work; to test it with all our powers; to seek the truth for its own sake and to act accordingly." I do not know what to make of this. First, it seems, you "adopt" Marx's theories, and then you proceed to "test them with all your power; to seek the truth for its own sake." In other words, after having found and "adopted" the truth, you still go on to seek it! What can this mean? Is it not just the old mediæval position, *Credo ut intelligam* (I believe that I may understand)? "I do not seek to understand that I may believe," says St. Anselm, "but I believe that I may understand. For I believe, further, that unless I believe, I shall not understand." Have you gone back to faith and mediævalism? Your words mean at least that you have "adopted" Marx's theories on faith, since you now find it necessary to form a circle in order to "study" and "test" them. I do not for a moment believe that this is what the class means, and I should be glad to have an expression of its views on the mediæval method. It would, indeed, be strange if "Das Kapital" were to be treated as a new revelation, or a new Torah, which had to be "adopted" on faith as authoritative and then studied with a view to understanding. Must the Hebrew accept a new Torah? You must now see what good reason I had to put off the discussion of socialism until such time as you had ceased to "adopt" its theories on faith and had regained an unbiased attitude.

I cannot see how any one can talk of the "true philanthropic labor" of Marx. That dogma must be one of those adopted on faith, which, according to

Cardinal Manning, "must conquer history." Is that labor philanthropic which fosters class hatred; which seeks to make one class of the people believe that its sufferings are all due to the rapacity and cruelty of another; which makes war upon the free institutions which it has taken thousands of years to build up; which, instead of striving to raise the unfree to the level of the free, tries to drag down the free to the level of the unfree; which would take away the conditions of private initiative, which has been the chief agent in human progress; which would put an end to the struggle which has developed all that is truly human, all that has any moral value, in us, and reduce us to the condition of children cared for by a paternal abstraction? One of the objections which the "Abend Blatt" has to me is, that I have tried to put an end to the spirit of hatred and vengeance, and reconcile class with class. Can the spirit which urges such objections be called philanthropic? Surely a socialism which fosters social hatred is a contradiction in terms.

I am glad to hear that some of you are ready to start new classes and circles; but, in duty to the Alliance, I must ask those persons *before doing so* to tell me (1) just what they propose to do; (2) who are going to join them. I told Mr. C—— some time ago that I disapproved of the class in logic as unnecessary. In addition to the objection then given, there is this: that next winter, when we come to deal with Aristotle, we shall be able to take up logic in its proper connection, and so to see its real meanings and bearings. I must, therefore, deprecate the opening of a logic class at present.

As to the Marx Circle, it would obviously be pure waste of time for persons who have already "adopted" Marx's theories. I therefore deprecate that as useless. Even if you had not "adopted" these theories, the time has not come for you to study Marx or modern socialism with any hope of a right result. Socialism, like everything else, must be seen in its historical relations. To consider it apart from these would be to condemn yourselves to prejudice and misunderstanding. The economic man is a mere abstraction, and cannot be studied to any purpose apart from the whole nature of man. If you are really interested in socialism, then study it genetically, and in connection with all human history. To aid in this, I recommend to the philosophy class, for summer study, the works of Plato, the first great socialist. Later on, we shall be able to study Marx from the standpoint of universal history.

I read Marx's "Das Kapital" when it first came out in 1867; but I recognized that I was not then able to deal with it, not having sufficient knowledge. I read the enlarged edition sixteen years later, and then I was far beyond it. Has the whole ever appeared in English?

And now, my dear friends, I hope you will not misunderstand all this. I have not the least intention of interfering with your liberty of thought, or imposing my views upon you. I am merely trying to protect you against having the views of others imposed upon you as matters of faith, and to induce you to conduct your studies in a truly scientific spirit and method, with patience and without passion. If you should look at social questions through the veil of your own

sufferings, you would certainly see them all distorted. You must try to look at them dispassionately, and from many points of view, like men and women who are eager to discover the truth and to live by it.

I think that your secretary has (unwittingly, I am quite sure) misrepresented a part of you at least, and perhaps the whole, attributing to you his own views. Here, as often, the wish has been father to the thought. I am sure that, as soon as he recognizes his mistake, he will acknowledge it, and make due apology. I trust that no attempt will be made to commit the class, now or ever, to any creed, social or other, or to impose any placard upon it that might make it less than human. I hope that the rooms of the Alliance, which at my request were intrusted to me, will not be used for propaganda of any sort. They were given to earnest students, not to apostles of sectarian creeds. There is always a desire on the part of fanatics to capture any promising movement for its own ends. Soon after I founded the society which afterward took the name of Fabian, — a name meant to show that it wished to delay, and devote itself to profound study, before beginning any apostolic work, — a number of socialists being unwarily admitted into it turned it aside from its noble purpose, and committed it to a creed "adopted" on faith. I then, of course, left it. I hope no such misfortune will happen to our present work. I hope you will go on developing yourselves into great individuals and personalities, ready for anything, prepared to do your highest duty, without waiting indefinitely for a great social revolution.

Please to send me a list of the books you wish to buy for immediate use. I have quite a number which I wish to send you.

I am much delighted to hear of Mr. L——'s present. You will not omit to thank him for it. I am sorry he has to leave without visiting me as he hoped to do. He sails to-day for France.

And now good-bye. Let nothing disturb the delightful relation that exists between us. Let us remain brothers and sisters, devoted to simple truth and righteousness.

I am ever yours affectionately,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, June 13, 1900.

My dear Friends: Your last week's discussion upon "Worry and Excitement" seems to have covered a pretty wide field. The recommendation of sodium bromide, as an antidote to worry, was bad. We ought to be able to depend entirely on the natural powers. Hindoo contemplation likewise is a poor specific. The true specific is the complete mastery of one's self; but this involves a good many conditions, — health, courage, patience, and a satisfactory view of the meaning of life. That was what gave Socrates his infinite calm. I am very sorry Miss C——'s paper, which was excellent, did not arrive in time. It was posted on Friday morning. I hope she will still read it. Would you kindly give your papers to the secretary ten days before the date at which they are to be read? It takes some time to bring them here, to read, and to return them.

I must correct a mistake, and apologize to your recording secretary for making it. He did not say that the whole class were socialists, or had adopted Marx's social theories; he asserted this only of a certain indefinite portion. I am sincerely sorry for having misrepresented him, and hope he will accept this apology.

I am distressed to learn, from many quarters, that there are a few unruly members in the class who obstruct the work of the evening by making frivolous points of a parliamentary sort, and who try to set up their own wills against the well-considered and wholesome rules of the house committee. I hope you will do your best to convince these brothers of the wrong they are doing the whole class, and induce them to behave in a thoughtful, kindly spirit. The house committee has my complete confidence, and has done its work admirably, deserving the gratitude of every one. Among the few malcontents there seems to prevail the notion that, somehow or other, they are being deprived of their rights, because they must leave the rooms at eleven o'clock. Now you all know that none of us have any rights of any sort in these rooms, but only privileges, and I am very sure that most of you are truly grateful for these. At my earnest request the generous gentlemen whose money supports the Educational Alliance gave these rooms for the use of the class; and the conditions of the gift they, of course, must be allowed to determine. They may close and open the rooms when they please, and no one has any right whatever to complain. We ought to be grateful that they are open at all. The rooms were intrusted to me, and as the representatives of our kind benefactors

I appointed a house committee to take charge of the rooms with their contents and to regulate their use. Any complaint against them is a complaint against me and the gentlemen of the Alliance. I am glad to know that the efforts of the committee have been duly appreciated by all except a small number who have sent their names to me. Apart from these, I know that you all recognize the evil of late hours, and would not willingly encourage them. In any case, the regulations of the house committee must be observed without complaint or rebellion. We are all anxious to have the best use made of the rooms; but we cannot sacrifice the good of all to the wishes of a few. If, however, any large majority of the class should desire to have the rooms kept open until midnight, and would state their reasons, I should be most happy to give these due consideration. I hope, however, there will be no further talk of rights which do not exist, and that the few malcontents will recognize their mistake and become quiet.

There seems to be some trouble about the payment of the very small dues which the class voted to levy upon its members monthly. That is beyond measure surprising. In order that there may be no difficulty about so small a matter, I shall ask the treasurer to send me every month the names of those members who have not paid their dues, and I will pay these out of my own pocket, in order that there may be no suspensions. As far as I can see, the house committee and the treasurer have only done their duty.

We must, in the future, exercise a little caution in the admission of new members. Now that we have our

own rooms, we are exposed to dangers that did not exist before, and we must meet them with caution. Henceforth, those who wish to become members will give their names, and their reasons for desiring admission, to the president of the Young Women's Club. The club, after considering these, will send them to me, and I will deal with them as may seem best. Of course we will exclude no one who desires to come in as a listener or as a pupil. We are a class, and not a club.

I take these things into my own hands, or turn them over to committees, in order that the time of the class on Saturday evenings may not be wasted on business matters which really belong to the Alliance. The class will henceforth be able to devote its whole time to its proper work, while the small matters of business will be managed by the house committee and the treasurer. Only if there is any need to alter the amount of the monthly dues will the whole class be called upon to attend to business. It will be understood that the house committee is responsible to me, as representing the Alliance, and not to the class, which will make its suggestions to me.

The matter of the Marx Circle does not, I am glad to think, concern the class as a whole, and, therefore, need not be considered here. I have written about it to those concerned.

This is not, my very dear friends, the kind of letter I like to write to you, and I am very sorry it has had to be done. I sincerely trust it is the last of the sort, and that we can return to far more important subjects, — indeed, to our proper work.

I have been very proud of your ability to carry on that work by yourselves, and of the harmony that has prevailed among you. I trust nothing will occur to diminish that pride, but that the class will go on toward ever greater truth and righteousness.

I am, as always,

Most affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, June 19, 1900.

My dear Friends: I am glad to hear that you passed Saturday evening in a lively and interesting way. I am sorry when papers returned by me do not reach you in time; but I do the best I can. You must remember it takes some time to read over papers, and that I cannot always do it the day they arrive. I am very, very busy. You should give me three or four days for each paper.

Your letter this week greatly relieves me; for information reaching me from many quarters was leaving me with the conviction that an unfriendly and caviling spirit was growing up in the class. I have now received several assurances that this has been exaggerated, and I am very glad. If we cannot attain social harmony in the class, how shall we attain it in the great world? The class ought to be the school for the world.

I am afraid the name you have chosen for yourselves ("The Breadwinners' Institute") will not answer. It is too vague. It might be a pathological institute, and then we should expect to find insane people in it. The word "institute" by itself has nothing that suggests

culture. You had perhaps better leave the subject for the present.

I have already suggested that you should form yourselves into knots or clubs for practical work. There is nothing invidious or exclusive in that. There are many kinds of work to be done, demanding as many kinds of talent. People who are already friends work best together, and save much time otherwise wasted in the attempt to reach a mutual understanding. Let each little group of friends unite for some definite form of welldoing; then let all the groups meet from time to time for consultation and mutual aid. Let each name itself from its purpose, and not from any belief or principle. This is the only way to avoid idols and fanaticism. Aristotle wisely said, "The form of a thing is its end or purpose." Let your purposes give form and name to your clubs. Remember that variety in unity is the formula for high organization and high social institutions, and that names or placards expressive of creeds are mere idols and instruments of fanaticism.

At certain decadent periods in the world's history men return to a childish dotage. Then they wish to do away with variety and revert to unity or sameness. If the dotage is of the intellectual sort, such as we find in the Buddhists, it demands *nirvana*, utter unconsciousness, in which alone multiplicity can be extinguished. If it is of the passionate, fanatical sort, such as occurred in the Frenchmen of the Revolution, it demands the extinction of all social differences and distinctions, and the introduction of universal equality. In either case, it demands the destruction of all that gives meaning and

zest to life. Along with this dotage, strange to say, there goes another form of childishness which might seem almost incompatible with it, — the fondness for names or placards designative of creeds or sects. In old Israel, Greece, and Rome no one wore such placards. Only in the days of their decay did these arise. But not only in periods of decay do these things happen: they happen at all times among people whose minds are in a childish state. Even at the present day there is a large number of childish people who desire the abolition of all social distinctions, and take delight in placards. Such are the socialists, anarchists, and other sectarians. No truly great man or woman, no one who has attained spiritual freedom, ever belongs to a sect or wears a placard. What placard would fit Moses, Isaiah, Jesus, Æschylus, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cæsar, Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe, Kant, Washington, Emerson, and the like of them. I hope, therefore, that in forming your clubs you will aim at variety in unity, and avoid all creed placards. All true and useful unity is variety of function determined by purpose.

The adoption of creed placards is in every way degrading, narrowing, and injurious. It builds up idolatrous walls of distinction between sect and sect; it unbrothers men; it panders to prejudice and blunts the sense of truth. Both Catholics and Protestants call themselves Christians; but they distrust and hate each other. Christians and Muslims both call themselves religious men and worshipers of one God; but their swords are at each other's throats. Socialists and anarchists spring from a common root; yet they detest each other, and both

detest the men who wear no placards. Let me beseech you, my dear friends, to avoid placards and sects as you would idolatry, superstition, or aught that beclouds the heaven of truth and right. I found in Emerson — that American of Americans — the other day, three lines that marvelously express one of my deepest convictions:

> Oh, what is Heaven but the fellowship
> Of minds that each can stand against the world
> By its own meek and incorruptible will?

And again this: "The great man is he who in the midst of the crowd keeps, with perfect sweetness, the independence of solitude." How can any one keep such independence if he attaches himself to a sect and wears its badge? How can any one be great who fears to face the world by himself?

The day has come, I think, for banishing all badges and placards and idols and sects: the day of moral freedom, when each man's bounden duty is to stand for himself in all his incommunicable uniqueness, and to express to the world what he alone in all the world knows — *himself*. That alone is manhood; that alone is nobility. Mr. C—— is entirely right in setting great store by systematic reading. Even good literature read carefully but unsystematically is of small value. System is unity in variety, and the variety must not be neglected. Dante is good literature; but the man who knows Dante only does not even know him.

And now, good night. I am, my dear friends,

Most affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, June 26, 1900.

My dear Friends: I am much rejoiced by your letter received to-day, and particularly by the account of the kindly reception given to the recent graduates. That was a most gracious thing to do, and I only regret that I was not there. Mr. D——, who is here and who takes to the woods like a deer, has regrets of the same sort.

I was sorry to have to throw cold water on the name you proposed to give yourselves; but it really was not designative enough. Had you put an adjective before "Institute," it might have done — Breadwinners' Culture Institute or East Side Culture Institute. The breadwinners of Paris are bold enough to call their culture institutes "Popular Universities," and they don't do such good or such connected work as we do.

One fact is giving me great delight, and that is, that so many of you are beginning to devote yourselves to active work. There is no education like that. Indeed, any education that does not result in that is vain. The great defect in the ordinary college and university education is, that it stops with knowing and does not go on to loving and doing. It, therefore, never really gets appropriated; for knowing that does not pass into habit and act is never ours, but remains an external thing, — a mere useless accomplishment to be vain about. And vanity is a poor substitute for work. If every one of you would translate his and her knowledge into love and work, we should have an educative institute — call it anything you like — such as the world has never seen. We should not need to tell anybody that; the

fact would speak for itself. Once more let me suggest the propriety of forming yourselves into little clubs for work. Let each group of friends form such a club with a definite end; let it work quietly and steadily, and it will be productive of such noble joy and satisfaction that life will be transformed for you. Let your chief thought be for others and their needs and interests. It is Wordsworth who says:

> The man whose eye
> Is ever on himself doth look on one,
> The least of Nature's works, one who might move
> The wise man to that scorn which wisdom holds
> Unlawful, ever.

To live is to have interests; to live nobly is to have broad or universal interests. There is no reason why our class should not be the very providence and inspiration of the whole East Side, if its members, bound together by love, will only forget their own troubles, and devote themselves to the spiritual elevation of their neighbors. That is the very essence of religion; if you do that, it does not make so much difference what you believe. But you must never forget that the first of all spiritual blessings is freedom. In the moral world, to be means to be free.

If you fully realize this, you will understand why certain doctrines which have shown themselves among some of you — doctrines fatal to all true liberty — have filled me with dismay, and made me act as I hate to have to act. It is the sense of freedom that imparts to us all true dignity and nobility, and makes it impossible for us to descend to envy, hatred, or meanness.

Therefore, in all that we do, our first care should be the safeguarding of moral liberty and its conditions.

What I hear about Dr. H——'s lecture is very satisfactory. Had he come as a mere theoretical partisan, I should have been sorry, for among truth seekers there should be no parties; but since he came to tell you facts, and left you to draw your own conclusions, he was conferring a real benefit. I have never ventured to discuss current questions in the class, for the reason that it is almost impossible to do so without seeming to drag in the spirit of party. On the Boer question I entirely agree with Dr. H——; but that is a purely personal matter. Having no first-hand facts, I could not make propaganda for my opinion. And this reminds me of a little incident which happened shortly before I left town. At the close of the class one evening a young man came up and asked me to keep the members together for a few minutes and interest them in a recent strike. I flatly refused, — I fear with unnecessary brusqueness, — which perhaps laid me open to misinterpretation. I refused because our class, as such, has nothing to do with strikes. The day will come, I trust, when it will be possible for us to discuss, in a truly scientific way, the whole question of strikes, boycotts, etc.; and then each of you will be in a position to determine for himself what his duty is in any particular case. You may, perhaps, come to find that you have a duty before the strike begins — to prevent it. We all recognize, I am sure, that strikes are things to be avoided if possible. Just think what a glorious thing it would be if we could convince employers and employees that their best interests are bound

up together; if we could induce the former to do their best for the latter, and the latter to beware of making unreasonable or capricious demands on the former; in a word, if we could replace the spirit of jealousy by the spirit of love! And why should we despair of doing this? There is one thing that nothing in the world is proof against, and that is love. It is the universal solvent. Blessed are they that love; for theirs is the kingdom of earth, — aye, and the kingdom of heaven. The people that love most will in the end rule the earth.

I am quite unwell to-night; but I am very happy because I know that it is well with you, — that the spirit of love prevails among you. Professor B—— is here and sends you warmest greetings. I owe several of you letters. They shall be sent as soon as I am able to write them.

Good night! I am ever most affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, July 3, 1900.

My dear Friends: The account sent me of your last Saturday's discussion is very satisfactory. You seem to have taken up the subject seriously and to have brought out many sides of it. One conclusion arrived at seems to me deserving of deeper consideration. That one should always tell what he supposes to be the truth when he speaks is certain. But there are times when it is even inopportune to speak the truth, and what we think the truth is not always such. Any man who has reached middle life knows that he has had to abandon

many things that earlier seemed to him true, and he is glad if he has not preached them and, so to speak, made himself responsible for them. One should be in no hurry to be an apostle of things about which there is no scientific agreement. There is enough to teach, about which there is no reasonable doubt. Why waste ourselves on the doubtful when the certain has not been impressed? There are many subjects about which young people, from the very nature of the case, are not fit to pronounce a judgment — things which require long experience and that temper of mind which comes only with years. They show good judgment in recognizing this, and waiting patiently till the experience and temper come. I am sometimes asked, "Why should I not preach socialism, since I believe in it with my whole heart and soul?" The answer is: "You have no right to believe in it in any such way. You have not had the necessary study and experience." I know you will find this a very hard saying. When I was twenty I thought I knew everything; at sixty I am sure that I know very little. Inexperience is the supreme flatterer. Experience insists upon the truth, which is not always indulgent to our opinion of ourselves. How often has she trampled upon my most cherished beliefs and convicted me of rash judgment and vanity! How many beliefs have I had to abandon because I had adopted them rashly!

July 4.

While, therefore, you should use every effort to arrive at the truth, you should be very slow in asserting that you have found it, and in assuming the right to preach it

to others. Preaching is altogether a poor business, anyhow. It is the trade of sophists, rhetoricians, and dogmatists. Socrates, the supreme teacher, never preached: he had too much respect for the autonomy of his fellowmen for that. His power lay not in preaching or in imposing any particular set of doctrines, but in teaching men to do their own thinking, which is the best service we can do them at any time. What is any particular set of truths compared with the training of the faculty for all truth? Creeds make sects; truth makes men. I trust, therefore, you will endeavor to arrive at truth and to live it. Above all, cultivate the faculty for truth, the power of seeing things without veil or prejudice.

Since I last wrote to you, two of your number have come here, much to my satisfaction and delight. They both seem to be enjoying themselves in this wild region. Mr. D—— and Mr. C—— have just gone down to the brook to bathe, while Mr. F—— is struggling away with compound fractions.

This will be a short letter, the reason being that I have been quite unwell in the last few days. But I want to ask a favor of you. Will those of you who have been, or are, engaged in shops or factories give an account of your experience, in writing? A collection of such accounts would be most valuable, and might be published.

And now good night.

I am most affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, July 11, 1900.

My dear Friends: I am sorry I was not able to return the second paper that was due last Saturday; but I am suffering a great deal, and have a great deal of work. I send it along with this.

I am glad that you seem to have agreed about the duty of children to parents, and its limitation. To draw the line of duty is by no means easy, and requires the utmost tact and fineness of nature. But you have the right ideas.

Nothing in connection with the class gives me so much pleasure as the fact that so many of you are engaging in real missionary work. That is the test of worth, and the most potent form of education. It is work that makes us serious, takes away all pessimism, and makes life rich in meaning. How well we are educated is shown by the work we are able to do. It makes me young again to follow you in your work. I wish every one of you would do what he or she can. Nothing would so much insure the unity and harmony of our class, nothing would give life so much zest, nothing would so bring you into contact with reality, as practical work. There seem to be only two clubs in the class; there ought to be a dozen, each with its sphere of work.

The three boys who are here seem to be very happy. They are all working bravely. I wish you were all here. Mr. C—— has got into his tent to-day. I can see his light through the wet woods as he works away at "Parmenides." It is delightful to think that several more of you will be here in a few days. I am counting the days till they come.

I am yours with much love,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, July 18, 1900.

My dear Friends: You must not be anxious on my account. I am, indeed, suffering a great deal; but I do not apprehend any danger. I do as much work as I can, and I don't allow myself to be depressed. The three "boys" who are here are a great comfort to me. By the bye, —— has just left for New York, to pass his "personal examination."

Your discussion last Saturday seems to have touched on a good many important points. I heard Mr. D——'s paper before it was sent, and made the same strictures on it that you do. I am greatly interested to find that you all seem to take the right view of the marital relation, holding that it should be the union of two free beings, who remain free after marriage. If this were universally the case, we might expect to see marriage assume a new significance, and a new family life come into existence. It should always be remembered that the relation between husband and wife ought to be love, which, where it exists, does away with the need of legal restrictions and makes all things easy. The question of rights and duties should never come up in a married life, nor, indeed, in family life at all. That life antedates the rise of law. In "King Lear" Cordelia is all wrong when she talks to her father about her bond. Indeed it is this talk that forms the collision in the play.

Your discussions are excellent; but what is most encouraging is the practical work done by so many of the members of the class, work headed by the president. That work will tell in every way, and give us a good standing in the neighborhood, which is a great

matter. We must overcome all prejudice and compel the confidence of our neighbors. Then they will work with us, and the leaven of your good work will leaven the whole mass. We must teach the people about us to look to us as their friends and advisers in all matters, to tell us their joys, their sorrows, their doubts and difficulties; we must encourage them to make our rooms the center of their social life, and to abandon the saloons and the pool rooms. If we can do that, and our work begins to tell, we shall soon have a "settlement" which will deserve the name, a real breadwinners' home and college.

I read Mr. H——'s paper last evening. From a literary point of view it might be improved, but its spirit is excellent, and his offer is one that you ought to accept with avidity.

I hope your excursion to Bronx Park came off and was a success. What fun it would be if you could make an excursion to Glenmore! You must do that some day.

Good night. I am yours with love,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, July 24, 1900.

My dear Friends: The regular class letter has not come to-day, but I have one from Mr. F—— which tells me about the good work you are doing in practical ways. You can hardly imagine how much I am cheered by such news.

July 25.

When I had written the above words Mr. F—— and Mr. D—— came up, and before they left, the evening

was gone. We had a great talk. To-day I have Mr. H——'s letter, and am glad to see that the discussion on friendship was so fruitful. You should read, in this connection, the two books on friendship in Aristotle's "Nicomachean Ethics." I would add, that nothing gives such dignity and zest to life as noble friendships.

Mr. C——'s proposition in regard to the roof garden of the Alliance Building is worth considering, especially the notion of conducting children's classes during the day. But you must not scatter your efforts too much, and you must endeavor to work in the spirit of our class. Better do a few things well than many things indifferently or ill. You may find it hard to work under a director whose ideas are different from ours. But you are certainly right to lose no opportunity of doing good. You might arrange with the director to have the entire control of certain classes.

The account of the class's visit to Pelham, and the telegram they sent me thence, were most cheering. I am heartily sorry I was not there, and still more sorry that the excursion was not here. I hope the time will come when the whole class will be able to visit me among these glorious mountains.

Mr. K—— came a few days ago and is doing good work. We expect Miss C—— and Miss Z—— and Mr. S—— to-morrow to supper. I am looking forward with much joy to their coming. They are now sailing up the Hudson.

I am most affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, August 2, 1900.

My dear Friends: Everything seems to be going on smoothly with you and you seem to be doing such good work that I can only stand aside and admire. Every week brings me news of your noble efforts, and thus I am enabled to rise above my suffering, and to be happy in spite of it. Go on and prosper.

There are eight members of the class here now, and they all seem to be enjoying themselves. The weather is glorious, and they bathe, fell trees, make roads, climb mountains, and do everything that can contribute to health. They are all looking strong and robust. We shall have a bonfire to-morrow night.

Your discussion on love and friendship seems to have included many interesting points. Even if you do not arrive at definite conclusions, such discussions are most valuable, and I am watching the progress of them with the deepest interest. At the end of the summer you will be surprised to see what ground you have covered. You will have become aware of most of your social duties and gained motives to perform them.

The "eight" send you their warmest greetings, and

I am most affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, August 8, 1900.

My dear Friends: You will have to be content with a brief letter this week, as I am in poor condition.

I am much interested in all the work that some of you are doing, and hope that, sooner or later, you will all

be workers. I owe some of you letters, which shall be written as soon as I am able to do so.

I am not sure that any of you struck the limits of the respect due to public opinion. If I were able, I should try to make them clear to you. Mr. H——'s assertion that only in a socialistic state would the tyranny of public opinion be escaped is the exact opposite of the truth. In a socialistic state public opinion would be all powerful. Mr. H—— is always sane except when he talks his hobby.

I think of you every hour of the day, especially during the hot weather. I wish you were all here. Those who are here seem happy.

I am very affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, August 22, 1900.

My dear Friends: I was most sorry not to be able to send you a letter last week, and I am not able to send you much this week. I am still in great suffering.

It rejoices me greatly to hear of all the good work you are doing, and I take the deepest interest in your discussions. It grieves me that I have not been able to return all the essays sent to me; but the truth is, I am doing all the work I can. Let no one suppose that his or her essay has been neglected. I owe several of you letters, much to my sorrow. They will be written as soon as I am able to do so.

I am longing to return to you, and I shall probably do so in October, if not earlier. You will be glad to

hear that it is possible that I may get off without another operation, though I shall probably have to suffer for a long time.

With love to you all, I am

Yours for ever and ever,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

HURRICANE, August 29, 1900.

My dear Friends: All that I hear about you — your essays, excursions, charitable work — is most encouraging. I am looking forward to the time when I shall be able to rejoin you and work along with you. It seems probable that I shall have to undergo another operation, but then I hope to be well and keep well.

I am much interested in Mr. E——'s essay, and sincerely trust that he will put in practice what he preaches. He might send it to me.

I am glad you are laying out work for the winter. We must prove a center from which shall radiate wholesome influences of all sorts.

I wish I were able to write you longer letters, for I have very much to say to you; but I am hardly able to sit up for more than a few minutes at a time. But I trust I shall be able to make up for it in the winter.

Miss K—— is not very strong and was unable to write her essay.

I am most affectionately yours,

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

CHAPTER VI

THE VITALITY OF THE IDEAL

BY THE EDITOR[1]

MR. Davidson's history of the experiment in the education of the wage-earners broke off, it will be remembered, with the mention of his effort to bring the members of his class into friendly relations with a number of wealthy and cultured people.[2] This social feature of the work was continued. Mr. Davidson arranged a number of meetings in the large parlors of some of his friends, where the active members of the class were given the opportunity to meet individuals representing a phase of life different from the one with which they had been familiar on the East Side. In this way, also, a considerable number of persons unacquainted with the conditions of the people in the lower section of the city became interested in the work, and have since then remained its stanchest friends. As a result, some of them have established recreation rooms and kindergartens on the East Side, where the work has been carried on with the

[1] This chapter has been compiled from material furnished by members of the original class in History and Social Science. I have, however, drawn chiefly upon the full and admirably prepared account sent me by Mr. Morris R. Cohen, Chairman of the Executive Committee that has guided the movement ever since Mr. Davidson's death. Much of what follows is given in his own words.

[2] See page 123.

assistance of some of the young women of Mr. Davidson's class.

In the spring of 1900 the board of trustees of the Educational Alliance voted the sum of six hundred dollars in order to make it possible for the class to establish itself in quarters of its own. A suite of rooms was rented and devoted exclusively to the work of the various classes. One of these rooms was set apart as a reading room and study. To cover the necessary expenses over and above the rent, the members of the class agreed to pay dues.[1] The class also received from the friends of Mr. Davidson several valuable gifts in the form of furniture. The Educational Alliance, after several futile attempts to get Mr. Davidson to accept financial remuneration for his work, resolved to present the class with the sum of one hundred dollars for the purchase of books, as a slight token of its appreciation of the good work done.

At about the same time (May, 1900) Mr. Davidson left the city for his summer home, there to gather strength for his future work. The members of the class and their friends arranged, as in the previous year, a farewell meeting, on which occasion they expressed their gratitude to, and appreciation of, Mr. Davidson as a friend and as a teacher. On the eve of his departure he called together some of the members in the new rooms, which had not yet been properly furnished, and there, by the light of a small oil lamp, showed how poems and stories might be read and interpreted to children.

[1] These dues were at first fixed at $1.20 per year, but have since been raised to $3. See Appendix B.

This was done in anticipation of the establishment of classes for children of the neighborhood. Those who were assembled there on that evening will never forget the impression made on them by his rendering of well-known poems.

For the summer work of the original class Mr. Davidson, at the suggestion of some members, outlined a course of studies on practical ethical problems. Each problem was treated in two essays, written, the one by a young man, the other by a young woman of the class. These papers were sent to Mr. Davidson for criticism, and were afterwards read by the members at their regular Saturday evening meetings. A report of each meeting was sent to him every week, and he replied in the letters which are printed in this volume.[1] This work was carried on during the entire summer, and proved of great profit to the members.

During this summer, also, a number of the members organized classes for the children of the neighborhood. All of these children lived in crowded tenement houses, and their only opportunity for play and for the enjoyment of fresh air was on the pavements of the dusty and, owing to the congested traffic, unsafe streets. These conditions assumed even a graver character during the summer months when the school buildings were closed. The work was begun, therefore, primarily to relieve these intolerable hardships of the children, and, accordingly, consisted of games, calisthenic exercises, baths, and frequent outings to the great parks of the city. Subsequently, provision was made for the

[1] See Chapter V.

æsthetic and moral training of the children throughout the year in classes formed with the aim of cultivating the feelings of kindliness and sympathy. In these classes appropriate stories and poems were read and discussed; the care of the body, habits of truth telling, of personal cleanliness, etc., were inculcated. [The extent to which this work has grown may be gleaned from the fact that on the last summer outing of 1903 as many as three hundred children were given the benefit of the country for a day. In this work the class received the support of generous friends.]

Almost as soon as Mr. Davidson reached his summer home he was again attacked by the disease which preyed on him during the last ten years of his life. For three months he suffered the most agonizing pain, yet he refused to give up his daily lectures or to discontinue giving instruction to several members of the class who were with him. At last, finding that an operation could no longer be postponed, he went to Montreal to have it performed. It was unsuccessful; and there, in the hospital, he breathed his last on September 14, 1900. Mr. Davidson was attended on his journey to Montreal by one of the members of his class, and his last thoughts were for the continuation of its history, the only manuscript that he had taken with him.

The news of the death of Mr. Davidson came as a great personal blow to the members of the class, who had all learned to love him as a father, but it did not make them lose courage, or faith in the work begun under his guidance. The members came together and resolved to use all their energy toward continuing the work along

the lines laid down by him. Their two years' experience in self-government and self-initiative while Mr. Davidson had been with them stood them in good stead. An educational committee was formed, consisting of the members who were teaching the several classes, and the direction of the educational work was intrusted to their hands.

The committee began its work by providing for the completion of the "Faust" course through the reading and discussion of Mr. Davidson's manuscript lectures on the second part of "Faust." When this work was completed a biographico-historical course was outlined, suggested by Mr. Davidson's syllabus of lectures on "The Origins of Modern Thought."

This course was planned to extend over several years. For the first year the subject was Hebrew Prophecy. The aim of this part of the course was to make the members acquainted with (1) the general character of Hebrew life and literature; (2) the character of the Hebrew prophets and their place in Hebrew history; and (3) the significance of the contribution of Hebrew prophecy to modern civilization. Selected portions of the Old Testament, with references to the works of Cornill, Driver, and Cheyne, were assigned every week for home reading, and, at the meetings, papers were read and discussed. In this course the class was helped by lectures from Rev. D. S. Schulman on Isaiah, Mr. D. S. Muzzey on Jeremiah and on Jesus, and Rev. Dr. K. Kohler on Deutero-Isaiah and Ezekiel.

This historical course, however, was given only on alternate Saturday evenings. On the other Saturday

evenings Mr. Percival Chubb generously volunteered to lead the class in the study of Tennyson's "In Memoriam." He continued to do so throughout the winter. This course was conducted along lines similar to those pursued by Mr. Davidson in his "Faust" course. Mr. Chubb read and expounded the meaning of the poem, and the members read and discussed papers on the various questions raised by the poem, such as the doctrine of evolution, faith and knowledge, immortality, Tennyson's mysticism, etc. In the study of this poem the members made frequent use of Mr. Davidson's "Prolegomena to Tennyson's 'In Memoriam.'"

During the summer of 1900 the class in philosophy continued its work with the study of Plato. An outline of the course, embracing the study of all the more important dialogues, was made by Mr. Davidson, and essays on the various topics were sent to him for his criticism, and were afterwards read at each week's meeting. A report of the discussion that followed was always sent to Mr. Davidson, and in reply he wrote weekly letters to the philosophy class. After his death this class continued the study of Plato, and followed this up with a course in Aristotle's "Metaphysics." The doctrines of these philosophers were considered with special reference to their bearing upon modern thought. In this work the class was assisted by several of Mr. Davidson's friends.

To spread the influence of Thomas Davidson, and to give practical expression to his teachings by helping others, the educational committee instituted classes and study circles in various subjects. These classes were mainly of three kinds, — elementary, academic, and what

Mr. Davidson used to call classes in the culture sciences. The elementary courses were intended primarily for the people of the neighborhood, and included the study of English grammar and composition, United States history, geography, and arithmetic. The academic classes were intended to help young wage-earners who were anxious to continue their education, and included instruction in English rhetoric and literature, Latin, Hebrew, German, French, algebra, geometry, and physics. The culture courses, besides the Saturday evening and the philosophy class, included classes in Greek and Roman history, with a section for the study of the Greek drama; a class for the study of the history and theory of the fine arts; and a class for the study of logic and the principles of science. In addition to these, classes were formed in voice culture, stenography, and free-hand drawing.

By the summer of 1901 the original class in social and historic science had thus ceased to be a mere class and had become an ethical fellowship, conducting an educational institution of considerable magnitude.[1] An executive committee was elected by the members to take charge of the administrative work. Monthly meetings were instituted to enable the members to come together

[1] The movement that Mr. Davidson initiated is now known officially as "Branch B of the Educational Alliance." However, the young men and women who constitute the movement, out of loyalty to their teacher and in order to emphasize the distinctiveness of their aim and ideals, have come to designate themselves "The Thomas Davidson Society." The Educational Alliance has been most liberal in its dealings with the Society, giving it an entirely free hand. Its work during the past four years has been planned, organized, and administered wholly by an executive committee composed of seven of its own members.

and have free and informal discussions of the affairs of the society, and also to promote the spirit of friendship by making them feel that they belonged to a group of active workers united by a noble ideal. To enable the members to get a more comprehensive view of the work, the summer of 1901 was devoted to a comparative study of modern efforts to spread culture among the masses of the people.

During the academic year of 1901–02 the work was continued along the same lines. The Saturday evening class took up, on alternate Saturday evenings, the study of Greek thought and civilization, and the study of Shakespeare's "Julius Cæsar." In connection with the latter work various papers were presented, bringing out the part played by the Roman element in civilization. The class was helped by a lecture on "Socrates and Intellectual Piety" by Mr. D. S. Muzzey, and one on Shakespeare by Mr. Percival Chubb. The philosophy class continued its work in the study of Aristotle's psychology, ethics, politics, and poetics. It also had the good fortune to hear Professor Royce who kindly came from Harvard to lecture to it on "Recent Conceptions of the Infinite."

The efforts of the new executive committee were directed toward introducing more system into the work of the various classes and establishing them on a more permanent basis. A new department, also, was organized, namely, a club department. This was brought about almost accidentally. In the spring of 1901 one of the members of the society organized a number of working boys who used to congregate in the neighboring street into a club, which, under his influence,

developed into a Junior Thomas Davidson Club. This work was so eminently effective that it encouraged other members to start similar organizations, so that there are now thirteen of these clubs, — nine for boys, three for girls, and one for boys and girls, — with an aggregate membership of nearly three hundred.

The work of these clubs is very important, not only because it reaches a class of people who would not be otherwise attracted to the society, but also because it enables the club leader, who acts in the capacity of a personal friend to the club members, to take up the actual problems which face young wage-earners — questions of greater personal interest and of more vital importance than those that can be taken up by one who is merely the teacher of a class.

The realization of the importance of this kind of educational work led several members of the society to organize a class for the study of the problems of club leading. Some of the papers read at the meetings of this class have since been published.

In the year 1902 a class was formed for the study of the principles of evolution. The first part of this course, dealing with organic evolution, was begun in February, 1902; the second part, dealing with the evolution of social institutions, was taken up the following year. This class has been under the leadership of two of the members of the original class, one of whom had made a specialty of biology, the other of history. In connection with this class frequent meetings were held in the American Museum of Natural History, where the remains of primitive peoples were studied at first hand.

A most important advance was made in the fall of 1902 by the organization of the various academic classes into a regular evening high school course. This course was instituted in order to afford young wage-earners, especially those who had just left the elementary public schools, the opportunity of a systematic course of study which would provide mental discipline and at the same time lay the foundations of a liberal education. As these students are already occupied in earning their livelihood, there is no attempt to make the studies bear directly on their wage-earning capacity. The course is primarily a culture course, intended to make the pupils broad minded, able and willing to take an intelligent and active interest in the various important questions of life. For this reason history, literature, civics, ethics, and economics are emphasized, though physical science, mathematics, and language training are by no means neglected. It was found that the classes in the culture sciences were not so successful as they might be were the pupils who attended them possessed of a more thorough preliminary training. One of the motives, therefore, for instituting the high-school course was to supply the necessary education which would prepare the young wage-earner for the more advanced courses outlined by Mr. Davidson in his plan for a Breadwinners' College.[1]

The reasons for the organization of the Davidson High School are stated as follows in the Fourth Annual Report of the chairman of the executive committee.

It is almost universally recognized that the age at which the vast majority of our people leave school is a most critical one in

[1] See pp. 76 seq.

every one's life. It is the time when we cease to be children and become young men and young women. The change which comes at this time is not merely a physical one, it is also a mental and moral transformation. It is a time when, for good or for evil, we become conscious of power and ambition; it is preëminently the period of character formation. Yet according to the latest report of the United States Bureau of Education more than ninety per cent of our young people are at this period of their lives thrown into the world with its many difficulties and temptations, without any further guidance from the school. Education for the great many stops just when it becomes most essential.

Now it is obvious that the kind of education needed by young people at this stage of life cannot be the merely intellectual and formal kind to which the public schools are restricted. What is needed is some agency which will combine the best features of the social settlement with those of the school — an institution which will not only train the intellect but will exercise a personal influence in the formation of character by appealing to the whole soul. Such, at any rate, has been the direction in which our efforts have been aimed. The pupils of our classes are also members of our clubs and share with us the responsibilities as well as the privileges of our home. The principal and the instructors, who have been selected from among the teachers of the various universities, colleges, and public schools of the city, all give their services gratis, and this enables them to exert a far greater *personal* influence than the ordinary paid instructor.[1] In this they reënforce the work of our club leaders.

The practical neighborhood work, which was begun in the early part of 1900 by the young men's club,[2] has been continued on a larger and more effective scale. In

[1] With the growth of the educational activities of the Thomas Davidson Society, continually increasing demands have been made on the time of the principal in charge of this branch of the work, upon whom devolves all clerical labor connected therewith, and, since the fall of 1903, he has received a salary of six hundred dollars per annum.

[2] See pp. 121 seq.

this the members have had the advantage of working among their own people. The method and results of work of this sort are not of the kind of which public report can easily be made. Suffice it to mention that many young men and women of the neighborhood have been stimulated to take an interest in higher things through the personal efforts of the members of the Thomas Davidson Society. The following extract from the Annual Report of the United Hebrew Charities, October, 1902, will illustrate the nature of some of this work:

> The experiment was tried during the past year of interesting the young men and women of the Thomas Davidson Society in the sons and daughters of our applicants, and through them influencing the general family conditions. The plan was attractive because the club members, earnest young men and women, and possessed of more than ordinary intelligence and education, were, nevertheless, in many instances living in the same neighborhood, and were part of the same social atmosphere as our applicants, and for this reason better able to judge of their needs and abilities. These visitors made no mention of the fact that they were connected with our society. They gave no relief. Their entire aim was to establish a sense of comradeship with the young men and women assigned to them, and then, indirectly and without the beneficiaries' consciousness, to interest them in educational and other pursuits; to help them obtain employment if necessary; to elevate the parents through the children; and in general to bring a wider horizon into lives that are of necessity sordid and narrow. While the experiment is novel and only in its infancy, it has demonstrated its feasibility and efficacy, and warrants the belief that a concerted effort should be made to interest similar organizations in our work.

A Davidson memorial meeting is held every year in October. At these meetings the members and their

friends recall the sterling and inspiring qualities of Thomas Davidson, and the views for which he stood. Annual meetings in celebration of the founding of the class are held in January, and have a similar object. These meetings have proved of great value to the members. The sentiment of the class was voiced in the Third Annual Report of the chairman of the executive committee.

Our colleges teach science and cultivate scholarship, but they do not create any large ideal or enthusiasm in the student's soul. They leave that to the church. The church does aim to build up a high ideal in the souls of its members, but unfortunately it is an ideal which has but little influence on the actual course of life; chiefly because it is often based on a supernatural view of the world that is no longer tenable. Our own little society aims to combine the advantages of the college and the church with those of the home. We form a school in so far as we help one another to master the world's wisdom and learning; a church in so far as we encourage one another to form and to live up to the highest ideals and to stand by one another in the hour of spiritual need; and we form a home in so far as we try to cultivate among ourselves those deeper cordial relations which, unfortunately, are seldom found outside of the home. In Mr. Davidson's later writings the idea of a Breadwinners' College is predominant. But those who knew him more intimately know that deeper than the idea of instruction or mere culture for the breadwinners was the idea of "a society with ideal relations and aims"; a society of individuals banded together in order to help one another to realize the highest life; a society of apostles who will spread love and righteousness by deed as well as by word.

What have we done to realize this, our real end?

It is difficult to answer this question because it is difficult to measure moral elevation. And it is more difficult for a member of our society to give this judgment, for he cannot impartially

observe the progress it has made. But those who have known many of our members before they joined our society must admit that its high moral standard has had a wonderful effect in raising and chastening the characters of our members, and of all those who came in contact with our work. This has been accomplished through adherence to Thomas Davidson's ideal of altruistic social service. Our society offers no advantage to members except the opportunity of self-sacrificing work for others — not in the form of material assistance, which often pauperizes, but in the form of friendly aid, which helps to make possible the higher life of plain living and high thinking.

The work of the Thomas Davidson Society naturally falls in two divisions: the first including the systematic instruction offered in the Thomas Davidson Schools, the second including the practical or communal work of its members. The following Summary gives a fair idea of its various activities at the present time.

I. THE THOMAS DAVIDSON SCHOOLS

1. *The Elementary Course.* The elementary course now comprises classes in English (language, grammar, and composition), arithmetic, geography, and United States history. English takes up four hours per week, arithmetic two, the other subjects one each. There are two grades, A and B, so that the whole course is a two-year one. The total enrollment in these classes during the past year was two hundred.

An examination of the record of attendance would show some decline as the year advanced. This, however, is no indication of any dissatisfaction on the part of the pupils. Many of those who have ceased to attend

the classes have moved away from the district; others are still members of the various clubs, but their daily work does not allow them to spend very much time in study. When a pupil has to work overtime for several weeks in his daily occupation he frequently finds it impossible to keep up with the work of his class and drops out. Still the attendance at these classes has been better than at those of any public evening school in the city of New York.

2. *The Academic or High School Course.* This work was organized in September, 1902, and a curriculum adopted that was more or less loosely patterned after that of the usual high school. As originally planned, the classes were to meet from eight to nine, and from nine to ten every evening in the week except Saturday and Sunday. This would have enabled any pupil who could find the time to take all the courses, to complete the curriculum in three years. The first year's work, however, showed that this was expecting too much from boys and girls most of whom are compelled to spend their days in hard work. Accordingly, this year, the Friday evening classes have been omitted, and a committee is now engaged in changing the curriculum to a four-year course with eight hours of recitations a week, and so arranging it that any one who is unable to find time to attend all the classes may, by proper selection, complete the course in a longer period of time. On the Friday evenings thus set free a course of lectures on practical ethical problems has been given by the teachers of the school and by invited lecturers. These Friday evening meetings have also served as general assemblies

for all of the pupils of the school, and they have proved so successful that it has been decided to make them a permanent feature.

In addition to the regular work there are special classes in elocution and free-hand drawing open to all of the pupils. And it is planned, if adequate quarters can be secured, to add a full manual training department, with courses, also, in domestic science for the young women.

The success of this work during the past two years in the face of many almost insuperable difficulties has been most encouraging. The pupils have been keenly interested in their studies, and have made a very creditable showing in their examinations. The fact that the school aims primarily at training in citizenship makes its curriculum and its method of instruction somewhat different from the method and curriculum of the ordinary high school, which is a college preparatory. It is difficult to describe the difference. The whole plan is still in the experimental stage. But the following points are worthy of note: (1) The effort is continually made to adapt the studies to the actual life problems which confront the pupils, and thus to help them to face these problems with a wider and saner outlook upon life. This was particularly noticeable in the work done in the classes in history. So in the class in literature, "Silas Marner," for example, was studied primarily from the ethical standpoint. In the physiology class the work was made to bear directly on the hygienic conditions of the East Side homes, and so on. (2) The personal relations existing between teacher and pupil

are peculiarly intimate. Teachers frequently invite their pupils to their homes, and in this way a close bond of friendship has arisen between them and their pupils, which gives them greater power and greater opportunity for usefulness, and at the same time brings to all alike that inspiration without which the work would be altogether impossible. (3) The work of the school proper is intimately connected with that of the various clubs presently to be described. All the pupils are urged to become members of existing clubs, or to organize new clubs of their own. In this way the bonds that connect the school work with the practical issues of life are further strengthened, and at the same time the communal work of the society is kept on a higher and saner plane.

The pupils of the school seem fully to appreciate what is being done for them, and are in their turn resolved to do their share in carrying forward the work of Thomas Davidson. Of their own accord they have organized themselves into two clubs in order "to promote the right spirit among the pupils of the school, to coöperate with the teachers and the principal, and to aid the Thomas Davidson Society in its philanthropic efforts." This resolution they have carried into effect, using their dues to buy stationery for the school, gladly giving their services in keeping class records and in other forms of clerical assistance, etc. And many of the more advanced students have freely given of their time in tutoring and coaching others still less favored than themselves.

3. *The Culture Classes.* These classes form the nucleus which Mr. Davidson hoped might some day develop

into a Breadwinners' College. It must be admitted that during the past few years this department has not made as much progress as the others. This is partly owing to the fact that many of these young men and young women, whose days, from earliest recollection, have all been spent in hard and exacting toil, are not properly prepared to take up the subjects outlined by Mr. Davidson in his essay on "The Educational Problems of the Twentieth Century."[1] It is also partly due to the fact that since Mr. Davidson's death the members of his class have been mainly thrown on their own resources, and it is not to be expected that, however earnest and otherwise capable, they should be able, with their youth and limited training and experience, to conduct work along such lines. They have therefore wisely devoted their energies mainly to the schools and to the development of the club work. It should be added, however, that all of this work is conducted primarily with the aim of preparing wage-earners for the Breadwinners' College.

During the past year the original class in social and historic science continued its Saturday evening meetings and completed the historical course outlined in 1900, studying the Renaissance and the development of modern ideals. The nucleus of this work was a course of ten lectures by Mr. David S. Muzzey. The rest of the time was taken up with the reading and discussion of papers by the members on such topics as monasticism, the history of the poor laws, the democratic ideal in modern literature, etc. For next year two courses are planned, for alternate Saturday evenings, one on "Types

[1] See pp. 76 seq.

of Character in Literature (mainly Shakespearean)," and one on "The Social Problems of the Nineteenth Century."

The class in philosophy has continued its meetings, taking up the study of Kant. In April it decided to meet fortnightly, and another class was started for beginners, following the plan drawn by Mr. Davidson for the original class. The class in the study of the book of Job, attended mainly by the younger members, also belongs in this group.

II. COMMUNAL ACTIVITIES

1. *Neighborhood Work.* As a part of the work of the society we may count the missionary work done by its members in other institutions. Thus a number of them founded the Eron Society, now the People's Culture Club, with a membership of over two hundred. Some of them are leading clubs in other institutions, or doing work in connection with various civic bodies, such as the East Side Civic Club, the Down Town Ethical Club, the Educational League, and other organizations.

Mention should also be made of the "friendly visiting" done by members of the society in connection with the United Hebrew Charities. In the nature of things progress in work of this sort is very slow from the point of view of *obvious* results. Still the efforts that the Friendly Visitors have made cannot, in the end, help exerting a good influence. On the East Side, as well as in a great many other communities, there is now taking place a general exodus from the churches. Here it

takes a very painful and tragic aspect, because it breaks up the family life. Most of the people who have left the synagogue are very young, and as yet there is nothing to take the place of the spiritual influence which it exerted. The various social settlements do not seem capable of doing it. The Thomas Davidson Society has been making the effort to devote itself to things spiritual without becoming sectarian, seeking to lay the proper emphasis on the value of the really earnest life.

2. *The Junior Clubs.* The motive that led to the establishment of these clubs was the desire of some of the members of the original class to pay a portion of their debt of gratitude to Mr. Davidson by attempting, as far as lay in their power, to do for others what he had done for them. These clubs are accordingly modeled after the Thomas Davidson Society. They are in the main self-governing bodies, the leaders serving in the capacity of older and more experienced friends as well as of teachers. During the week most of the members of the clubs attend either the elementary or the high school classes. The special programmes of the different clubs vary according to the ability and the interests of the members. Thus one club leader, following the course taken by Mr. Davidson, is making Henderson's "Social Elements" the basis of his work; another is attempting to develop types of heroism, making use of Frederic Harrison's "New Calendar of Great Men"; one club is studying the various departments of the city government and the social conditions of the East Side; another has been specially interested in the development of certain industries; and one, whose members

have had little schooling, has been studying Longfellow's poems. The girls' clubs are similarly organized. In all of these clubs selected poems are learned by heart and recited.

The weekly meeting is, however, by no means the most important feature in the life of these clubs. They are, it must be remembered, primarily groups of friends organized for mutual helpfulness. Problems of daily life are freely discussed with the club leader. It must be borne in mind that the parents of most of these boys and girls are strangers in this land, and their past life and Talmudic creed make them incapable of appreciating the peculiar problems that confront their own children. This circumstance gives the club leader peculiar power and an exceptional opportunity. The members of the clubs are always ready to aid one another by all means in their power, giving assistance with the daily lessons, helping any that may be out of work to find employment, visiting any that are sick, and in general standing by one another in the hour of need. These clubs also afford a great deal of healthful enjoyment to their members in the form of monthly entertainments, outdoor games, and excursions to the museums and parks in and about New York City. In the summer of 1903 the boys' clubs established a summer camp on Staten Island in order to afford those members whose occupations deprive them of longer vacations the opportunity of spending Sundays and holidays away from the crowded city.

These clubs have shown their loyalty to the parent society in their readiness to coöperate in its work. Thus

one of them has given two performances of "Julius Cæsar" and turned over the proceeds, upward of one hundred dollars, to the Children's Friends Society; another gave a theater benefit and used the proceeds to establish the summer home, which they afterward opened to all the other clubs. Some of the members of the junior clubs have been helping in the friendly visiting, and others have been giving assistance in the children's work. And, in general, the spirit they have shown gives evidence that the ranks of the original Thomas Davidson Society will be kept recruited from the membership of the junior clubs.

The work of the Thomas Davidson Society has been carried on in the past few years in the face of many difficulties, among which the most serious have been:

1. The lack of funds and, consequently, of proper facilities for the work. Though some of the members have of late been relatively successful from a financial standpoint, they are not in a position to make any material contributions to the society, since, for the most part, they have parents or others dependent on them. The great majority are young people who are still struggling to get started, and some are not yet financially independent of their parents. The Educational Alliance has been more than generous in its support of the work. It has, however, other interests to look after that it cannot sacrifice for this work, and a considerable independent endowment is much to be desired. 2. Lack of decent rooms. The house that is now occupied by the Thomas Davidson Society offers many obstacles to its work.

The rooms are few and small and the ceilings so low that proper ventilation is impossible. The sanitary arrangements are far from perfect. That the society has been able to continue its work in spite of its quarters is a significant and encouraging fact. 3. Lack of a leader. And, at the present time, what the society most needs is a leader who shall supply, as far as that may be possible, the place that Mr. Davidson filled; a wise leader, with a broad outlook upon life and life's problems, who, with untiring zeal and self-sacrificing devotion, shall spend himself in this work, and shall guide and direct and concentrate the energies and the efforts of this band of earnest, truth-seeking wage-earners that Mr. Davidson gathered together.

As one looks back upon the work of the Thomas Davidson Society, and particularly upon that which it has accomplished, mainly through its own efforts, since the death of Mr. Davidson, one feels that it is significant not so much for the actual form that the society's activities have taken as, rather, for the method of its work and the spirit in which that work has been done. It is this that gives the movement its unique and distinctive character. And this is traceable directly to Mr. Davidson's inspiration. He worked from the first with and for individuals, and not simply with a class, and the spirit of friendly coöperation became contagious; he made the young men and young women work and work hard for their results, and in so doing appealed continually to what was most heroic and ideal in their aspirations. This spirit has prevailed in all the work

that has been done, and in the case of many members of the society the result has been nothing less than a complete transformation of character. And, unfinished as the story is, the work that has been actually accomplished speaks volumes not only for the force of Mr. Davidson's personality and, it must in fairness be added, for the character of these wage-earners themselves, but also for the vitality of the ideal that has guided them and him in all that has been done.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Tabulated Summary of the Activities of the Thomas Davidson Society for the Year 1903–1904

I. The Thomas Davidson Schools[1]

Class	Teacher	Time of Meetings	Number of Meetings during Year	Registration	Average Attendance
A. The Elementary School					
Arithmetic (Elementary)	Rose Tannenbaum	Mondays, 8–9 P.M.; Wednesdays, 9–10 P.M.	60	45	36
" (Advanced)	Jacob Greenberg	Mondays, 8–10 P.M.; Wednesdays, 9–10 P.M.	60	21	17
English (Elementary)	Margaret Fireman	Tuesdays, 8–10 P.M.	30	46	36
" (Advanced)	Mary Ryshpan	Tuesdays, 8–10 P.M.	30	38	27
Grammar (Elementary)	Bernard Levine	Wednesdays, 9–10 P.M.	29	47	38
" (Advanced)	Louis Weinberg	Wednesdays, 9–10 P.M.	29	39	26
Geography (Elementary)	Minnie Masiroff	Thursdays, 8–9 P.M.	27	28	25
" (Advanced)	Frances Shostac	Thursdays, 8–9 P.M.	27	17	14
U. S. History (Elementary)	Ab. Kantrowitz	Thursdays, 9–10 P.M.	27	36	28
" (Advanced)	Frances Shostac	Thursdays, 9–10 P.M.	27	16	14
B. Academic or High School					
First Year					
Algebra	Simon Hirshdansky	Mondays, 8–9 P.M.; Thursdays, 9–10 P.M.	65	34	32
English	Joseph Kahn	Tuesdays, 8–10 P.M. / 9–10 P.M.	58	38	35

[1] In addition to the activities here outlined there are extra classes in singing, free-hand drawing, and voice culture, and a course of lectures in chemistry.

I. The Thomas Davidson Schools — Continued

Class	Teacher	Time of Meetings	Number of Meetings during Year	Registration	Average Attendance
B. Academic or High School					
First Year — Continued					
French	Oscar Kollner Eugene Schoen	Mondays, 9–10 P.M. Wednesdays, 9–10 P.M.	57	24	16
German	Regina Gross	Mondays, 9–10 P.M. Wednesdays, 9–10 P.M.	57	20	17
Latin	Leo Jacobs Augusta Salik	Mondays, 9–10 P.M. Wednesdays, 9–10 P.M.	57	18	16
Physiology and Hygiene	Simon Rothenberg	Thursdays, 8–9 P.M.	27	36	34
Ancient History	Morris R. Cohen	Mondays, 8–9 P.M. Thursdays, 9–10 P.M.	64	12	9
Second Year					
Algebra	Aaron Felberg	Thursdays, 8–9 P.M.	29	20	13
Geometry	Robert Robinson	Thursdays, 9–10 P.M.	29	20	14
Modern History	Paul Radin	Wednesdays, 8–10 P.M.	22	9	6
English	Elias N. Caplan	Mondays, 8–10 P.M.	34	13	10
Biology	Louis I. Dublin	Thursdays, 8–10 P.M.	25	10	9
General Assembly	Invited Lecturers	Fridays, 8–10 P.M.	26	—	100
C. Culture Classes	Leader				
Book of Job	Morris R. Cohen David Klein	Mondays, 8–9 P.M.	30	20	15
Philosophy Club	Edward Endelman	Sundays, 11 A.M.–1 P.M. Fortnightly	20	12	7

Philosophy Class	Morris R. Cohen	Sundays, 11 A.M.–1 P.M. Fortnightly	6	6	5
Thomas Davidson Class	Eugene Schoen[1] *Chairman*	Saturdays, 8–10 P.M.	62	125	85

II. Communal Work

A. Club Department

Clubs for Men and Boys					
Culture Circle	Louis Hussakoff	Thursdays, 8–10 P.M.	44	15	14
Young Men's Educational Club	Morris R. Cohen / Abraham Goldfarb	Fridays, 8–10 P.M.	30	15	12
Breadwinners' Literary Club	Louis Roth	Sundays, 8–10 P.M.	42	22	18
Thomas Davidson Junior Club I	Louis Hussakoff	Sundays, 8–10 P.M.	50	33	27
" " " " II	Leo Jacobs	Sundays, 8–10 P.M.	50	50	46
" " " " III	David Tonkinogy	Saturdays, 8–10 P.M.	44	12	9
" " " " IV	Herman Friedel	Saturdays, 8–10 P.M.	50	18	16
Sons of Liberty	Jacob Greenberg	Mondays, 8–10 P.M.	13	35	26
Glee Club	Israel Joseph	Sundays, 4–5 P.M.	14	18	15
Progress Social Club	Harry Z. Cohen / Max Carton	Fridays, 8–10 P.M.	38	24	18
The Educational Club	Alexander Springer	Saturdays, 6–8 P.M.	12	30	15
The Young Men's Culture Club	Henry Newman	Saturdays, 5–7 P.M.	14	20	16

[1] Work conducted by members and by invited lecturers.

II. Communal Work — Continued

A. Club Department — Continued

	Leader	Time of Meetings	Number of Meetings during Year	Registration	Average Attendance
Clubs for Women and Girls					
The Jasper Social Circle	Margaret Fireman Sarah Hirshdansky	Saturdays, 8–10 P.M.	53	35	28
The Thomas Davidson Girls' Club	Margaret Fireman	Saturdays, 8–10 P.M.	50	20	15
Young Ladies' Athletic Union	Augusta Salik	Fridays, 8–10 P.M.	10	30	25
The Child-Study Club	Sarah Hirshdansky Rose Davidson	Sundays, 4–6 P.M.	22	12	9
Mixed Clubs					
Friendly Visitors	Joseph Grossman Simon Frucht	Irregular	—	—	—
Children's Friends	Roselyn Jacobson	Fridays, 8–10 P.M.	10	25	20
Elementary Students' League	David Klein Morris R. Cohen	Sundays, 8–10 P.M.	20	23	18
T. D. Students' League	Simon Hirshdansky	Sundays, 8–10 P.M.	28	50	30
Clubs and Classes for Children					
Little Women	Margaret Fireman	Saturdays, 4–5 P.M.	40	25	23
Friendly Circle	Roselyn Jacobson	Saturdays, 4–5 P.M.	40	32	30
Young Folks' Social Club	Bertha Cohen	Saturdays, 5–6 P.M.	22	10	8

B. Miscellaneous Activities

Children's Outings	Children's Friends Society	Sundays during Summer	10	—	200
Summer Camp	Herman Friedel *Superintendent*	Saturdays, Sundays, and Holidays during Summer	28	—	50

APPENDIX B

Receipts and Expenditures of the Thomas Davidson Society for the Year ending June 30, 1904

Receipts

From the Educational Alliance	$2193.48
Dues of members of Thomas Davidson Society	297.31
Dues of pupils of the Thomas Davidson schools	98.30
Voluntary contributions of the clubs	43.84
Contributions of members and friends to book fund	20.15
From Mr. S. Fels	37.00
Total	$2690.08

Expenditures

Rent	$878.32
Coal and gas	238.20
Furniture, fixtures, and repairs	143.94
Janitor service, cleaning, etc.	206.13
Text-books and reference books	331.29
Printing and stationery	63.37
Postage	38.36
Piano rental	47.00
For social meetings, etc.	49.91
Sundries and incidentals	75.00
Salary of principal	500.00
Expenses of lectures	100.00
Total	$2671.52

In addition, mention should be made of the fact that the members of the Thomas Davidson Society and of the Junior Clubs raised among themselves $300 for the use of the cottage committee in connection with the society's summer camp, and $150 for the use of the Children's Friends Society in defraying the expenses of the summer Sunday outings for children.

374.973
D253E
Davidson
The education of the wage-earners

374.973
D253E
Davidson
The education of the wage-earners