PUBLIC MINDEDNESS

WILLIAM JEWETT TUCKER

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO

JK
175
T8

PUBLIC MINDEDNESS

AN ASPECT OF CITIZENSHIP

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/publicmindedness00tuck

PUBLIC MINDEDNESS

AN ASPECT OF CITIZENSHIP CONSIDERED IN VARIOUS ADDRESSES GIVEN WHILE PRESIDENT OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

BY

WILLIAM JEWETT TUCKER

CONCORD

The Rumford Press

1910

COPYRIGHT, 1909,
BY THE RUMFORD PRESS

TO MY WIFE

BY THE AID OF WHOSE HELPFUL CRITICISM THESE
PAPERS HAVE BEEN MADE READY
FOR PUBLICATION

PREFACE

The accepted definition of a citizen is that of "a person who enjoys the privileges of a city or state." Citizenship is the "status" of a person enjoying these privileges. There is as yet no sufficient recognition, either in idea or in fact, of the quality of public mindedness as inherent in citizenship. If we wish to emphasize this quality we are still obliged to speak of "good" citizenship. The title of the present book is a reminder of this deficiency. It implies that the discrimination may fairly be made between citizens who use their citizenship to guarantee their private interests, and citizens who also use their citizenship with supreme regard to the public good.

As indicated on the title page, discussion is here carried on through occasional addresses given during the period of my service as President of Dartmouth College (1893–1909). The traditions attaching to the office of the president of a New England college call for a very considerable amount of public address, not only in reference to the college itself but also in regard to many matters of general interest and concern. Very likely, under the present requirements of specialized knowledge, a college president may cover too much ground in these outside addresses. There is, however, a difference in the demand which different subjects put upon him. Some lie close to his own work or thought, some readily yield to such investigations as a trained mind may be able to make, others manifestly lie beyond his reach, requiring either highly specialized training, or such constant familiarity and close knowledge as is required, for example, in a discussion of current party politics. But the relation of the higher education to most of the public needs which are involved in citizenship is direct and intimate. College men are set toward those professions or toward those businesses in which, whatever may be the service which they can render through their calling, they ought to be pre-eminently citizens. The willing and intelligent fulfillment of the duties of citizenship is the price which educated men may reasonably be asked

to pay for the privileges of democracy. Every college also has its local environment which ought to be recognized on suitable occasions. The individual college and the individual state are mutually related. The relation of Dartmouth College to the State of New Hampshire has called out several of the addresses which are included in this book. Some others relate to events which took place within the borders of the State, in which the State itself took part. When I assumed the presidency of Dartmouth College it seemed to me that in many ways its interests were identical with those of the State of New Hampshire. Each had had a great history, but neither could rely upon its history for the advancement of its interests. It was evident that under right co-operation the interest of both might be advanced to a degree corresponding with their mutual inheritance. So far from developing any spirit of provincialism, it was considered that the development, in all legitimate ways, of the spirit of self-respect would entitle each to its largest place and its largest influence in the nation.

It is an open question whether the spoken word, especially in the form of an occasional address, ought to be allowed a second hearing or be put on duty a second time. My apology for recalling these addresses, which were chiefly called out by occasions, is that as arranged they have a certain cumulative effect bearing upon the question under discussion. The earlier addresses, not necessarily earlier in time but in arrangement, have to do with some of the present needs and requirements of citizenship. Incidentally yet directly principles of good citizenship are discussed. Later, addresses are introduced dealing with men or with events illustrating in one way or another some aspect of citizenship. And in the concluding addresses account is taken of various educational agencies which may be expected to bear their part in the training of citizens. The discussion at this point has been kept free, as far as possible, from all technical questions which at the present time fall within the scope of the higher education.

W. J. TUCKER.

Hanover, N. H., December 15, 1909.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. GOOD CITIZENSHIP DEPENDENT UPON GREAT CITIZENS 1

Address at the Federation of Churches, Carnegie Hall, New York, November 17, 1905.

II. THE SACREDNESS OF CITIZENSHIP . . . 7

Address before the Religious Educational Association, Tremont Temple, Boston, May 25, 1906.

III. SOCIAL RIGHTEOUSNESS 16

Address before the Faculty and Students, Union Theological Seminary, New York, January 18, 1897.

IV. THE SPIRITUAL LIFE OF THE MODERN CITY . 38

Address at the Semi-Centennial of the City of Manchester, September 6, 1896.

V. THE CONSCIENCE OF THE NATION . . . 58

Sermon on the Liberation of Cuba, College Church, Hanover, April 22, 1898.

VI. THE REVIVAL OF CIVIC PRIDE IN THE COMMONWEALTH 71

Address at Dedication of State Library Building, Concord, N. H., January 8, 1895.

VII. NEW HAMPSHIRE DURING THE PERIOD OF INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION 87

Address before Members of the Present and Past Legislatures of the State, Concord, N. H., June 30, 1896.

CHAPTER PAGE

VIII. THE ORIGIN OF THE DARTMOUTH COLLEGE CASE 109

Speech in Response to the Toast "Dartmouth College" at the Banquet of the Bar Association of New Hampshire in Celebration of the Centennial of Chief Justice Marshall, Manchester, N. H., February 4, 1901.

IX. NATIONAL UNITY 122

A Speech on the Transfer of Battle Flags Following the Presentation of Memorial Tablets by the State of New Hampshire to the U. S. S. Kearsarge and the U. S. S. Alabama, Portsmouth, September 18, 1900.

X. COMMODORE PERKINS 129

Address at the Unveiling of the Statue in State House Yard, Concord, N. H., April 25, 1902.

XI. THE OWERSHIP OF LAND 156

Address at the Thirty-First Annual Session of the New Hampshire Grange, Dover, N. H., December 20, 1904.

XII. "THE MIND OF THE WAGE EARNER" . . 167

Address before the Twentieth Annual Convention of the Officials of Labor Bureaus of America, Concord, N. H., July 12, 1904, Hon. Carroll D. Wright Presiding.

XIII. THE REPEAL OF THE CHARTER OF THE NEW ENGLAND BREEDERS' CLUB 177

Address at a Meeting of Citizens of Manchester, N. H., January 14, 1906.

XIV. THE TREATY OF PORTSMOUTH IN RETROSPECT 189

Address at the Unveiling of Commemorative Tablet in the Navy Yard at Kittery, Me., September 5, 1906.

XV. WHAT HAS PATRIOTISM THE RIGHT TO DEMAND OF EDUCATION 195

Address at Union League Club, Chicago, February 22, 1906.

CHAPTER PAGE

XVI. THE HISTORIC COLLEGE: ITS PLACE IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM 204

Inaugural Address, Dartmouth College, June 26, 1893.

XVII. THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE MODERN COLLEGE 234

Address before the Wonolancet Club, Concord, N. H., December 7, 1905.

XVIII. THE RIGHTS OF THE PERIOD OF EDUCATION 252

An Address Given at Several Gatherings of Teachers, 1899.

XIX. ARRESTED EDUCATION—HOW RECOVERED . 270

Delivered at Rutland, Vt., before the State Teachers' Convention.

XX. THE SCHOOL OF THE COMMUNITY 288

Address at the Dedication of the High School Building, Newton, Mass., February 22, 1898.

XXI. THE PUBLIC LIBRARY 300

Address at the Dedication of the Gale Public Library, Laconia, N. H., June 9, 1903.

XXII. MODERN EDUCATION CAPABLE OF IDEALISM 310

Address at the Inauguration of President King at Oberlin, Ohio, May 14, 1903.

XXIII. NEW IDEALS BEFORE THE YOUTH OF THE COUNTRY. 319

Address before the Hampton County Teachers' Convention, Springfield, Mass., October 26, 1906.

XXIV. THE STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY GREATNESS 336

Lecture before the Faculty and Cadets of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

I

GOOD CITIZENSHIP DEPENDENT UPON GREAT CITIZENS

ADDRESS AT THE FEDERATION OF CHURCHES, CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 17, 1905

As I interpret our present civic conditions the chief fact in evidence is the opportunity for influential and commanding citizenship. I therefore strike at once the note of greatness, not that of mere obligation nor even of necessity, as most in harmony with my subject. The first question about any urgent matter of a public sort is not, how urgent is it, but how great is it? What rank are we ready to assign to it among the subjects which demand our attention? That is the question which I put in regard to citizenship. What rank do we propose to give it among the compelling objects which address themselves to the ambition, the patient endeavor, or the consecrations of men? If we are not prepared to put it in the first rank, to give it a place beside the great constants in the service of state and church, or beside the new and fascinating openings of science and industry, it is quite useless for us to expect any results from our discussion of the need of good citizenship. If we are to have good citizenship, as things are today, we must have great citizens. When we have them in sufficient number, and rightly distributed, we shall have practically settled the question of citizenship. I address myself to one, to my mind *the* one, solution of our present civic troubles,

namely, the presence of men qualified for leadership, whose great qualification is not a sense of duty, but the joy of the task. Nothing short of this will take the men we want away from the fascinations and the rewards of private gain.

What then are the qualities in men which can make them able and willing to achieve greatness by way of citizenship? I name first, without the slightest hesitancy, imagination, the power to see beyond, or even through, wickedness into righteousness. No great cause ever moved far until it had taken possession of the imagination of men. Whatever start the conscience may have given it, it waited for the kindled mind to give it movement. Foreign missions in this country sprang out of as fine a burst of idealism as the republic itself. When young Mills said to his comrades at Williams, "we ought to carry the gospel to dark and heathen lands, and we can do it if we will," the word of duty waited upon the word of inspiration. We have had enough to say about the duty of citizenship. Progress does not lie in any more discussion of duty, or even in the deeper sense of it. It is time for us to change our camping ground—to move out from "we ought" to reform our cities, into "we can do it if we will." What we need in further thought about citizenship is to put more of what Stevenson calls "the purple" into our thinking; or if we are ready for action, to give to that what the London Spectator calls the "Nelson touch," the fashion which the old admiral had of doing a great thing in a great way because he saw it in its greatness.

Next to imagination as requisite to any kind of efficiency in citizenship, I put intelligence, that fine discernment of an issue which gives us simplicity in place

of confusion. Men are variously intelligent for public uses, every man after his own kind. We ought to be careful about prescribing the method. What matters it whether discernment comes by way of the school, or by way of the street? "Wisdom is justified of all her children." Of course the security of corrupt men lies in the confusion of good men, or in their divided counsels. No matter how great or wide-spread the corruption, good men are absolutely helpless until some one arises who can simplify the issue and make it clear and imperative. The tendency to overweight a moral issue, to put the work of tomorrow into the work of today, has brought many an attempted reform to naught. It requires the clearest intelligence to place an issue before the public mind, and to hold it there, naked and unadorned, till the public mind becomes ashamed of its continued presence.

When we add to imagination and intelligence the evident quality of courage we simply remind ourselves that citizenship is in the militant stage. The task of citizenship in most of our cities is many years in arrears. Some valuable properties have been irretrievably lost. Other and greater properties are in danger. The looting of the public wealth is not the work of one man or one set of men. It has become a recognized industry. The men who practice it are as highly trained as men in the skilled employments or in the professions. They are never, of course, men of moral courage, and seldom of physical courage, but they have the courage of their position, intrenched as they are in power and equipped with means. Every attempt to bring a set of political thieves to justice is fraught with personal danger, but the danger increases mightily with the settled purpose

to break up the business. The man who stands for that result must have the long courage of the campaign. No one can tell how far we are from the reign of honesty in our cities. The time depends, I suppose, upon the steadiness, the endurance, the unflinching courage of those who fight our battles. I know of no better motto for any man who dares a great deliverance for his city than the word of the most persistent of the anti-slavery reformers—"I will not compromise, I will not equivocate, I will not retreat a single inch, and I will be heard."

But why should we discuss the question of citizenship in the Federation of Churches? What have we to add, or what ought we to add, to the qualities which make up the great citizen? We ought to add the supreme qualification, namely, consecration. Consecration supports and steadies the vision of duty, it directs the trained intelligence, it nerves the will and cheers the heart in defeat, and above all, it teaches the soul the joy of self-sacrifice. There is but one equivalent for the immense rewards of private gain, and that is the exceeding great reward of self-sacrifice. If a man does not allow himself to feel the joy of self-sacrifice in a righteous cause, he is not out of reach of the rewards of private gain. When he has once tasted that joy, rewards seem cheap. What money would bring back your missionaries from "dark and heathen lands," where their comrades have fallen and are falling at their side? What money has been able to hold back from the high places of public duty, men who have been summoned there out of the very midst of us at the cost of personal enjoyment or professional honor? In our demands for citizenship, we cannot stop short of the man capable of devotion.

In declaring then the attitude of the churches toward citizenship, I insist first upon the recognition of all who are giving us the finest illustration of it, regardless of name, or creed, or profession. The men about us who are rising into the greatness of citizenship are the men for us to study, not to criticise. Let us beware how we say the word of the disciples, "Lord, we saw one casting out devils in thy name and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us," lest we receive the answer of the master, "Forbid him not: there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me. He that is not against us is on our part." The test in all this business of reforming our cities is the power "to cast out devils."

In the second place I insist upon the duty of our churches to create "so far as in them lies" the conditions which produce the citizen. It is in the expression of this duty that I have been urging that advance in the rank of citizenship which shall put it among the foremost privileges of christian service. I would have every church put it upon the list of great causes for which men are to pray, and to which they are to give as occasion may arise, and to which they are to consecrate themselves. While the present emergency lasts I would give it standing with missions at home or abroad.

And in the third place I insist upon the acceptance of the high duty and privilege which co-operation in citizenship offers as a means of making real to ourselves and to all men, in their own generation, the unity of the church. Unity is not an end to be striven after as men may strive after the truth. Truth is always the greater end, even though the search after it may for the time separate a man from his brother. Unity comes in

upon us through the sense of a common need, a common duty, and a common privilege. Suddenly, in the providence of God, the churches are confronted by the same imperative and exciting duty, and lo, in the doing of it, we are one. In the immediate providence of God we have been brought, through a well nigh universal demand for civic righteousness, into one of those great meeting places of righteous men upon whom God looks down, "without respect of persons." Let not the church miss its present opportunity to realize its oneness. Let the search for truth go on, lead where it will, but let righteousness, plain, everyday, brotherly righteousness, have its day amongst us. What better word could the great apostle have for the men of today than that which he had for men of his own time, as he led the way out of the confusions of their thoughts and desires for the things of the spirit into the works of charity—"Covet earnestly the best gifts, and yet show I unto you a more excellent way."

II

THE SACREDNESS OF CITIZENSHIP

Address before the Religious Educational Association, Tremont Temple, Boston, May 25, 1906

In the opening volume of the series on Modern History, planned by the late Lord Acton, modern history is defined politically, and is dated from the rise of the spirit of nationality. It is very doubtful, I think, if we have as yet arrived at the political conception of the modern world. Other conceptions, born chiefly of the discoveries of science, have thus far filled the imagination and developed the energies of men. Suddenly, at least to us in this country, there has come a conception of political power which we had not entertained, and for which we are not prepared. We awake to find the spirit of nationality the dominant force at the opening of the century. We see, at a glance, that it has supplanted all other forces of like nature—the power of race, and the power of organized religion. A man no longer counts, as we take note, because he is of this or that race, or because he is of this or that religion, but because he is of this or that nation. And on the other hand, we are conscious of a marked change in our attitude toward the government. We find ourselves instinctively turning to the government for ends which we had not contemplated, and which we cannot now exactly define. But in the midst of the overwhelming and often reckless supremacies of material power we are asking for something which shall guarantee to us

the condition of human well being, and if not the government, what?

Therefore the new meaning, or better, the new valuation attaching to the idea of citizenship, a word which expresses the responsible relation of the individual to this wide movement which is stirring the nations, and also to this inner movement which is stirring the hearts of the people. And if we are to discuss citizenship here, in these surroundings, I do not know of any lower terms in which we can afford to discuss it than those in which my subject has been cast for me, namely, "The Sacredness of Citizenship."

We must be sure that we advance our ideals as the facts for which they stand are filled with power. Every powerful thing must be capable of being invested with sacredness, else it is an evil thing—money, position, knowledge. It is the chief business of righteousness to follow after power and after powerful men. Whenever this work is ignored or evaded all minor tasks are futile. The account with righteousness is not kept by attention to incidentals. As someone has recently said, "There is something grander than benevolence, more august than charity: it is justice." Citizenship, as it advances to its new and enlarging functions, must become more and more sacred in the eyes of men if it is to fulfill these functions. It must concern itself, according to our judgment of its business, with "the weightier matters of the law." We must learn to become impatient in downright earnest with all easy and spectacular, if not questionable, substitutes for citizenship.

So much lies in our subject without further saying. But how shall we compass so great an end, which is nothing less than to raise the moral estimate of citizen-

ship? How shall we who believe in the values of education contribute to this end? How shall we come out of the academic into the practical, and say the things we have to say, and do the things we have to do, effectively? So far as the masses are concerned, we must work, I think, in and through the concrete. Citizenship is a matter of principles and ideals, but it is no abstraction. It is a matter of details, which in their ceaseless and monotonous return teach "line upon line and precept upon precept." Citizens are made by doing the things for which at any given time citizenship stands. There is no other way of making the ordinary citizen. Principles are established, standards are set, ideals are made clear and abiding through persistent, or, as in some cases, through aroused and impassioned action. A campaign like that of District Attorney Jerome on the east side of New York is first education, secondarily politics, with the outcome in citizenship. We can educate somewhat politically through the schools, but for the most part we must be ready to take the field, and deal with men who do not think much in our way, but who are capable of thinking earnestly.

But the immediate question before us, and, as it seems to me, the most serious political question before the country is not, how shall we educate, in the ordinary sense, those whom we call the masses, but how shall we raise in those already educated the moral estimate of citizenship? The greatest political danger of our time does not come directly from ignorance, but from the use made of ignorance by the intelligence of organized power, with the tacit consent of the intelligence of culture. Ignorance may be the condition, it is not the inciting cause of political corruption. That cause lies

within the region of intelligent dishonesty. It is our bounden duty, for every reason, to educate the ignorant; but it is a shame that we are obliged to educate them for the sake of protecting ourselves from our own trained and often educated leaders who have become adepts in corruption.

It is as true today as when Carlyle said it,—"It is the knowing ones who rule." What do our "knowing ones" think about citizenship? What is the moral estimate which they put upon it? What is the moral estimate which we, as a consenting if not an active political part of the knowing and ruling ones, put upon it? Let us test very briefly this moral sense of citizenship as it comes within our observation or experience.

Citizenship, we shall agree, requires the faithful use of political rights. Rights once established instantly become duties, otherwise we must speak of them as unoccupied rights. An unoccupied political right always represents so much indifferentism, so much moral as well as physical absenteeism. The per cent of unused rights has become a calculable factor in political manipulation. It can be pretty definitely located in any given community, for it usually follows the line of intelligence. We familiarly say that the quality of the vote in New England, not its size, depends upon the weather. No man can faithfully use his political rights without a good deal of inconvenience, personal effort, and sometimes personal courage. The result is an increasing disuse of political rights among those who are unwilling to pay the price of the right. It is for this reason that a great many question the extension of political rights, as through woman's suffrage. Will the right if established be occupied? Citizenship is cheapened by unused, as it is demoralized by misused, privileges.

Citizenship, we shall emphatically agree, requires that its political purity be kept inviolate. Bribery is to suffrage what forgery is to business, or treason to the "service." But bribery is a recognized, not exactly authorized, but recognized method of transacting political business. Neither party claims to be free from it. The general facts in regard to political bribery are part of the public knowledge, though it may be difficult to individualize them. Aside from the dullness of the party conscience at this point, the most disheartening feature of this whole business has been the failure to put the emphasis upon the wrong in the fit place. We have held in public contempt the men who take bribes, instead of holding under public condemnation the men who give bribes. Not until the exposure in Missouri were we ready to view this matter in right proportion. Of course there is a vast difference in degree between the selling of one's vote and the sale of one's official power or influence as a legislator or judge, still it is the men or the corporations who are taking the initiative in this kind of corruption with whom we are chiefly concerned. We cannot expend our wrath or our contempt upon their victims and allow them to maintain their respectability. Certainly as regards the purchase of votes it is the purchaser who is the greater sinner in the light of the sacredness of citizenship. It is he who conceives the mischief, and works the temptation, and secures the result. Upon him should fall the heavier condemnation. We are just awakening to the enormity of the offense of bribery on its active as well as on its receptive side. Last evening I listened to a statement, at a hearing in the New Hampshire House of Representatives, by Judge Lindsey of Denver, in regard to the new

court established by the state of Colorado for juvenile offenders. It is the business of this court to locate the real offender. If a father sends his boy to a saloon with the result that he falls into disorderly conduct, or if he sends his boy to take coal from a railroad with the result that he becomes a petty thief, it is the father with whom the court deals at first hand, the boy with whom it deals at second hand. Let us learn to discriminate in like manner in respect to bribery in the purchase of votes among the more ignorant voters, so that penalty shall fall where it belongs, at a second remove upon ignorance, at first hand upon intelligence.

Citizenship, we shall further agree, requires the subordination of private interests to the public good. I would not affirm, I do not believe, that men are more selfish or less patriotic than formerly, but it is entirely clear that there are greater opportunities for, and greater incentives to, self-aggrandizement at the public cost than formerly. Organization has become a powerful influence in stimulating private interests. It retires personal responsibility, it awakens in its place ambition and pride in large adventure, it develops great rivalries, it creates powers which must be recognized, and which may demand to be fostered by the state. Unconsciously, it may be, the private citizen finds himself carried on step by step, by the way of organized power, to a position where he seeks to utilize the government or where he is forced to antagonize it. The process is evident, and we are becoming familiar with the result. Hence the growing fear in the public mind of organized power as such, a fear which is beginning to include organized labor as well as organized capital. It requires no prophetic vision to foresee the nature of the

next political struggle, if there is to be a struggle rather than a campaign—that it must be between the organized and the unorganized power of the country; in which event organized capital and organized labor will be found of necessity upon the same side. Who can doubt, in the present circumstance, the duty of all enlightened and patriotic citizenship of trying to avert the possibility of such a struggle. Now, if ever, is the time to consider, and to consider diligently, the public good, and if for no other reason, that lasting security may be given to all private interests which are compatible with the public good.

And yet again I am sure that you will agree with me as I say that citizenship cannot exist without sentiment. The state is not a corporation. It has a soul. It has its essential greatness in its humanity. Let me recall a recent word which some of you will recognize as from the pen of Justice Holmes. "It seems to me that the social difficulties of our time are even more sentimental than economic, and that those who let their democratic feeling grow cold, be they rich or poor, do more than any other to shake the present order of things." The present order of things, as we know it, is the order of a democracy. Citizenship amongst us must conform to the political aims which we profess and to the political ideals which we cherish. The "democratic feeling" must not be allowed "to grow cold." It is the ruling passion of a people which fixes its destiny. That ancient and formative passion for liberty, that respect for man as man, that sense of justice which was not satisfied till it had set the bondman free, that hospitality which has held the doors of the nation open to all who aspire after freedom, that tolerance which has kept the

realm of opinion as free as the realm of action, that almost impracticable sentiment which has been struggling and is struggling still to realize the equality of opportunity, all these are our inheritances of the spirit, the endowment of our citizenship. These are the things for which we stand. Realized politically, they make a democracy. Realized spiritually, they make a brotherhood. Let us realize them through citizenship. Let us keep the path for the democracy of toil and struggle open to the last material rewards to which it is entitled. Let us keep the path for the democracy of the mind open through every grade of education to the last training of the university. Let us keep the path for the democracy of the soul open to every spiritual privilege, even if in so doing we must needs reconstruct our churches. Nothing less than these things can satisfy the deep and abiding sentiment of citizenship.

Judged by the tests which I have recalled we cannot say that citizenship as it exists within our knowledge is clothed with those sanctities which alone can give it saving and redeeming power. And yet I firmly believe that there has begun a revival of the political conscience of the nation which is to make its moral power commensurate with its intelligence. We are certainly growing more sensitive to political wrong doing, in the nation, in the state, even in the city. We are growing steadier and more determined in movements for reform. We are not afraid to invoke the law of the land for all legitimate ends which are revealed by public necessities. We are growing less narrow, less captious, less partisan in our criticism of public men, and more discriminating and more demonstrative in our support of those whom we believe deserve well of the Republic.

Within the last decade we have had two men of commanding personality in the presidential chair, men who embodied in honorable degree our national ideals, men whose faults are not the faults of weakness, neither one of them blind to corruption, nor insensitive to social or economic wrongs, nor mentally inhospitable to the things of the spirit—Mr. Cleveland, and Mr. Roosevelt. But within the decade the nation has grown more appreciative of what I may call political personality, and supports Mr. Roosevelt as it did not support Mr. Cleveland in his time of official service. Other reasons, partly political, and partly personal, may explain to some degree the difference, but enough remains to prove the fact of the growing appreciation of high-minded and resolute public service. Approval of the right, and of right men, is just as much a sign of moral advance as criticism of the wrong, and of wrong men.

And we are also coming to believe as a nation that greatness is not incompatible with righteousness, but rather that if greatness be ordered of God, righteousness must come forth out of it in the divine sequence. If God be in His world at the present time this must be so, for all things which belong to the nations are taking on the dimensions of greatness. The spirit of nationality, of which I spoke at the outset, and of which we are beginning to be fully conscious, is I believe related to the spirit of God. In His name it is summoning nation after nation to show itself at its best. There is a call of God to nations as to men, to be great. It is not wise for a nation any more than it is for a man, when the call comes, "to hide amongst the stuff." May God in His infinite grace deliver this nation from the weakness and the cowardice of mere material prosperity into "that liberty wherewith He makes His people free."

III

SOCIAL RIGHTEOUSNESS

Address before the Faculty and Students, Union Theological Seminary, New York, January 18, 1897

If we can determine what that righteousness is, of which we are confessedly so much in need, which we are beginning to call social righteousness, some advance will have been made toward the solution of our present social problem. Not that definition will solve it. I shall want to say before I close that the greatest difficulty in the way of establishing social righteousness lies in the extraordinary demand which it makes upon the interest of man in man, an interest as sensitive and absorbing as that which we take in our theories, or in our occupations, or in our institutions, or in any matters of personal and public concern. But to begin with, we need definition. We certainly need to know why there is such a demand for what seems to be another kind or department of righteousness in the process of moral specialization which is now going on.

We began to specialize because it was found that general righteousness, the goodness which is expressed in ordinary personal character, was not a sufficiently positive and well-defined force to meet the conditions of modern society. Put a good man into a bad environment, put him into a corrupt political body, or into a heartless corporation, or into frivolous society, the probabilities are that he will remain a good man, but he will not change his environment, unless he makes that

object his particular business. As Edmund Burke used to say, he will not make "goodness prevalent."

It became necessary therefore to specialize, that is to organize righteousness to specific ends. What are these ends? They have been and still are in all cases representative of institutions, or of what had become institutionalized. They are at a second remove from life. The first great specialization in righteousness in this country was directed to the overthrow of slavery. But slavery had become incorporated into the national life. It had become institutionalized. We called it "the institution of slavery," and it was against slavery as such that the moral power of the nation was being organized, when Mrs. Stowe brought the question back to its simplest human aspects, and made the humanity of "Uncle Tom" as real as the arguments of Calhoun. Something of the same process is now going on in the movement against intemperance. We are face to face with the commercial and political aspects of this social evil. The liquor traffic has in time become institutionalized. Society is not thinking so much today about the drunkard and his family as about the saloon keeper and his political associates. We are specializing in like manner for the protection of institutions—the family, the trades and professions, the municipality, the state at large, and even the church. Society has been training reformers, organizing crusades, and in various ways concentrating public opinion at the exposed points in our modern civilization. Sympathy of interest is called for in all these various movements, but division of labor is equally called for. Nobody is expected to attend to more than one kind of righteousness. The old time philanthropist is simply the man upon whom everybody

calls to pay the bills. So far as actual work is concerned, the conditions are so exacting that one is justified in the impatience of Lyman Beecher, when on his return from Cincinnati to Boston he was besought to identify himself more actively with the anti-slavery cause—"I have got too many irons in the fire already," was his lament. What the grand old man felt he could not undertake, he left as the moral birthright of his children.

Now the present demand for social righteousness seems to be, as I have indicated, the demand for one more kind of righteousness, to meet a new and pressing difficulty. I do not, however, so interpret the situation. I prefer to consider and to treat social righteousness as the complement of personal righteousness, at least of the personal righteousness of today, for three reasons. First, I would not divide and subdivide righteousness, even for practical ends, further than may be absolutely necessary. Specialization in morals always reaches a point, where it raises the question whether there should not be a return to what is fundamental. Such is the history of creeds. One doctrine after another is formulated to meet the succession of errors. Gradually the creed loses in tone and spirit what it gains in definiteness. It becomes contentious and belligerent. The church at last becomes aware of this fact and, with or without modifying its articles, goes back into the mind and heart of Christianity, to get a new disposition and outlook toward truth and life. We have now reached the point, I believe, in the development of our moral specialties, where we need to assure ourselves that our righteousness of every sort is so far right-minded and right-hearted as to be easily effective. We may find,

as we proceed, that some kinds of righteousness are ineffective, because we have not put the human element into them in right proportions.

Second, social righteousness is not a specific and concrete end like commercial or civic righteousness. Society cannot be viewed as a distinct thing, as we can view the state or an industry. What most persons have in mind, doubtless, when they ask for social righteousness is the right feeling between people of different positions or occupations. The demand grows in large measure out of the disturbed relations between capital and labor, and is really the call, when translated into its lowest terms, for economic righteousness.

The third and chief reason is that the personal righteousness of our time needs the complement of social rightousness. Of course it is possible to so define personal righteousness as to make it inclusive. If you could only have the perfect man, you would have the perfect society, and the perfect state, and the perfect church. I have referred to the personal righteousness of our time. That, I say, needs the complement of social righteousness. A righteous man may need, he does need at the present time, a certain character or quality of righteousness. You do not necessarily get that by extending the righteousness which he already has into his business or into his citizenship. There are different ways of being righteous, genuinely righteous, in these external relations. Society just now lays the stress upon a given way. And if you can get a personal righteousness which in all its relations, and at all times, will work that way, you have gained the end of social righteousness.

Social righteousness then I would define, not as a

specific kind of righteousness directed to a concrete end, like the purifying of government, but as representing a quality and method of righteousness made necessary by the conditions of modern society. I speak of it as the complement of personal righteousness because personal righteousneses, as we know it, is so manifestly insufficient and incomplete at the very point where the social distress or danger is most acute. This conception of social righteousness may seem to you to be to a degree negative. I am entirely content, if I have succeeded in what I have thus far said, in giving my subject a negative definition, in taking it out of the category of specialized duties, where it must come into competition with all manner of righteousnesses. Let me now advance into the positive application of this idea or definition.

Social righteousness makes its first and most insistent demand for a habit of mind for which we have no training in the school of individualism. Theodore Parker used to say of democracy—"Democracy does not mean I am as good as you are, but you are as good as I am." Consider the change necessary to the mind of a man accustomed to think of democracy in the terms of the first saying before he can think of it in the terms of the second. Suppose the occasion for the assertion of his politcal rights or sense of equality in the face of another man was over, he would still keep on thinking of democracy as the satisfaction of personal rights, or the assertion of personal equality. He might be led to acknowledge another's rights, but not so easily his equality. He might fairly say of many a man, he is not so good as I am: not understanding that while it is not the business of democracy to proclaim as a fact that

which is not a truth, namely the moral equality of men, it is the duty of democracy to endeavor to establish the fact, that is, to make one man as good as another. Democracy may have come into being through the habit of mind, which expressed itself in the first saying, but the continuance of democracy depends, as any one can now see, upon the habit of mind which expresses itself in the spirit of the second saying.

The habit of mind of which most men are at present possessed is the product of individualism. I am not about to speak of individualism as the moral opposite of altruism, or as in any direct way the synonym of selfishness. I am not so ignorant of its history. It has been thus far the most potent force in modern civilization. It has given us religious, political, and philosophical freedom. It has accelerated the rate of material progress. It has created those great units of personal power which have changed the level of society. But we are now getting the secondary effects of individualism which, as in the case of any great force, are often not only so much less, but so different from the first effects. Individualism acting as a motive power toward personal freedom, or personal responsibilities, shows a first effect, than which nothing can be more inspiring. Individualism serving as a barrier to unity, or as deadening the sense of social and corporate responsibility, is a secondary effect, than which nothing can be more deplorable.

Let me give you two illustrations of this secondary effect of individualism as we can now see them. I will take first the effect as seen in the expression of religious feeling. We have driven out most of those expressions of personal experience which were at first the genuine

result of a deep sense of sin, but which had become the cant of a self-seeking salvation. It is very seldom that we now hear them. But the same individualistic habit of mind finds expression in another form, comparatively harmless, but showing that it is still the ruling habit. I refer to the common expression of gratitude or thanksgiving by way of comparison or contrast of our condition with that of others. This is the ordinary way of realizing our mercies. We do not seem to be able to make them real in any other way. From thousands of family altars the prayer of thankfulness is for mercies which we have, of which others have been deprived, or for exemption from suffering which others are experiencing. The ritual of extempore prayer in an ordinary social assembly is to the same effect: we thank God that while other communities have been visited with pestilence or famine, or, as it is now more frequently some kind of financial disaster, we have been mercifully spared. This is not pharisaism. It is not a rude selfishness. If it were, we should attack it and drive it out. We leave it alone because it is simply the harmless vestige of a habit of mind which instinctively works that way. I refer to it now because it shows just as conclusively as a more harmful expression would show, that the habit of mind is there.

Take a more serious illustration. It is our constant complaint that corporate action is not as responsible as individual action. We say that the same man cannot be depended upon to act with others as he will act alone. Perhaps we ought not to expect that he will. Nevertheless the fact remains that corporate responsibility must bear some proportion to the tremendous advance in the absorption of individual activity into corporate activity.

You are losing the individual: how are you going to follow him with individualism? Individual responsibility is becoming capitalized: how are you going to get at the moral value of the new capital? We must have measurements which are fitted to this object, and apply them. Or carry the thought over into our social and civic obligations. In the old days of Boston, in the time of its transition from a great village into a city, the citizens organized themselves into a Watch and Ward Society. They took turns in patrolling the streets. Of course this could not last. A city means delegated authority; first the creation of departments to do certain things, and then perhaps the organization of societies to see that they do them. This is the process by which we divest ourselves of individual responsibility—not by denying it in the first instance, but by putting the exercise of it at a farther and farther remove from us, till at last with this removal of responsibility there comes in the gradual loss of sentiment, of feeling, and even of shame. I suppose that it would be as hard for the average citizen to repent of his share of the sin of New York, as for a man trained in the New England school of theology to repent of the sin of Adam. He does not know how to do it. He doesn't see things in that light. His mind is not capable of working that way.

Now, social righteousness, speaking in the person of its advocates, calls for a habit of mind which will correspond to present facts and conditions. To the extent to which the individual has been merged into something else, in fact, it demands that something else, in theory, shall take the place of individualism. Every great moral movement which has been successful has created for itself an appropriate habit of mind. The Reforma-

tion began that way. It was another habit of mind, another sense of the individual self, another vision of God. It is useless to confront new and obstinate conditions with old habits of thinking, or with unused sensibilities. The demand of social righteousness at this point is a reasonable demand. It can make no great headway until the demand is complied with. When once this demand has been met, when once the habit of mind has been created which will express itself steadily and urgently, through sensitiveness to others, through responsibility for things held in common, through what we may call, in spite of its philosophical vagueness, the social conscience, the work of social righteousness will be well under way, if not well accomplished; and then there may be a return to individualism or an advance into a new view of life and duty. Just as individualism did its work suddenly and effectively when it had made its own type of mind, so may we expect like results of social righteousness when it can work through a like instrumentality.

More positive perhaps than this demand on the part of social righteousness for an appropriate habit of mind, because more appreciable, is the protest which it enters against all social or business theories which ignore or undervalue the human element in affairs. Humanity has suffered more from the tyranny of theories which were believed to be right, or, if wrong, inexorable, than from any other one source. The history of economic progress, as of political progress, has been the history of deliverance from the fetich of so-called laws, laws of supply and demand, and the like. Every reformer has had to meet at once the outcry, "you are attempting the impossible, you are going against the law of nature,

or of business, or of society." The outcry is not always in the interest of selfishness. The worst aspect of it is that the men who raise the outcry believe what they say. To the disciples of the early economists many of the now accepted methods of production and distribution seemed absolutely impossible. The then current laws of supply and demand were to their mind as inexorable as the law of gravitation. To many minds, when they have given any working theory the name of law, they have given it the prerogatives of the law of gravitation. And to such minds one essential part of the idea of law is that it shall take no note of the human element. To do so is unscientific. It introduces sentiment, or at least some variable quantity, which prevents all accuracy of calculation or of working. Nature, they say, takes no account of human suffering, why should trade, or rather, how can trade any more than nature? And so under the helplessness of this kind of logic, we not infrequently get the same results from the working of the laws of trade as from the working of the laws of nature.

Some years ago I read in the London Spectator the report of the discovery in South Africa of a hill called the "Hill of the Footsteps," on the slope of which, on a wide uncovered rock, there had been imprinted a crowd of footsteps, some human, some of wild animals, but all turned toward the top of the hill, toward which in some past century all had been fleeing in dire confusion, the soft rock taking the imprint of their flight. The reading of the report anticipated the comment—"it was as if one could hear an isolated scream of agony coming up from the depths of centuries ago, without hearing anything of the tragic cause or of the tragic issue."

Unhappily these tragedies of nature have been paralleled by the tragedies enacted under the laws of trade and industry, by the tragedies of the mine and of the factory. Men, women, and little children were sacrificed by thousands under the early factory systems to the theory of *laissez faire.* Under cover of this theory interference with the inhumanity of the system was fought at every step. The first legislation which gave the slightest relief to the health, morals, or life of operatives took effect only at the beginning of the century, and under bitter opposition,—legislation which the Duke of Argyle has not hesitated to say, "was the greatest invention in the science of government in modern times." My reference to this state of things at the beginnings of industrialism, is not to expose the cruelty of the early masters of industry, but rather to show the inhumanity of the theories to which they were in bondage. Starting with the theory that labor was a commodity, and therefore subject to the ordinary law of commodities, the laboring man or woman or child became the natural victim of the principle. The masters took this theory from the economists, who could see no place for the human element in their conception of labor. And it can hardly be said that the human, in distinction from the mechanical, view found a place in economics till the day of John Stuart Mill.

The narrowness of the position of the early economists has been clearly put in the calm words of Professor Marshall in his "Principles of Economics."

"It caused them to regard labor simply as a commodity without throwing themselves into the point of view of the workman: without allowing for his human passions, his instincts and habits, his sympathies, his class

jealousies and class adhesiveness, his want of knowledge and of the opportunities for free and vigorous action. They therefore attributed to the forces of supply and demand a much more mechanical and regular action than they actually have: and laid down laws with regard to profit and wages that did not really hold, even for England, in their own time. But their most vital fault was that they did not see how liable to change are the habits and institutions of industry. In particular, they did not see that the poverty of the poor is the chief cause of that weakness and inefficiency which are the chief causes of their poverty: they had not the faith that modern economists have in the possibility of a vast improvement in the conditions of the working classes."

We may say that we have passed out of the reach of these earlier theories. This is only measurably true. Every proprietor of every sweating den justifies himself by some such theory; every reform still looking to the advance of unskilled labor is met by a like theory: and the general indifference to the condition of the poor is excused by the easy reference of their poverty to their habits. (Society at large refuses as yet to see, as Marshall has said, "that the poverty of the poor is the chief cause of that weakness and inefficiency which are the chief causes of their poverty.") We turn off our responsibility for poverty upon the intemperance of the poor, if not with the contempt, with the easy indifference with which a recent Secretary of Ireland dismissed the land tax agitation in that country—"You have the remedy in your own hands: drink less whiskey."

Social righteousness has something to say about the indifference which is begotten of wrong theories, just as it has something to say about the insensibility to the

kind and amount of unnecessary burdens put upon those who seem to be content to bear them. Social righteousness protests against the tolerance of abuses before they reach the stage of the outspoken grievance. It calls upon society to interpret the grievance and meet it before it is declared. A traveler in the north of England found, on the morning after his arrival at an inn, a kind of stage or omnibus standing at the door, advertised to run some miles into the country. What arrested his attention was a placard giving different rates of passage—first class fare a shilling, second class ninepence, third class sixpence, but with no apparent difference in accommodation. Out of curiosity he stepped in, paid the highest fare, and awaited the result. Everything went on as at the start till they came to a long stretch of rocky, muddy road, when the driver stopped and called out: "First class fares stay in their seats, second class get out and walk, third class get out and push."

Without stopping to verify the incident I hasten to point the moral. That process, I venture to say, will go on just so long as there are enough third class fares willing to get out and push in the mud. And nothing that anybody, like my supposed traveler, can say, will avail in the way of remedy, till sometime there comes up out of the mud the cry which cannot be put down, "Mend your roads." Why does not society mend its roads of its own motion? That it does not do so is a part of the concern of social righteousness.

And another part of its concern is with those changes which are constantly taking place in the customs and laws which were designed to protect the individual man. Advantage may be taken of legislation which was made to secure a given result in the interest of personal free-

dom or security, to bring about an opposite result. We are just now in the midst of countless difficulties growing out of the fact that laws which were passed to protect the rights of personal property are being used to extend the power of corporations. Much of the law, under which the great questions arising out of industrialism must be tried, was made before the rise of industrialism. The legislation of that time was established to meet entirely different conditions. And unless an interpretation can be given to that early legislation which will preserve its original intent, we shall be subjected, under the name of law, to the betrayal of certain individual rights, or to the extension of corporate privileges which could not be secured under present legislation. Corporations have their rights. They have become incorporated into the American system. They represent in a large degree our way of conducting great enterprises. Socialism, in the sense of entrusting the municipality or state with indefinite business functions, is at present better adapted to English political conditions than to American political conditions. The tendency with us to increase the functions of the state in business directions keeps pace with the growth of municipal reform, and is a very definite means to that reform. I believe that we have much social and economic good in store for us through the assumption by the state of more business in the interest of the people at large, but I doubt if the corporation will lose its place as the chief method with us of carrying out great enterprises, or of conducting great productive operations. All the more reason therefore that we see to it that no powers and privileges are allowed to be taken up into it out of past conditions when the

same powers and privileges would not now be conferred. And I believe that we must look to our judges to maintain at this point the original intent and limitations of the earlier laws. A great judicial decision may accomplish as much for freedom or progress as a decisive battle.

More positively still, social righteousness lays a new emphasis today upon outward conditions as affecting character. I am well aware that in the stress which the advocates of social righteousness lay upon conditions they seem to some people to run counter to the methods of evangelistic Christianity. They have been charged with preaching a gospel of environment rather than of conversion. As with all such charges, the ground of misunderstanding lies in the impatience of men for quick moral returns in place of long and permanent results. It lies also in the assumption that a traditional method is sufficient to cover new conditions. What is always wanted is the unchanging spirit of Christianity informing one method or many.

There are three ways of attacking the problem of sin in the personal experience of men. First, that of reaching the individual man in his sin, man after man, delivering him from evil surroundings, and giving him a better chance under a new environment: that is the work of rescue. Second, that of attempting to so invigorate and fortify the man under daily temptation that he will have power to resist: a large part of the work of the pulpit of every city. Third, that of striving to arrest the forces which are helping men to sin, if not compelling them to sin, and so far changing the conditions of their life without taking them out of it, that it shall at least be harder for them to do evil, and easier

for them to be clean, honest, and true. There is no conflict between these methods, if all who use them are equally loyal to the spirit of Christ. They are all necessary. It is foolish beyond conception to insist upon one method as against another, when all must work steadily and persistently to make any appreciable headway. The method of social righteousness finds its justification in the plain fact that multitudes are wrongly conditioned. "What should strike one,"—I quote the words of Professor Smart of Edinburgh, former manufacturer and an employer of labor,—"what should strike one is the enormous disproportion between the people to whom the 'good life' is open and those to whom it is impossible." Impossibility is the word of despair, not of faith. Still it expresses what looks to many minds too much like a fact, in the case of some people: and faith can only say in such cases—"All things are possible with God." In saying this I do not restrict the moral or spiritual outlook to the children of poverty. Their case is no more serious, it may be, than that of the children of luxury. Christ did not say "how hardly shall they that are poor enter into the kingdom of heaven" nor "it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a poor man to enter into the kingdom of heaven." That is altogether a nineteenth century variation.

But to the main question, namely, the actual conditioning of people with a view to their prospects for the kingdom of heaven here and hereafter—let us look at the matter in the experience of the average man, and see how social and economic changes have affected the means of his moral and spiritual development. Consider his life as conditioned by his place in the city.

Under other social conditions he has the great opportunity of what Dr. Munger has so happily termed "salvation by fellowship." That was the means of the salvation of vast numbers of the last and earlier generations in this country. Conversion was not an isolated act. A man was converted among his neighbors, and with his neighbors, and largely because of them. A great city changes all this for the average man, though not altogether for those of exceptional social advantages. We cannot overestimate the part which the democratic spirit and habit has had in the development of moral and religious character.

Or consider the religious prospect of the average man who is the offspring of pure secularism. Here you have the force of heredity to take account of as well as that of environment. A famous sermon of the last generation started from the text—"His father was an Amorite and his mother was a Hittite"—and reached the conclusion, what can you expect of him? Many a workingman of today has a sad heritage of secularism. Christian institutions are foreign to him, as foreign as if they were not under his observation. He knows no church, he knows no family altar, he knows no Sunday as a religious day, he knows no Bible, few if any of the words and deeds of the Lord Jesus. And his thoughts and ambitions, as well as his associations, are non-religious. While you are at church he is discussing the vital questions of labor at his unions.

Or consider the conditions of the man who is becoming isolated in the country, not the resident of the country village, but the man who is being left alone in the remoter part of the town, whose neighbors are moving away from him, whose children must go further and

further to school or stay at home, whose church is being deserted, who looks into the face of strangers and aliens as they come and go.

In the light of such changes as these, will any one say that social righteousness, in so far as it is a religious question, is not a question of conditions? What proportion of the life of the country is not affected directly by these rapid changes in the conditioning of people, by the growth of cities, by the extension of industrialism, by the abandonment of the remoter districts?

But I have been speaking of the average man. What shall be said of those at the extremities, who are the special concern of social righteousness, the children of poverty and the children of mere luxury? What is the chance for the moral or spiritual salvation of the typical child of either class: the son of a father, at either extremity of the social scale, of depraved and debauched mind and habits, who inherits his father's passions with some of their results, who comes to know his father's associates, and to entertain his and their views of life. "Even in a palace," said the old Stoic emperor and saint, "life may be led well," and so it may be in a hovel. But the circumstance, as any one can see, is tremendously against one in either place: and as we are at last beginning to understand in this country, quite as much against one under the conditions of splendid luxury, as of abject poverty. How can we do anything to help in either case, save by attacking the conditions? In the one case it is a question of natural surroundings, in the other it is a question of atmosphere. We can change the material surroundings, we can charge the moral atmosphere with purity, and righteousness. The work below is the work

of physical reconstruction, out of which may come moral sanitation. The work above is altogether that of moral sanitation, the work alike of pulpit, press, and society, and all together. The immediate work above and below, and all the way between, so far as it is concerned with conditions, is the work of social righteousness. Let me remind you of the great sociological parable of our Lord, the parable of the sower, a parable which deals with the apparent wastes of life, the seed by the wayside, that among the thorns, that on the shallow earth. But why should the seed be in unprofitable places? Why not fence the sown ground, why not uproot the thorns, why not deepen the shallow soil, and then wait the harvest; not an equal harvest, but as nearly equal as on any good ground, some thirty, some sixty, some an hundred fold.

But more positively still, social righteousness as I conceive of it, rests its argument, it stakes the very possibility of its success, upon the interest which it may awaken of man in man, of a man in his fellow. I said at the beginning that the chief difficulty in establishing social righteousness lies in the extraordinary demands which it makes for just this kind of interest, it is so much easier to be interested in small things than in great. But nothing which has had to do with the life of men has ever had any power or success, until it has become seriously, and profoundly, and passionately interested in that life. I use the word interest, rather than concern, or pity, or even love, because that is the word which expresses precisely what I mean. There are so many ways of rendering formal and mechanical service under the incentive of what we call christian love, which fall so far short of our way of doing the things we are inter-

ested in, that I want to get something which represents just that thing. It is the tremendous interest in men as sinners which underlies the work of the Salvation Army, the only people, as Cardinal Manning used to say, who have a passion for sinners simply because they are sinners. It was the interest which Mills and his comrades felt for the heathen of unknown lands, as they were idealized to their minds, which created the missions of our century. It was the interest of the Puritan, and of all lovers of liberty in his time, in men as the subjects of political and religious freedom, which led him and them on beyond their own freedom to that of other men and other peoples.

The interestingness of humanity is something which has been overshadowed in our time by the conception of utility. We have thought of people at large for what they could do, not for what they were in themselves, as individuals, or groups, or communities. A kind of interest has been created by the school of realism, but it has been mostly of one sort, so that when we read the stories which come to us from the hamlets of Scotland, we say, "this is idealism; people are not so interesting as that." Happily "Ian Maclaren" has been here to deny the charge. "No," he said, "this is realism. I have just as much right to be realistic in the good, as Zola has to be realistic in the bad. This is the way I see men whom I have known."

It is through this principle of interest carrying with it identification, sympathy, helpfulness, faith, that social Christianity is now beginning to work through the social settlement. The process is plain, first to qualify one's self by training and sympathy to see people as they are: then to live among them, day by day, in

season and out of season: then to try to draw out the people among whom one lives toward one another, to create the neighborhood: then to try to change the environment, to get better surroundings, sanitary tenements, and streets; if need be to bring in books, art, music, some cheering, refining influence; to co-operate with all charitable and religious agencies in doing better work for the neighborhood, seeing to it in every possible way that the people are protected from fraud, and trained toward independence and self-respect, and that every man learns how to help his neighbor. The social settlement is yet in the stage of experiment, at work under limitations, such as the lack of perseverance in residents, the lack of equipment, the lack of public recognition. But it has principles which will certainly come to the front in the service of social righteousness.

Such is my conception of social righteousness. I have tried to show you what it means, what it requires, and how it works.

Not much can be expected of it in the way of a clear and direct result until it is able to produce a habit of mind which will be receptive of its teachings and sensitive to its requirements.

It will be obliged to do battle with theories and with methods, which by intention or by indifference, or by ignorance, are hostile to its spirit.

Its aim, like that of all righteousness, is the righteous life, but its chief work is to so determine the conditions which affect character, as to make it harder for men to sin, and easier, because a simpler and clearer thing, for them to do well.

And for its work it requires of those who would be its prophets and apostles nothing less than a consum-

ing passion for their fellow men. Its greatest danger, perhaps greater than that incident to any other form of Christianity, is institutionalism. If it can be guarded from that, if it can be kept from being reduced to some temporary or even permanent specialization, if it can be held as the complement of personal righteousness,—its outgoing, constructing, unifying, reforming and therefore regenerating life,—it will come to be seen and known of men as a power of God unto salvation: and to attain that end is enough for any righteous man, or for any form of righteousness.

IV

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE OF THE MODERN CITY

ADDRESS AT THE SEMI-CENTENNIAL OF THE CITY OF MANCHESTER, SEPTEMBER 6, 1896

You have judged it a fitting thing to give the opening session of this commemorative week to the recognition of the spiritual life of your city. You have judged rightly. The modern city, though founded in industrialism, or built upon commerce, and set toward every form of material development, has its spiritual life: otherwise its history were quickly told in figures and statistics. We must not allow ourselves to be deceived by appearances. The modern, by contrast with the ancient or mediæval city, seems to be non-religious and secular. The contrast which gives this result is superficial. Religion, of its own notion and for its own ends, never built a city. The religious spirit has moved men to great secular tasks, including discovery, colonization, and conquest, but it has not directed their energies to the making of cities. The instinct of worship, however expressed, cannot explain that strange mingling of diverse peoples and races and religions which is the characteristic of the great municipality, ancient or modern. And even when the people have been of one race and of one religion, the chief motive for massing the population at a given center has not been the spiritual motive. The site of the most religious city of the world, "whither the tribes went up, the tribes of the Lord to

the testimony of Israel," was chosen for defense. And when war ceased to be the determining reason for the location and development of cities, then commerce and trade came in as the determining cause, just as now it is industrialism.

But while it is not the genius of religion to build cities, nor indeed to bring men together in the mass in any permanent form, the great concern of religion, perhaps for this very reason, is with the city. The voice of the Lord is always crying to it. Whatever the "world" meant to the prophet of the old order, as something to be overcome, whatever the "world" meant to the apostle of the new order, as something to be redeemed, that the "city" now means to Christianity, as something to be feared and loved, to be served and mastered. The supreme question which confronts Christianity as a religion, and which confronts it equally as a civilization, is the question of the moral and spiritual outcome of the cities of Christendom.

It is peculiarly the question before our American Christianity. Notwithstanding the rapid massing of the population at centers, usually at the call of capital, we have not become used to the idea of the city. Manchester stands about midway in the list of tabulated cities. But you are just celebrating your semi-centennial. There are other communities within our fellowship which are much younger. Cities have grown in fact much faster than in idea, in the understanding, that is, on the part of the people of their nature and significance.

What is a city, in the modern sense and under modern conditions? A city is a self-centered community, of various if not of diverse population, thoroughly organ-

ized, having resources within itself sufficient for increase, secure in the safeguards of order and justice, equipped with the means not only of material but of social and spiritual advancement, and great enough in itself in numbers, in resources, and in character to affect, if not to dominate, the life of the individual citizen. Incorporation does not make a city, neither do numbers, neither does wealth. A city is that combination of forces which really makes a new unit of power. It is in fact the most powerful unit which is today at work upon the individual life, more powerful than the home, or the state in the larger meaning, or the church. It is so powerful that it creates a kind of provincialism. The greater the city the more difficult it is for the average citizen to escape from his environment. The city educates and enlarges him to a certain point, makes him, as we say, more cosmopolitan, and then defines, restricts, and controls him. He reads the world through the columns of the local press, he measures the outer movement of industry and trade by the effect upon the prevailing business, he judges people at large by the social standard with which he has become familiar. Such is the modern city, in its influence over the average life which forms a part of it. We are just beginning to understand and feel its power. Such, therefore, is the moral significance of the civic fact which we celebrate during the present week.

I think that I can render you no better service at this hour than to speak to you of the Spiritual Life of the Modern City.

I use the term spiritual, rather than religious, simply because it is more inclusive. We must widen our definitions if we are to hold them. If we are to keep the

ancient terms we must make them broad and free. Civilization, for example, seemed to be a term of inherited breadth, but how grandly its meaning was enlarged in the recent address of Lord Chief Justice Russell. "Civilization," he said, "is not dominion, wealth, material luxury: nay, not even a great literature and education widespread, good though those things be. Its true signs are thought for the poor and suffering, chivalrous regard and respect for woman, the frank recognition of human brotherhood irrespective of color or nation or religion, the narrowing of mere force as a governing factor in the world, the love of ordered freedom, abhorrence of what is mean and cruel and vile, ceaseless devotion to the claims of justice."

That sentence could not have been penned in its entirety a century ago. Civilization means more today, and religion means more, and to make sure that I get the wider meaning, I prefer to speak in the terms of the spiritual life. I want to affirm the presence, the reality, and the increasing power of the spiritual life of the modern city. I want to unfold, so far as I may be able, the working of that life under the action of Christianity upon the city, and of the city upon Christianity.

As I have already intimated, the modern city, if judged by appearances, stands for materialism. Who sees the things of the spirit as he enters its gates? Here and there a church, or some institution of beneficence, may come under his notice, but how still and powerless they are in the rush and tumult of the street. The people whom he meets are for the most part busy in the production of wealth, or in the search after it: some in the display of it: no one appears to be indifferent to

it. The whole life of the city seems to be absorbed in one pursuit, you may give it what name you will, you may call it business, you may call it industry; the one impression of it all upon the mind of a stranger is that of the supremacy of the material over the spiritual.

Where are the things of the spirit? What are the signs of its presence?

The true inquirer will not look first among the things which are evident. He will not wait till Sunday to begin his search. If the spiritual has any real power, it will be able to live in the midst of the material, working in and through it all, and directing it to higher ends. The inquirer, therefore, into the spiritual life of a community will go down at once into the work of the people. He will seek to know the local standards of the profession, the business, the industries of the town, the relation between employers and employed, the spirit in which the daily task is wrought; and then he will want to know equally what becomes of the gains of work, whether expressed in income or earnings, how much of it is spent in mere luxury, or debasing pleasures, how much in an honest and generous livelihood, or a noble charity. He will follow men to their homes that he may assure himself of their purity and peace. He will go into the alleys and outskirts of the city to see who may be there on errands of mercy, who are watching by the sick, who are relieving the suffering. He will mingle with children in their studies and sports, and note their manners, temper, and training. He will go into the courts of justice, and follow out the administration of law, to determine how far it is firm, evenhanded, and consistent, a steady and sure restraint upon vice. He will take part in the recreations and amusements of the

people to see if they are natural, open, clean, and fresh. And when he has made these studies he will have reached some pretty definite conclusions in his own mind about "the state of religion" before he visits the churches. And yet when he visits these he will not forget that there is a life of faith as well as of works, a life born out of penitence and forgiveness, a life of profound and vital beliefs, of personal consecration to a personal Master and Redeemer, of devout and thankful acknowledgment of the one living and true God.

Such an inquiry as is thus suggested would bring out, I am convinced, in unexpected proportions, the spiritual life of your own and of the average modern city. It would raise some doubts, it would leave some unanswered questions, it would create not a little disappointment, it would cause some dark and painful experiences, but it would give a fine lesson in social perspective. An unrighteous, corrupt, vile minority, however small, is a disgrace and a shame to a christian city. But it is one way of supporting and increasing that minority to allow it to show for more than it is. If the goodness of a city could be written out as vividly as its badness, if the ninety and nine within the social fold could be made as interesting as the one who has gone astray, if the story of a virtuous and happy home had the same kind of fascination as the tale of scandal, if it would cause as much of a sensation to find one upright, courageous, wide-hearted, God-fearing man, as to find a betrayer or a hypocrite, then virtue would have the same publicity which now accompanies vice. I would not be guilty of minimizing the evil of a city, nor of making light of its materializing tendencies, but I would declare the things unpublished, unnoted, and therefore

unmeasured, which stand for its spiritual life; the prevailing integrity, fidelity to the common duties, the self-denying affection of the true home, the charity which suffereth long and is kind, the courage which on occasions doubles the power of justice, the sincerity of the honest servant of his Master and worshipper of his God.

You may have read the "picture," as he terms it, which Edward Everett Hale has drawn in his own inimitable way under the title, "If Jesus Came to Boston." It is the story of a Syrian stranger, as he appears to be, who comes to the city searching for a lost brother. The search is not unnaturally long, but it is long enough to show the variety of agencies, and helpers, and friends, at work for the recovery of the lost. The sentence in which the stranger returns his thanks, when the search is over, throws off the guise in which he had appeared, and answers the half implied question of the title: "What you have been doing to the least of these my brethren and sisters, you have done it unto me."

The spiritual life of a city, as expressed in charity, stands revealed at the touch of every kind of want or suffering. It is the very complexity of that life which hides it. A single charity, one philanthropist, would be conspicuous. John Eliot preaching to the Indians at the Falls of Amoskeag seems the embodiment of the Gospel. He was, just as John Stark at Bennington was the embodiment of the spirit of the Revolution. But the Gospel which Eliot proclaimed has since gone out into all the world, and the spirit which Stark illustrated has since made a race free.

Many of us recall a man, as he was in his prime, a tall and alert figure, a gracious presence in our streets,

who for more than forty years fulfilled among us the office of a christian minister, and the no less responsible office of a christian citizen. I suppose that no name is more closely identified with the religious history of Manchester, or more representative of its earlier moral tone and character, than the name of Cyrus Wallace. It is an honor to his memory, as it has been to our advantage, that his pastorate and his citizenship covered so many years of honorable life, of eloquent speech, and of sustained influence. And yet during the past fifty years scores of men from various pulpits, and with differing views, have uttered the fundamental truths of the common Christianity, and thousands upon thousands of our citizens have declared in their daily lives, by speech, at the polls, everywhere and by all means, the principles of social and political righteousness. The plain fact is that the spiritual life of a city cannot be summed up in any one man or in many men, in any one church or in many churches, in any one institution or in many institutions. It is a diffused and distributed life, and though of far less significance than might be desired or even expected, it is, as I have affirmed, a reality and a growing power in the modern city.

I have been speaking thus far in general terms. What now shall we say is the actual working of the spiritual life of the city under the action of Christianity upon the city, and of the city upon Christianity? It is impossible that two such forces should act upon one another without producing some peculiar and distinct result. Christianity cannot use precisely the same means or do precisely the same work, or mean precisely the same thing apart from its central truth, within the city and without. The modern city creates conditions,

to which Christianity must conform, if it would save or even help the city.

There are several aspects in which the actual working of Christianity in the spiritual life of the city comes before us. One aspect,—it is perhaps the most evident and the most striking,—is the amount of energy which must be directed to the work of recovery. The city wastes. It is prodigal of life. It is actively wasteful. It exhausts, it wears out, in some cases it devitalizes and destroys. No corporation which uses machinery is obliged to maintain such extensive repair shops as the modern city. These are its reformatories, its hospitals, and, for that matter, its churches.

Consider in this connection the peculiar function of the pulpit of the modern city, how much of its effort must be directed to the restoration of spiritual force, or the reinvigoration of faith. The same men and women appear before the preacher Sunday by Sunday, upon whose lives every day of the week has made its serious draft. There is scarcely one among them who has not passed through some experience which has tended to reduce love to man, or faith in God. It is one great office of the preacher to recover the lost faith or love, to heal the hurt of the world. The message which he brings may take on such language as it may please him to give, but it must be full of spiritual health, it must be charged with spiritual life. The gospel which he utters may or may not be shaped in philosophical thought, it may or may not be touched with emotion, it must have power to invigorate. If I were asked to name the one distinctive thing for which the pulpit of the modern city must stand, I should say at once, inspiration.

See, too, in like manner how much of the christianized charity of the city is directed to the recovery of spiritual as well as of physical losses. The poverty of the city is of its own type. There is nothing quite like it to be found elsewhere. The poverty of the country, or of the frontier, is by contrast little more than hardship, the absence of comfort, the endurance, at times, of want. It was the poverty of Lincoln and Garfield. How different the poverty of the city, the old Roman poverty, the poverty of enfeeblement, or of profligacy, the decay, as we say, of fortune or of family. The ministry to the poor of the city is for the most part a ministry to the weak and worn. Its object is not to restore their fortune,—they may never have had any,—it is to recover them. In many cases this is impossible. Nothing remains but to fulfill the apostolic injunction—"We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak." Herein lies the patience of the true charity of the city.

Or think yet again how surely the work of recovery passes over into that of rescue. This means infinitely more than relief, it means deliverance, sometimes from associations and surroundings, more often from habits which have become another self. Nothing shows so clearly how necessary this work is, how essential it is to the Christianity of the city, as the fact that whenever it is neglected, whenever the existing orders of Christianity rise above it, instantly a new order is established which makes this work its special business. The latest order of Christians which has set itself to this task is the Salvation Army, which justifies its existence by its "passion for sinners." It is only the passion for sinners which can overcome in them the passion for sin.

And the existence always, in some form, of some body of Christians, charged with this passion, shows the constant draft which the city makes upon Christianity in the work of recovery. It may be impossible to locate the responsibility for this demand. It is enough to state the fact.

Another aspect of the direct working of Christianity in the spiritual life of the city appears in the form of collective or organized righteousness. When Abraham arrested his mighty pleadings before the Lord, in behalf of the doomed city of his kinsman, with the final petition, "Peradventure there be ten righteous men: wilt thou destroy all the city for lack of ten?" he anticipated the absolute conditions of moral and spiritual reform. For the mere use of example one righteous man would be as good as twenty. His solitary, unshared righteousness would be awfully impressive. So, as I can conceive, Abraham himself would have towered aloft in Sodom. But if example fails in the midst of evil, then righteousness, singlehanded and alone, is powerless.

It has been said that if men were to come together today in any great numbers without a religion, they would be obliged at least to evolve the ten commandments. Society would be impossible without these. But grant the ten commandments, who will enforce them? This of course is the question in every city, for the city, in an indirect way, organizes evil; evil, that is, becomes a part of the trade and traffic of the city. If it were merely a question of dealing with human passions, as they exist in the individual, if these passions were not utilized in the interest of gain, if they were not commercialized, society might rely chiefly upon

moral means for their restraint, or for their conversion into moral power. It is the trade in them which demands another treatment. It is the men, for the most part, who in themselves stand at a remove from these passions, cold-blooded, self controlled, and relentless, who defy the commandments, and through them, society. Against such a class of men, to be fóund in every great city, if not the product of it, there is no sufficient opposing force save that of organized righteousness. Organization without righteousness is futile, and righteousness unorganized is equally futile. An historian writing of a certain period in English history says, "These were hard times for bad men to live in, good men were so terribly and formidably active." It is the activity of goodness, if weighted with judgment, and made firm through organization, which ensures the ends of civic righteousness.

That the increasing task of the Christians of the city lies in this direction no one can doubt. To so organize public sentiment, with such breadth of view and yet with such definiteness of aim, with such inclusiveness that no rightminded and really earnest citizen will be left out, and with such constancy of purpose that enthusiasm and effort will survive a given campaign, this is becoming a recognized part of the business of christian citizenship.

I call your special attention to the bearing of this aspect of the Christianity of the city upon the question of religious unity. I have said that the city is acting upon Christianity, just as Christianity is acting upon the city. This action is in some respects restrictive. The city is at least defining the work of Christianity, if not modifying its types of character. But in this

matter of religious unity the influence of the city is broad and constructive. The city can afford a multiplicity of denominations better than the country, but it cannot afford the denominational spirit. That is too costly a luxury for religion anywhere. So long as christian believers and worshipers differ in the emphasis which they wish to place upon particular forms of belief or of service, there are manifest advantages from such liberty, provided it does not prevent the higher unity. The city enters the protest of its own great spiritual life, the moment a practical working unity is forbidden in the name of authority or in the name of liberty. It lifts its moral necessities before the separated and divided forces of righteousness, and asks if this condition must needs be. Who creates it? Who justifies it? It passes no judgment upon questions of polity or questions of faith, it respects the sacredness of inspiration and the sacredness of institutions, but it asserts through all its pleading necessities the supremacy of righteousness.

The city, in its action upon Christianity, is thus becoming one of the great unifying forces in religion. A result is being achieved under its demands for which other agencies have proved insufficient. I do not overestimate the effect of its influence. It does not accomplish, or even forecast ecclesiastical unity. That must come, if at all, from within. It must have an inward, not an outward, compulsion. But moral and religious unity, co-operation for work, alliance for conflict, these are the contribution of the modern city to Christianity.

Among so many illustrations of this fact, I hesitate to give an example. But there is one near enough at hand, and so pertinent that I refer to it. For several years the city of Cambridge, Massachusetts, has been

able to maintain a firm, consistent, and efficient position on the practical issues of temperance. This result has been brought about by the union of all the forces which make up the higher life of the city. The voice of labor, of business, of the university, and of the church has been one and the same. The union among the churches has been especially noticeable, because natural, sustained, and complete. It has represented all polities and all faiths. Catholics and Protestants have spoken from the same platform, and have worked together at the polls. And when recently one of the bravest and most earnest champions of the cause, the minister of a certain denomination, was called to a western city, the clergy of every faith, and the citizens of every party came together to bid him God speed. Such here and there is the present fact. Such is the growing hope for the influence of the city upon Christianity. Organized righteousness is one step, it is a long step, toward religious unity.

There is another aspect in which the actual working of Christianity in the spiritual life of the city is becoming distinctive, namely, the production of unusual types of character. We have been accustomed to look to the country for individuality. We have said that the city makes men conventional, molds them to its own type, and so makes them alike. I believe that this distinction is still true in large degree. We have also been accustomed to look elsewhere than to the city for the more devout forms of religious life. Paul, indeed, addressed the Christians of Corinth as called to be saints, but the response was not such as to create a precedent in favor of the saintliness of the city. In one respect, however, the balance of religious power as between locali-

ties has changed. The prophet no longer comes from the desert. The message which he bears is not only to the city, but from within the city, and from the city to the country at large. The great prophetic denunciations of wrong, the curse of slavery, the crime of corruption, have come from the pulpit and from the press of the city. The city is becoming the home, the moral birthplace, of the reformer.

The types of character, however, which I have in mind as I speak, are more strictly personal. They are represented by men as individuals or in groups.

The Christianity of the city is developing a type of character strong in the power of resistance. The city is a repository of trusts. Its citizens are becoming in large degree trust bearers. As such they are exposed to extraordinary temptations. Some fall before temptation, but the proportion is small, and out of those who stand, there are constant examples of those who stand grandly, with a magnificent resolution and tenacity. Every one who knows such men, knows that they are worthy of the title borne by one of the heroes of the war,—"The Rock of Chickamauga." The tides of financial battles roll against them in vain. When the battle is over they have held their ground. They are at their post.

Let us not underestimate the negative virtues, the virtues of the Old Testament, the virtues of men trained under the ceaseless iteration of the command, "Thou shalt not." They give security to our institutions. They are the safeguard of the national honor. There are times when the country rests upon the conservatism of the cities. There are national issues which the cities as such are apt to ignore or neglect, or upon

which they act unintelligently. The political judgment of a city is not always up to the standard of the country at large. But when issues are at stake affecting the stability of institutions, the rights of inheritance and possession, the credit of individuals and of the government, the city is not reckless. And to the charge of self interest which may be urged, the reply is sufficient, that at such a time whoever saves himself and defends his own, thereby defends every other man and saves the state.

And closely akin to this type which is characterized by the power of resistance, another, and perhaps finer, type is gradually forming. It is that of character under self-restraint, reaching at times to self-denial and sacrifice. Consider the temptations which today confront young men of fortune in the city. They have the choice of self-restraint or profligacy. Some choose profligacy. These are the most serious menace we have to the stability of democratic institutions. The mere display of wealth is aggravating to a democracy, especially if the wealth displayed can show no equivalent in some form of the public good. The flaunting of wealth in the eyes of men, the sign of shame, is not only beastly, it has a political significance, it is destructive of every principle on which the Republic is based.

But on the other hand, suppose that the man who has this open choice does not choose to be a profligate. Suppose he holds himself in restraint, and listens to higher ambitions, and gives himself and his fortune to noble ends, shall no credit be given to him commensurate with the shame which attaches to his brother? Such choices are being made constantly. The city is to be credited with the good as well as with the bad choices.

If it allures with its vices, it appeals through its wide and far reaching opportunities. And when the appeal is heard and obeyed, a type of character is developed which is unique. It cuts across that self-seeking type which is continually seeking and using the city for gain or advantage. It represents what the young ruler might have represented if he had given his possessions to the poor and followed Christ. The man of today obeys that injunction of the Master, not by parting company with his possessions, but by giving himself in and through them to the public good.

Such types of character as these are peculiar to the city. They can hardly be developed elsewhere. They are the outcome of its temptations and opportunities.

The final aspect of the working of Christianity in and through the spiritual life of the city, to which I refer as being peculiar and distinctive, appears from time to time in the moral and religious enthusiasms of men in the mass. The city alone can reveal in its just proportions the enthusiasm of humanity. The great bishop of North Africa, wearied with the distractions of the cities and sick at heart of their conventionalities, took his appeal on one occasion straight to the individual soul. "I summon thee, O Soul, not as thou art in the groves and academies, not as thou art in the market-place, but as thou art at the cross roads, unlettered and unlearned, naked and alone." He had his authority for such an appeal in the very constitution of the human soul. It was made to stand by itself before God. "So then every one of us must give account of himself to God." But there is an instinct in every man which craves a place in the great human brotherhood. At times we all long to lose ourselves in it. We want to be

caught up into the higher moods and swayed by the wider passions which are the property not of men as individuals, but of humanity. The properties of water are the same in all places. The ocean alone feels the tides. Men in their individual and associated lives have movement and current. The tides are in humanity. And we catch something of their ebb and flow, as the local mass of which we are a part begins to be moved by a common impulse. The moral uprising of a city has in it the heave and swell of the sea.

I have heard once and again, in the graphic words of Dr. Fenn, the story of the uprising of Manchester at the fall of Sumter, when men were lifted by one common movement on the full swell of patriotism. That one event changed in a moment the moral tone and temper of the city. Men walked these streets with another bearing, they wrought their daily tasks with a more serious purpose, they talked one with another in a language which had a meaning, they prayed face to face with God. Whether they went to the field or stayed at their work, they fought the battles of the Republic in their own souls. Every city of the North was swayed by the same emotion. It was as if the foundations were broken up, and deep was calling unto deep.

The spiritual life of a city may show a yet deeper and more spiritual possession. I appeal to any man who has seen and felt the spirit of God descending upon a city, and resting upon it. A whole city, feeling at its heart the peace of God, the strife of tongues still, enmities and jealousies and hate subdued, the love of neighbor for the time as natural as the love of self, the things of the spirit as plain as the things of sense, the heart of the dull made quick to the truth, the doubts and fears

and unbeliefs of men lost in the reality of faith and the joy of forgiveness, what is all this but the earthly realization though for the time, of the city of God, a vision of the new Jerusalem come down from God out of Heaven?

Brethren and friends of this christian city: In speaking to you of the spiritual life of the modern city, I have spoken out of an impulse, not yet spent, from the spiritual life of your own city. Coming here at the opening of my ministry, a learner rather than a teacher of the mysteries of the Kingdom of God, I came to see, as I then believed, the things of the spirit in this community. Looking back over a score of years, I am confident that I was not deceived. What things I was then taught by experience to recognize as belonging to the spiritual life of a city, these same things I have learned to recognize elsewhere with a clearer vision and with a larger faith. Our churches are not separate from the workshop, the office, the school, the college. The men with whom we worship are the very men with whom we walk the street, at whose side we work, with whom we lay the plans of our business enterprises, with whom we study in our search after knowledge and truth. Let us not rule God out of any part of his world. Why should not He make His habitation wherever men build their homes, and do their work, and fight their battles? What has religion to fear from the modern city, except it be some kind of faint-heartedness or doubt or disloyalty on the part of His church?

I congratulate you upon the assurances, the guarantees, you have for christian service and christian citizenship in this city. The record of the past as you have told it in your churches is an honorable record. But

Manchester is still in the formative state. The fifty years which are past have not so determined its spiritual life that it may not be broadened and deepened in every part. Open your minds and hearts yet more and more, I pray you, to the spiritual capacity of your city, so that its material supremacy, while thereby ennobled and ensured, may yet be overshadowed by the power of the city for righteousness.

V

THE CONSCIENCE OF THE NATION

Sermon on the Liberation of Cuba, College Church, Hanover, April 22, 1898

There is an ancient prophecy which forecasts the time when the world will recognize and acknowledge the conscience of nations. The nation which has the bravest, the most trustworthy, the most thoroughly organized and developed conscience, other things being equal, will have the right of way. "Open ye the gates," runs this joyous prophecy, "that the righteous nation which keepeth truth may enter in."

I wish to speak to you today, under the incentives of the experience through which we are passing, concerning this conscience of the nation. It is really the determining factor in the present situation. Whichever way the immediate issue before us may turn, the strain of the decision will fall upon the national conscience. If, through any resources of statesmanship yet left, war may be averted, the conscience of the nation will be held to the task of securing the end for which war seemed to be necessary. We have undertaken to say, we have said, that the inhumanity, which has been practiced in Cuba under the name of war, must be stopped. War is terrible, but it is not necessarily inhuman. Inhumanity has no right to the name of war. President Cleveland affirmed the obligation of the American people to stay this "useless sacrifice of human life." President McKinley, upon taking office, reaffirmed this obliga-

tion as a more imperative and still nearer duty: and in his recent message he declared with a stronger emphasis, "In the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests which give us the right to speak and to act, the war in Cuba must stop." The American people thus stand committed to a most serious business. The step proposed may be in advance of existing international law. International law is made by the actual advance of some one nation in the direction toward which all are tending. We have taken a position from which we cannot retreat in honor, to be maintained, if through peace, no less resolutely than through war.

And if war is the more probable and, as it now seems, the near alternative, then the burden which rests upon the national conscience is no less serious. It must guarantee the restriction of the war to the one purpose for which it was invoked. This is no easy guarantee to fulfill, for war once begun for high ends passes on rapidly towards secondary ends. This war begun in the interest of the common humanity will, if unrestrained, pass straight on to the end of national aggrandizement. We repudiate today, with one accord, the thought of the annexation of Cuba. Shall we continue to repudiate that idea as we realize the cost of war? Shall we find a sufficient recompense for the losses incurred, and the new debt added to our liabilities, in the consciousness of a humane and righteous duty discharged? Or, to take another test, Senator Hoar has made the suggestion that "it is well understood that the aspiration of Gomez is for a black republic in the West Indies. If he should get control of Cuba," he goes on to say, "and if Hayti and San Domingo join him, and perhaps

Porto Rico, he aspires to give an example to mankind, showing how men of the colored race may rule themselves as equals, socially and politically and in all other ways, in freedom and honor." Should this aspiration prove to be the natural and fit outcome of the struggle, will the nation, north and south, honor it, and be content with the issue?

These and like tests confront the national conscience, from whatever point of view we approach the issue. Have we a national conscience which can bear the strain which is coming upon it? This is a far greater question than that of peace or war. It goes with either. And it takes hold upon the future of the country. Spain has far less at stake, and Cuba, than the United States. Spain may lose a province, and Cuba may not realize the aspirations of its leaders: the United States has committed itself by this act to a far reaching and irrevocable policy. By as much as its future is greater, and apparently longer than that of other peoples concerned, by so much is its interest more vital and profound.

I have had occasion elsewhere to remind some of you that we are rapidly becoming a world-power. The step which we now propose to take is a long step into the world. Cuba is virtually in Europe. Whatever we do there, even in the name of humanity, touches the nations, it touches still more sensitively the races. It is already the Anglo-Saxon versus the Latin. Our action may necessitate further advances; it may determine future alliances. I see no escape from this wider responsibility. We cannot afford to purchase our isolation at the price of courage or of humanity. We must go forward. But I would be sure that you do not underestimate the moral significance of each advancing

step. Many of you will live to see results, which now seem to be remote if not impossible. That is no reason why we should falter or be afraid. It is a reason why we should be sober minded, sure of our motives and methods, and, above all, determined that the national conscience shall assert its authority, and take command in this whole procedure. Therefore, the subject which I am urging upon your thought today, the conscience of the nation as the director and arbiter of the impending struggle.

Let us go out a little way from the immediate issue to consider the full import of our subject. The conscience of nations is a term which we have not held by inheritance. The idea itself, as a working principle, is being slowly evolved under the conditions of modern civilization. The conception of the state as a moral person is not new. The Old Testament is full of it. Greek philosophy taught that the "end of the state is not only to live but to live nobly." Puritanism affirmed through Milton that a "nation ought to be but as one huge Christian personage, one mighty growth or stature of an honest man, as big and compact in virtue as in body." But the practical idea of a conscience in the state, organized and developed to ensure this conception, is comparatively new. Underneath all national ideals, however high they may have been, there has always lurked the sentiment that the nation was not to be held to the ordinary distinctions of right and wrong. The sentiment is not to be wondered at. The nation as it rises before us in its majesty, does seem to be something other than we are in self-determining power, more worthy of being a law unto itself. And this sentiment is heightened by the fact that the nation

is empowered to use means which are not entrusted to private hands. The nation can make war. But war involves the art of deception. If this art can be employed in war why not in diplomacy? It is not to be wondered at, I say, that the conscience of nations is something not easily recognized and acknowledged. Modern statesmanship has never endorsed the extreme position of Machiavelli, extreme even for him, that "it is frequently necessary, for the upholding of the state, to go to work against faith, against charity, against humanity, against religion," but it has been apt to rest midway in the axioms, "Whatever policy requires, justice sanctions," or "There are no crimes in politics, only blunders." Gradually only, and with difficulty, have we reached the theoretical position that a nation, our nation, ought to speak the truth like a man, and ought to do right like a man.

And singularly enough in this struggle of modern civilization to organize conscience in nations, there has been less help than might have been expected from two natural sources of aid, religion and liberty. Religion has too often sanctioned actions which have been distinctly wrong. It has sometimes advised, and at other times upheld the principle, that the end justifies the means. And even now, whenever a christian nation does violence to the rights of a pagan nation, and thereby opens the way to missions, we are apt to refer to the act as one of the overrulings of Providence, and let it go at that. The conscience of the church is still blunt to the primary distinctions of right and wrong in matters affecting the spread of Christianity.

And modern liberty, in its heroic struggle for human rights, has not always built up the conscience of the

nation it has created. The result has sometimes been sentiment rather than conscience. It is impossible even at this day to analyze the French Revolution and find its absolute moral content. Here again we ought not to be altogether surprised at the result. We could not reasonably expect that previous conditions would bring forth a symmetrical development of conscience. Every nation has had some one supreme and absorbing end to gain, like religious freedom or political equality. Until that was gained nothing else could be considered in its proper value. Now the conditions are changed. The advanced nations have secured the first objects of national aspiration. Religious toleration is a substantial and assured fact. Political rights are in full exercise. These nations are magnificently equipped with the advantages of religious and political freedom.

The new demands upon national life, upon the life of the great nations, are of another kind. They all have duties in common, duties to one another, the duty of the strong to the weak, a joint responsibility it may be, a separate responsibility it may be, for some incompetent sovereignty, a common concern in regard to declining civilizations and degenerate peoples, a like interest in the new wealth created by science or brought to light by discovery, and an equal obligation for the advancement of learning, justice and truth. Here is the training school for the conscience of nations. No nation has as yet become proficient under this training, but results have already been secured. International law has been advanced, arbitration has been introduced, disturbing ambitions have been held in check, war has been mitigated, and diplomacy has been brought nearer to the common standards of truth. Even the concert of

Europe has a moral intent, and it has certain moral results to show, albeit it falters in great emergencies through jealousy and distrust.

And now we have come to take our part under this new discipline of the nations. The national conscience has already been under training. No nation ever passed through a severer moral discipline than that through which we passed in the overthrow of slavery. How can I make that earlier discipline real to the men of another generation? Let me call up these words from the second Inaugural of Mr. Lincoln—written after four years of war:

"The Almighty has his own purposes. 'Woe unto the world because of offences, for it must needs be that offences come: but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh.' If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of these offences, which in the providence of God must needs come, but which having continued through his appointed time, he now wills to remove, and that he gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offence came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may soon pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid with the sword; as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, 'The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.' "

In these words of humility and penitence the heart of

the nation found utterance. The national conscience was on its knees before God. The experience of today is different. We are not now called to atone for offences, to pay the cost of unrequited toil, or undergo the penalty for injustice and greed. Were such the case we should at least have the advantage of a chastened spirit. The present work to which we believe we are called is a more delicate, if not a more serious work. It is to set another nation's house in order, to rebuke another's inhumanity, to ensure freedom beyond the limits of our own territory. Are we in the spirit to do this business? I do not ask, have we the power, or the courage, or even the enthusiasm. The question which I put at the beginning is continuously in order. Have we a national conscience equal to the task? Or better the question, because answerable,—have we a national conscience which can be made equal to the task? That I must believe, otherwise I cannot understand how God has put the task upon us. I cannot believe that it is mere vainglory, or mere revenge, or mere passion of any sort, which is now stirring the heart of the nation at large.

What shall we do then to make sure that the conscience of the nation is made equal to its business? First, let every conscientious citizen put himself in a responsible, rather than in an indifferent or critical attitude to the Government. The tendency with us all is to insist too much upon the incidents in proportion to the substance of a great issue. Unconsciously we become the partisans of a method. There are better and poorer methods. A given method may be right or wrong according to time and place. Personally, I have believed that the method of statesmanship ought to have

undisputed and unvexed opportunity before the resort to war. But that question is now practically settled. The President has said that he can go no further until there has been put into his hands full authority for war.

"In view of these facts and considerations, I ask the Congress to authorize and empower the President to take measures to secure a full and final termination of hostilities between the government of Spain and the people of Cuba, and to secure in the island the establishment of a stable government capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations, insuring peace, tranquility and security to its citizens as well as our own, and to use the military and naval forces of the United States as may be necessary for these purposes."

Personally, I believe that intervention is more consistent with the end proposed than recognition. Recognition seems to me to be the weaker and more questionable policy. But the difference is still one of method. It does not cover the question at issue. That again has been determined. The nation has practically decided that it is its duty to relieve distress and to restore order in Cuba, and however that is done, the nation must be prepared to take the consequences, which at present no one can foresee. Neither method can prevent complications, nor guarantee speedy withdrawal. The pacification of Cuba by the United States will not be the work of a day. The essential duty of citizenship,—this is the principle I advocate,—is that of identification with the great purposes of a nation, provided they are right. It corresponds to the duty of protest, provided they are wrong. Between the two there is no responsible position. If you believe, as I do, that in this matter

the nation is essentially right in its purposes, you will agree with me also in saying that method should be held in right proportion to the end. And further, that every man should put himself clearly and openly into some relation of responsibility. Otherwise what do we more than those whose indifference or unconcern about the public welfare we are wont to condemn?

I chanced last evening to open Mulford's Nation, and to read, I think it must have been for the first time, this passage. It made so much impression upon my own mind that I read it to you.

"Hegel says, the mob in a nation is the force which acts without, or apart from, the organization of the whole. There may then be an ignorant or a learned mob, a mob of men of fashion or of men of science, but the spirit is the same, and in its severance from the organic people there is the same essential vulgarity. This has an illustration of singular force in one of the political plays of Shakespeare. When Caius Marcius turns to the crowd in Rome, and denounces them as the detached and disorganized rabble, in whom there is nothing of the organic unity of the people, the disdain of the Roman is in the words—'Go, get you home, you fragments.' And those who in the conceit of culture, or of wealth, or of higher interests, or of spiritual endowments, withdraw from the normal political action of the nation, are obeying the impulse of the mob, and are as the very fragments for whom the Roman patrician felt such unmeasured scorn."

"The normal political action of the nation"—how imperative are its demands at all times. How much more imperative when it passes into great acts which either rise out of or return into the national conscience.

Indifference, aloofness at such a time makes a man a "fragment"; or to use the more vital figure of our Lord, "he is cut off as a branch and withers."

Second, let every conscientious citizen support the men who stand for the conscience of the nation. The nation owes nothing whatever to any other kind of men from the beginning of its history until now. Adventurers, soldiers of fortune, ambitious rulers, conscienceless statesmen,—to what one does the nation stand indebted? The two names typical of the Republic, commanding the great crises in its life, are Washington and Lincoln—strong men, slow men, as other men of their time thought who ran themselves out of breath in their petty haste; patient men, capable of enduring Valley Forge or Gettysburg; firm men, unmoved by criticism or popular clamor; courageous men, with the courage of faith, able to see the end from the beginning; self-sacrificing men, able and willing to lay every personal ambition, and every partisan advantage upon the altar of country,—these are the men who made this Republic what it is, who established its reputation, who gave it stability at home and authority abroad. These are the men who trained this democracy. Do you suppose that under any other training, this nation would have held its peace, and possessed itself in a self-respecting quietness, while the court of enquiry was calmly investigating the wreck of the Maine?

Let us honor our past in the present, our dead in the living. And if God has seen fit to add further to this succession of distinctly American leaders in the person of the President of the United States, let us recognize the succession and support him, as we think we would have supported his predecessors. This is no time for

criticisms, or comparisons, least of all is it the time to set one department of the government over against another. But it is the exact time for the American people to say what they want in men who are to guide them through this crisis. It is the time to say whether they want men of like quality with those who established the traditions of the Republic, or whether they want men by comparison less American in spirit and in method. We are to be tested, we must remember, in this emergency as well as our leaders. And as the months go by, and events take place which will try us, it will appear to others if not to us, whether we as a people are capable of maintaining our reputation and of preserving our traditions.

And finally, let every conscientious citizen try to measure in right proportion the things which are actually called for in this exigency of the Country. The call has been made for money. It has been quickly honored. Other calls of a like nature will be made. These will be honored. Taxes will be imposed, and will be borne without complaint. Under present appearances, it does not seem that the immediate call for men will be large. As it is made known trained men will respond, and if later, others are needed, they will put themselves at the service of the nation. What more will be called for? The very thing that I have been holding up before you this morning, the conscience of the nation. Moral integrity, moral purpose, moral restraint, these are the necessities of the hour. These are the difficult necessities. It is easier to get money, or ships, or men, than to get sufficient conscience for this war. The moment war is declared the first thing to do is to send some men to the rear, all mere adventurers, all partisans, all traders on their country's fortune or

honor, all seekers after their own things and not the things that be of the nation. Let it be understood at the outset that this war is none of their business.

What! is this war to be used to any advantage of an individual, or of a party, or even of the nation, to help any man's business, to sell newspapers, to quicken special industries, to affect the price of stocks, to maintain the Republican party in power, or to give the Democratic party a better chance, to add to the prestige of army or navy, to annex Cuba to the United States? There is but one answer to these questions, which will surely arise, each and all of them. Commit this war to the conscience of the nation. There is where it belongs, if true to its professed object. This war has one, and but one professed and acknowledged justification. If it can be held to that purpose—and only the conscience of the nation can hold it there—it will leave us a self-respecting nation. It may entitle us to the greater respect of the nations. Some nations perchance may say of us, as it was foretold should be said of Israel, if true to its traditions—"Surely, this great nation is a wise and understanding people." "Open the gates, that the righteous nation, which keepeth truth, may enter in."

VI

THE REVIVAL OF CIVIC PRIDE IN THE COMMONWEALTH

Address at Dedication of State Library Building, Concord, N. H., January 8, 1895

I ask at once in your presence, as you are assembled to dedicate this building to the uses of the State of New Hampshire, How shall we ensure to the state or commonwealth a rightful part in the present revival of civic pride throughout the country?

The chief effect of that revival, as we are now conscious of it, is the glorious assurance of nationality. "We the people" have at last become the nation, and we know it. It has not been an easy matter for us to reach this supreme consciousness. As late as 1811 Josiah Quincy made this confession from his seat in congress: "Sir, I confess it, the first public love of my heart is the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. There is my fireside; there are the tombs of my ancestors." That was the utterance, not of South Carolina, but of Massachusetts, in the national house of representatives, twenty-three years after the adoption of the constitution. No Massachusetts man, no man, I trust, from any state, would utter that sentiment now. The events of our generation, in which some of you were actors, have wrought a mighty change in our opinions and in our feelings. The nation sits enthroned today in the hearts of the people. The most interesting and the most inspiring expression of civic pride is this calm but proud

consciousness of nationality. We are beginning to realize to ourselves the great conception of Milton: "Not many sovereignties united in one commonwealth, but many commonwealths in one united and entrusted sovereignty."

The present revival of civic pride may be seen at work, if not equally, yet with marked effect, at the other extreme of our political organization, in the municipality. Next to the national feeling, the municipal feeling is at present the strongest. Something of this feeling is due of course to the recognized peril of the cities. It is in many cases the sense of danger which tests the depth of our affection, which may discover the fact itself to us. Probably no city in the country has had, in proportion to its importance, less municipal pride than the city of New York, but he must be less than an alien, whether resident for longer or shorter time, who does not now feel the responsibility of citizenship. The sense of responsibility, however, is not the chief sign of municipal pride, but rather the increasing sense of opportunity. The city is beginning to stand for more than size, it represents every possible advance and improvement. The period of silly rivalries and competitions about numbers has been out-grown, and account is being taken of solid and substantial growths. Men are seeking to be identified not only in personal interest, but in reputation and name, with their respective cities. Schools, libraries, museums, parks, bearing the names of individual donors, are the visible evidence of an enlarged municipal enthusiasm, while the surer though less conspicuous sign is found in the fact that here and there a citizen of acknowledged capacity is willing to forego further gains in his business or profession, that

he may answer in person the demand for honest and capable government. The ardent imagination of Mr. Depew interprets a popular tendency, when he predicts that the second office in the United States will soon be that of mayor of greater New York.

Now in this revival of civic pride, so manifestly affecting the nation and the city, what of the state, the old commonwealth, the original substance and life out of which in due time the nation was born, and from whose permanent and abounding vitality cities are now springing forth? Evidently the day for the reassertion of rights once surrendered is forever past, and no encroachment upon the interests of the growing communities may be allowed. But the commonwealth remains, worthy of an equal place in the honorable pride of its citizens with that held by the nation or a city.

And among us the opportunity, if not the necessity, for some very practical expression of this pride of state, is apparent in the fact that the influence of New Hampshire is not overshadowed by that of a great municipality within its borders. With us the state is not in bondage to the city, nor subordinate to it. Neither can the state throw off its responsibility to provide for the higher wants of its citizens upon any one locality, equipped with all the modern appliances of progress—the library, the museum, the university. In few states of the nation are the resources so variously, if not equally, distributed as in our own. Every section of it, east and west, south and north, has a share in its history. The whole state had its pre-existence in the province. And under the incoming of the later industries, and the consequent re-distribution of population, the ancient equality has not been altogether destroyed. It is the

state, not a city, which still offers the great attraction to visitors from far and near. It is the state, not any one locality, which holds undeveloped resources out of which new industries may spring for the support of new populations. It is the state at large which shelters the great schools, which send out the sons of New Hampshire into other states, and which draw to their training the sons of all the states. It is, in a word, the state, the old commonwealth in its entirety, not a city, not any localized center, by means of which we are to maintain the honor of our inheritance, and keep step with the march of the nation.

I welcome therefore, as a citizen of New Hampshire, the occasion on which we dedicate in the name of the state another building, the choicest of its outward possessions, to be henceforth one more visible reminder of the real presence and personality of the commonwealth. I rejoice especially in the object of this building, which shows in so representative a way the enlarging functions of the state. It answers in part, by illustration at least, the question with which I began—How shall we ensure to the commonwealth its share in the present revival of civic pride?

I go on then to speak of the maintenance of the state library as one of the means through which we may show our pride of state, and also one of the agencies through which we may develop the higher interests of the commonwealth.

It may seem almost too obvious for me to say, that it is through the agency of the library, that the state is best able to avail itself of its own history. But the full meaning of this statement does not appear in the utterance of it. The history of a great past is made avail-

able only to the degree in which it can be reproduced in spirit in the continuous life of a people. But what is the continuous life of a people? What is the continuous life of the people of New Hampshire? Not the unbroken succession of families. Not the local increase of the native stock. Names once significant in the annals of the state have disappeared, or appear only in remoter regions. Families of wide connection and of extended influence remain as remnants. Others, let us rejoice, survive in the fullness of their strength, and gain upon their heritage. But if the state, if any one of the older states, were dependent upon the original stock it would exist as a fragment of its former self, unless it could call home its own. The state continues to live through the incoming of the new, through constant accessions from various and unforeseen sources. This continuity of life is absolutely dependent upon the process of assimilation, the moral part of which lies in the power of the state to impress its principles, its history, itself, upon those who may choose to share its fortunes.

Pardon me if I pause to assert and emphasize the fact, that there are none among us upon whom the great men and the great events of our history are making a deeper impression than upon the more receptive minds of the new population. We ignore or underestimate this fact in times of social depression. We forget the philosophy which underlies it. Noble traditions lose their power when held in too easy and familiar possession. Inspiration does not long abide in what has become to anyone the commonplace. But the familiar deed springs into newness of life as often as it gains a fresh hearing. It is not alone the new seed, it is the

new soil, which explains the harvest. Again and again have I watched the kindling of eager minds, coming from other states, as I have told the early story of Dartmouth, that heroic romance in education, when there was nothing in personal inheritance or personal association to awaken the mind, nothing but the contact of an inspiring history with a quick intelligence. We grievously mistake if we suppose that history appeals only to those who are the natural heirs to the deeds which it records. History never fails in its appeal to men as they come and go, provided the sources are kept full and open, so that it may be rewritten to the mind of each generation. Here is the advantage in part of such a library as this, in distinction from the ordinary private, educational, or public library. We build here upon foundations already laid a great storehouse for originals, documents of every sort illustrative of early and later history, dispatches, records, reports, addresses, letters, nothing of this nature too small or too remote to be neglected. This is not the material for a circulating library. It has another use and another value. Here is the material on deposit which gives worth to the current literature of its kind. You open here a home and a workshop for the investigator, the scholar, the writer, the man who is to come hither with knowledge and imagination, capable of translating this ancient life into the speech and life of today. So you make the history of the state available in ever recurring variety of form. For, as I have intimated, it is of the very genius of history, that it should be written to an age, and therefore its story be continually retold with new motive and in new setting. The age which sings the Iliad to the notes of camp and battle and seige, is not content till it has

sung the Odyssey in the strains of love and home and kindred, the arts of peace, and the common ways of men. Every considerable period of history presents various aspects. We want to know them all to know the period. We want to know, of course, the story of discovery, and adventure, and war; we want to know also the record of political struggle, and religious advance, and educational development, the growth of the arts and industries. There is the true source and reason of events, the mere narration of which we sometimes think makes history. History in its highest form is the discovery of cause and reason, it is the explanation of actions and events. We read the memorable speech of the "Defender of the Constitution" through which he postponed secession for thirty years, and made it thereafter more possible to save the Union. Is that speech of Mr. Webster's to be explained by his own greatness? Not at all. His father had made it before him. At that critical hour when the convention of New Hampshire met to adopt or reject the constitution, when its vote to adopt would complete the number of states necessary to form the Union, when the conventions of New York and Virginia then in session were anxiously waiting the result, couriers having been stationed by order of Hamilton to carry the news from Concord to Poughkeepsie, and on to Richmond, in that convention where the result was in serious doubt, Colonel Webster arose and uttered this sentiment (the language may show the revision of a later hand)—

"Mr. President: I have listened to the arguments for and against the constitution. I am convinced that such a government as that constitution will establish, if adopted—a government acting directly on the people of

the states—is necessary for the common defense and the general welfare. It is the only government which will enable us to pay the national debt, the debt which we owe for the Revolution, and which we are bound in honor fully and fairly to discharge. Sir, I shall vote for its adoption."

The reply to Hayne was the echo of the speech of the New Hampshire farmer. It was the same spirit which urged the adoption of the constitution in that hour of doubt, which, in the hour of its danger, rose to its defense. The speech was in the blood.

The constant and honorable boast of New Hampshire has been of the quality of the men whom she could furnish to the nation. One historian writes of a given national administration, and that one of the best, that at its time New Hampshire could have furnished from the number of her own public men, the full equivalent for those who held the offices of president and vice-president, and also of those who held seats in the cabinet. Grant it. Who were behind these men? Who made them possible? As we have seen in an illustrious instance, such men do not explain themselves. You might as well try to explain the flow of the Merrimack as it sweeps these meadows on its way to the struggle and toil below, without pointing to the hills, as to attempt to explain the public men of the state without going back into the life of the people. What we ask, therefore, first of all for this library, is that it shall be made complete to the last degree in whatever pertains to the history of the people of the state; that it shall be a repository, not only for public documents, but also for private papers; that it shall reach out after all facts, however transmitted, which have a bearing on vital questions of

state interest; and that it shall be able to trace the great events in which the state has had a part, and the great men whom it has sent forth, back to the causes which determined or produced them. What we want, in a word, is a library which shall explain New Hampshire.

A more direct, if not equally obvious, use of the library for the advancement of the state, is to be seen in the very great aid which it offers toward intelligent legislation, the interpretation of the laws, and general administration. Doubtless we have in this use of the library the chief intent of its founders. The statute under which the library is administered provides first that it shall be "for the use of the governor and council, officers of the state government, the legislature and the clerks thereof, the judges of the supreme court, and such other persons as the trustees may determine"; and afterward in fixing the duties of the trustees, it prescribes that "they shall procure for the library full sets of the statutes and law reports of the United States, and of the several states; histories, including those of the counties and towns of the state whenever published; maps, charts, works on agriculture, political economy, the arts and natural sciences, copies of state papers and publications relating to the material, social, and religious conditions of the people, or bearing upon the business and objects of legislation, and such other works as they may deem suitable, works of fiction excepted."

Naturally this is a law library in its largest intent and purpose. The provision which has been made in this building for the sessions of the supreme court emphasizes this purpose, as does also the mention of the duty, first among those prescribed for the trustees, "of procuring for the library full sets of the statutes and law

reports of the United States and of the several states." It is a matter of congratulation, that in the comparison which this array of statutes and reports invites, the reports of New Hampshire hold by common consent so high and honorable a place. Indeed this was to have been expected, if we recall the names, which, in the quaint language of a former generation, "reflected the gladsome light of jurisprudence,"—the names of Weare, Bartlett, Langdon, Livermore, Woodbury, Bell, Smith, Parker, Perley, and so many of their associates, an honor one and all to any bench.

It does not fall to my lot to speak of the relation of the state to its bench or courts, but without venturing beyond the province of a layman, I may fitly call attention to the present demand for the more general knowledge of what may be termed the literature of the law, the knowledge of statutes and reports, as indispensable to wise legislation. As any one can see, the relation between the federal and state authority is becoming at certain points complicated and sensitive. No past political conditions have ever involved issues of greater perplexity than those involved in present economic and industrial conditions. Decisions are rendered almost every month by some one of the United States courts affecting the interests of corporations and of labor in every state of the Union. Not long since, in a western state, I chanced to listen to an after-dinner speech from one of the younger judges of the United States court of appeals, in which, though a man of remarkable wit, he put aside at once the pleasantries of the hour that he might impress upon the company the very great seriousness of the questions upon which the federal courts were called to pass in determining the rights of

property and the rights of service. The discussion was as earnest as an utterance of the pulpit. And between the states the lack of uniformity in the very principles of legislation is becoming in some cases not only serious but grievous. One has but to refer in illustration to subjects so widely removed from one another as taxation and divorce. At such a time the value of a state library which gives ready and complete information on all points of current decisions and statute law cannot be overestimated. A library with these facilities seems as much a part of the equipment of the legislature as of the courts. It has a distinct moral influence. Through its system of exchange it keeps open communication between the states. It enables us to realize the closeness of the fellowship of the body politic. "If one member suffers, all the members suffer with it."

The statute, however, which wisely gives precedence to law in the furnishing of the library, makes generous provision for other subjects which have to do with the material and social development of the state. I see no reason why this provision should not be fulfilled, as far as the annual appropriations may allow. The teachers of the state have already asked that a department of pedagogy may be opened. Why should not requests be urged from other sources? Why, for example, should not the library be made tributary to our great industries? Where should one interested in any one of these expect to look for careful information except to such a library as this? Where else within the state could one hope to find it? Technical departments are to be found to a certain extent in our educational libraries; and here and there the public library of a city may provide some books of this character on a given industry.

But to what source ought one to turn for such discriminating and well-directed information on the industries of the state as to the state library? Here again I must remind you that we have no great center to which we can look except to the state itself. And in so far as the state may see fit to answer this demand, let me suggest that whenever any department of this kind is set up, the fact be made known, and a classified list of the books in the department be published and circulated. Gradually and without undue expense, the state library may become an authority upon many matters of industrial and economic value.

Allow me the further suggestion that such works as have to do most immediately with the resources of the state be duplicated, and distributed at convenient centers, usually in connection with a town library, but under the control of the state library. Such a distribution would create among our citizens a habit of thinking about the state and its interests. It would provide material in advance for our legislators. It would add to that general intelligence which they bring to their duties a special knowledge on many points, which there is little time to gain during the session of the legislature. It would be a step for the state to take out among the people, arousing them to a greater interest in their citizenship. Like the attempt of which I have spoken to make the library available for recovering the history of the state, it would make the library more available for its present and future advancement. A great library, of any kind whatever, is more than a repository. That is its second use. The first and supreme object is to inform, incite, awaken. Rightly used, it is one of the creative agencies of civilization.

Assuming that the specific uses of a state library are such as have been indicated, namely, to give the state the advantage among its citizens of its own history, and to aid the state appropriately in the making and interpretation of its laws, and the development of its resources, it remains for me to speak of the library as standing for the identification of the state with the whole intellectual life of the people. In the language of the Governor's inaugural, "its relations to our educational system should be intimate." I take the apt suggestion of the term. Intimacy of relationship rather than domination or control is the characteristic of the New England states in their educational policy. The distinction in educational policy between the earlier and later commonwealths is marked. The later commonwealths, almost without exception, have created elaborate educational systems, culminating in a university, which they support and control. The earlier commonwealths demand popular education as the basis of citizenship, and within certain limits they carefully provide for it, but they seek to arouse the public spirit of individual citizens, and to develop private munificence. Hence the peculiar phenomena, to be seen on every hand, attending the intellectual development of New England; great schools, colleges, and universities founded and maintained by endowments; the fortunes of private citizens returning in part to their native towns in the gift of libraries; voluntary associations springing up in all parts of the community for the mutual advantage and improvement of their members. Meanwhile the state is no mere onlooker, no indifferent or curious spectator, its interests elsewhere, itself intent on other and lower ends. The state is the watchful guardian, the solicitous

friend, the helper and patron. Its interest in whatever concerns the intellectual life of the people is active, constant, and altogether beneficent. The state acts by various methods, now working through legislation, as when it reaffirms more vigorously the principle of compulsory intelligence, now entering into co-operation with the communities under its care, as in the library system of our own state and of Massachusetts, now granting immunities and privileges to institutions of learning when necessary to their freedom, not hesitating if need be to offer the helping hand, and now teaching by example, as by this occasion, and through the dignity and worth of its standards, broadening the public thought, and elevating the public taste. Such, in its traditions and increasing practice, is the New England commonwealth in the intimacy of its relationship to the intellectual life of the people. It was a statesman, you recall, not a theorist, a mere scholar, or poet, who said, "The state is a partnership in all science, a partnership in all art, a partnership in every virtue. And as the end of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, and those who are dead, and those who are yet to be born."

It is impossible to overestimate the impression which the state is able to make upon its citizens through this noble union, this high partnership in great interests. Nothing else can rouse them to such a degree of civic pride.

The state, we must remember, does not always appear before us in this aspect. So many of its functions are negative and repressive. It is through the state that we deal with crime. Much of its legislation is the itera-

tion of the commandments. There is a majesty in this aspect of the state, and there is benignity. The other side of law is security, order, peace. Still it is not through its repressive force that we respond most heartily to the power of the state.

Through other functions the state is concerned chiefly with material interests. These interests are vital. Nothing concerns any man more than his daily work, the work itself, and the result of it in his livelihood. But the actual power of the state to affect business is far less than that of the general government. In every state election the issue broadens into the field of national politics. No citizen looks exclusively to his own commonwealth for the adjustment of those conditions which determine his work, his business, or his investments.

The state is excluded from the province of religion. The experiment once tried in that direction will never be repeated. The one reservation which the individual citizen has made for himself for all time is liberty of conscience, in every possible expression of it, and in all its results.

The open field into which the state may enter, where it may exercise unhindered its higher ministry, where it may illustrate this noble partnership, is education, the development of the intellectual, and, through that, of the moral life of the people. The essential contribution of New Hampshire, as we fondly believe, to the life of the nation, has been mental character, not simply brain power, not simply conscience, but character informed and developed by the trained mind. That has been the ground of our boasting. We have no other to compare with it. It can have no equivalent and no substitute. We may cherish local associations in the state with a

sentiment which will idealize even its rugged and barren hills. We may respect the authority of the state as it guards our rights, and protects our interests. But the one source of civic pride for the state is the maintenance of its extraordinary intellectual and moral history. It is the remembrance of that, and that above all else, which quickens the blood, and stirs the spirit within us.

May this day which is set apart in recognition of one of the higher functions of the state recover and restore to us this former ideal. And accepting the inspiration and teaching of the present hour, may we understand better what is the abiding duty, and what the lasting honor of the sons of this ancient commonwealth.

VII

NEW HAMPSHIRE DURING THE PERIOD OF INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION

ADDRESS BEFORE MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT AND PAST LEGISLATURES OF THE STATE, CONCORD, N. H., JUNE 30, 1896

The state of New Hampshire has been during half the period of its existence under the government of Legislatures which are represented in this Reunion. The time of your official service, if reckoned backward, would cover the Convention which adopted the Constitution of the United States, and gave New Hampshire its place among the original thirteen. The members who in 1840 took their seats in these legislative halls were nearer in time to the men of that Convention than they were to many of those with whom they now sit in this legislative Reunion. But they were nearer in time only. Social and economic changes were even then impending which were to inaugurate a new period of legislation, because they were to revolutionize so many of the interests of the state. The legislative history of New Hampshire, though unbroken and continuous, is therefore separated through these two outward causes into two nearly equal periods, the latter of which falls within the lifetime and within the personal recollection of those present. I take note of the change in the objects and in the character of legislation within these two periods.

The legislation of that earlier period was characterized by a certain simplicity which could not be carried

over into the new conditions. The state inherited from the Revolution its share of the questions which vexed the general government, and local questions were continually coming to the front. But they were all of the same general nature. They had to do with the application of practical principles already accepted, or with the development of the state along lines which had been marked out. New Hampshire grew like every New England community. We must not forget, in these days of boasting on the part of the newer states, that New Hampshire grew rapidly in its early days. The tide of immigration set this way. Dr. Belknap estimated that in nineteen years, seven of which included the War of the Revolution, the population of the state doubled; and that from 1790 to 1830 the rate of increase varied from ten to thirty per cent for each decade. The population was homogeneous. Each colony which pushed its way along the valley of the Connecticut was prepared to set up a township the moment it took possession of its grant. All the settlements in the state were not characterized by the same independence, but they all conformed to the same general plan. The pursuits of the people were practically the same. Agriculture was the common industry. And for the greater part of this period there was no competition. The agricultural states this side of the Mississippi began to come into the Union as late as 1816-1820. Not a state on the other side of the Mississippi, north of Missouri, antedates the time of the reconstructive period in the history of New Hampshire. There was little or no intimation of any change in the industries of the people. The substitution of machinery for human strength was accepted gradually, as a convenience, but there was

no conception of the actual manufacture of power such as we now witness without wonder.

Here then we have the local conditions of that earlier time,—a homogeneous people, the absence of competition, and an apparently fixed industry. The essential issues were still political, engendering, it is true, some personal enmities, but not disturbing the general welfare. Fortunate for the state, fortunate for us, were the conditions of that early and formative period, conditions of simple and natural growth, the occupation of new territory, the extension of agriculture and trade, the opening of highways, the establishment of schools and churches; in a word, the ordinary conditions of the settlement and development of a country by a free, vigorous, and intelligent people. Fortunate those years of comparative repose for the application of the new political principles to a growing commonwealth, and for the formation of the political character of its citizens.

These years were in striking contrast with those which were to follow, years which I have called those of reconstruction and readjustment. The state was then called to pass through the most serious test of its vitality to which it could be subjected. Under the opening of rich and almost boundless agricultural regions, where the prodigality of nature seemed to scorn the toil of man, the values, upon which New Hampshire rested, gradually lessened until they were well nigh lost; and more disastrous still, the people themselves sent their sons and daughters after the new wealth. The abandonment of the old farms began. Then came in the new industries to which the people were unaccustomed, and in which they could find no large place for employment, industries bringing in their own population, strange in

language, customs, and religion. Then came the necessary redistribution of the old population, the formation of new centers, and the consequent withdrawal in many cases from the old. And in the midst of all this confusion and change came the sudden and sharp call to arms, the summons to the state to give its men and its treasure to save the nation.

It is not to be wondered at that in this long season of uncertainty and confusion, and in many respects of discouragement, some lost heart and accepted the superficial verdict of decay and decline. The changes were such as to appeal to sentiment. There were those who could not find, nor be expected to find, in the prosperity of the rising industrial city an equivalent to the departed glory of the old shire town with its stately homes and its gentle folk. The boy who had left the hill farm of his fathers, returning rich in western acres or city lots, could not be expected to look without emotion upon the deserted homestead, even though his steps had been the first to leave the trodden ways. Nor could the traveler from distant states, without local traditions or associations, be expected to enjoy the scenery which had drawn him thither, without noting here and there on the landscape the spire of an unused church, and moralizing on the scene in the columns of his city paper. All this was to have been expected. It was inevitable.

But, as you well know, there is another and very different aspect of this situation. The story of these past years when read aright has not been a story of decay and decline, but of reconstruction and readjustment. To my thought, the insight, the energy, the perseverance, the courage, the faith, with which the result has been achieved, have been magnificent. It has been like

the change of front in the full tide of battle, this readjustment of the old state to its new duties and opportunities, in the midst of the turmoil and competition of the time, without lowering its educational or moral standard, or failing to honor a single demand of the national government in the hour of its peril. The story has been told in part in the journals of successive Legislatures, in the language of debate and statute. I retell it in your hearing—because it is worthy of being retold—in a language with which I am more familiar, the language of that social and economic science which takes careful note of all changes affecting the life of communities and states as they occur, and which seeks to interpret them in the light of the accomplished fact.

The fundamental problem which presented itself to the people of New Hampshire at the opening of the period of reconstruction was the industrial problem. It has continued to be the fundamental problem throughout the entire period. In 1840 New Hampshire was almost entirely an agricultural state; but it had then become evident that the farmer of New Hampshire could not compete with the farmer of Illinois. If the rich lands of the nearer west had not been opened, and canals had not been cut to bring their harvests into eastern markets, farming in New Hampshire would have been more profitable than at any previous time. The demand for its products would have increased with the growth of population in this and neighboring states. Farming ceased to pay in proportion to the general increase in the national wealth, because the same labor could secure far greater results elsewhere. Relatively the state could not maintain itself on the basis of agriculture. As this fact became more and more apparent

the sense of discouragement began to be felt throughout the state. How could it have been otherwise? What could then have been done to meet the situation? No change of methods, no improvement in farming, could have availed against such tremendous odds. Before agriculture could resume its place new conditions must come in, new markets near at hand, ready transportation, a better science, and the economy of machinery.

Meanwhile attention was turned toward the utilization of other resources whose value was just beginning to be seen. More wealth had been flowing through the state year by year in the waters of the Merrimack than had been taken out of the soil on its banks. The waters of Winnepesaukee were worth more by far than the land which they covered. The discovery and appreciation of this new wealth in the unutilized water power of the state brought in the epoch of manufacturing. It was the material salvation of the state. It began at once to stay the tide of emigration into other states, and to bring in a population which was peculiarly its own. It has been the increasing source of prosperity. The gross value of the product of our manufacturing industries has risen from $23,000,000 in 1850 to $85,000,000 in 1890. The number of workmen employed has increased within the same time from 27,000 to 63,000, and the annual wages paid from $6,000,000 to $24,000,000. I think it a reasonable estimate to put the number of people who are the immediate outgrowth of the manufacturing interest at 100,000, about one-fourth of the entire population of the state.

Has New Hampshire then become a manufacturing state, relegating agriculture to a secondary place? By no means. The capital employed in farming is still

twice as great as that employed in manufacturing. The value of farms alone, without buildings, implements or stock, is nearly equal to the capital of the manufacturing corporations. The only disadvantage in the contrast lies in the fact that whereas the value of manufacturing property has steadily increased, the value of farm property has been fluctuating. It was higher in 1870 than it was in 1850 or 1860, and higher than it is now. The total number of farms has decreased slightly within the past decade, and also the total amount of acreage under improvement. But this fact signifies very little. It appears equally in Illinois, and to a far greater extent in New York. The question of abandoned farms, of which so much account is made from time to time in the daily prints, is a very insignificant question. An abandoned farm may be, as has been said, a sign of progress. Some farms now deserted ought never to have been cultivated: others have been given over to gain the greater profit from concentration. A very suggestive comparison has been made by the Secretary of the State Board of Agriculture in a report prepared for the United States Department.

"Along the banks of small streams," he says, "in all sections of New England may be found evidences of the existence, at some former time, of shops and factories devoted to various purposes. Later, the improvement in manufacturing methods had a tendency to centralize power and capital, supplanting hand labor with machinery, and hundreds of mill sites were abandoned for cheaper production and better paid labor in large establishments. No one claimed any decline in manufacturing by reason of this change. Many farms

located on rugged hill-tops and in remote sections, which under the former system of agriculture and style of living yielded their owners satisfactory returns, have been abandoned so far as cultivation is concerned. Although they met the requirements of their time, they could not be utilized by the advanced system of agriculture, and were wisely turned to pasture, or devoted to the growth of wood and lumber. This transformation was as significant of progress as in the case of shops and factories."

The real question is, Can farming in New Hampshire now be made to pay, quite irrespective of the past? The old conditions which, as we saw, made it such discouraging business, have given place to conditions which are certainly different and more helpful. The western farmer is now the greatest sufferer from competition. He must use up a large portion of his crop to get the remainder to the market. Meanwhile the market has been coming nearer and nearer to the door of the New Hampshire farmer. Cities and towns have been springing up in close proximity to many of the better farming sections. From forty to fifty thousand people take possession of the state every summer, whose wants must be met, and who leave an estimated return of from six to eight millions of dollars. The railroads have opened routes into various parts of the state for the quick delivery of milk and fruits. And as a safeguard against extortion from the shipper, the farmer has his recourse to the creamery or the canning factory. Men of means and leisure have been meanwhile buying farms not for making money, but for improving stock and for trying experiments, all of which, whether favorable or unfavorable, are in the interest of the farmer. And the

state and national governments maintain schools and experiment stations to the same end.

I do not presume to invade the province of my friend, the President of the New Hampshire College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts, nor of the vigorous and alert Secretary of the Board of Agriculture, but as a student of the economic situation, I cannot overlook nor fail to take account of the changed conditions which affect the agricultural interests of the state. I do not affirm that all farming now pays, but the conditions, which at first operated to take away the profit, have been so far reversed that they are now working toward a profit. Whether they have reached that point, it is not for me to say, but the outlook is manifestly far different from what it was a generation ago. Ex-Governor Goodell has stated on the authority of the State Treasurer that farming towns have much larger deposits per capita in savings banks than the cities and larger towns where manufacturing is carried on. Selecting towns in various parts of the state, he instances Westmoreland with $309.27 per capita, a purely agricultural town, and Rye, with $415.26 per capita, a summer resort, against Manchester with $176.99 per capita, and Nashua with $206.36 per capita. I grant the insufficiency of statistics to meet any large situation. I understand the contention that a bank may not be the most profitable place in which a farmer may invest his surplus earnings, but these and like facts are beginning to go on record to show that some kinds of farming do pay. There are sections of the state which show it in improved land, and stock, and barns and houses. The day of farming adapted to New England, intensive rather than extensive, with small acreage, high culture,

and quick markets, is at hand, if it has not fully arrived.

The industrial problem of New Hampshire, which fifty years ago seemed beyond solution, has, I believe, been solved. The state knows its resources and how to handle them. The policy of legislation has on the whole been broad, progressive, and intelligent. The industries of the state have been organized and reorganized, until at last a New Hampshire lad instead of asking, where shall I go to earn a livelihood, may ask himself, why shall I not stay at home?

The industrial problem has been attended, during these years, by another of equal significance, namely, the social problem. By the social problem I mean especially the question of the redistribution of the old population and the assimilation of the new. New Hampshire is no longer a state of scattered hamlets, neither is it a state of cities. It has become rather a state of compact, well equipped, and prosperous towns and villages. I doubt if our citizens have taken note of the extent of this growth, or have estimated its social significance. The national census of 1890 classifies the towns of the country in three divisions: those over 25,000; those between 25,000 and 2,500; and those between 2,500 and 1,000. Of the first class New Hampshire has but one. Of the second 26, but of the third class the state has far more than its natural proportion, showing its advance over many of the states still made up so largely of scattered and practically unorganized communities. The whole number of towns in the United States, ranging from 1,000 to 2,500, is 2,060. The proportion of New Hampshire should be 47. The state actually has 72, 25 more than

its proportion, and a gain of 14 since 1850. Add to these the 26 in the second class, and you have nearly three-fourths of the population of the State organized into about one hundred communities, illustrating under different degrees of progress the same social aim and the same social conditions. And if you withdraw Manchester with its 44,000 from the remainder, you have left but about one-fifth of the population of the state which may not be said to be thus organized. There is a difference, as I have intimated, in the material progress of these communities, but nearly all are aiming at the same general result, a result which as it has been reached by the greater part may be expressed in the following terms: good sanitary conditions, including pure water, and drainage; streets and sidewalks properly laid out, and properly shaded and lighted; a well graded system of schools culminating in a high school or academy; a public library supported by the town or by private generosity; churches under voluntary support; frequent and easy communication with the outer world; and in general, those social advantages which ought to correspond with the development of such communities in the art of self-government.

I pause for the moment to dwell upon the social advance which is indicated by this redistribution of the population, which has been and is still going on in our state. The old political unit in New England was the township. So long as that remained the practical working unit, or better, so long as the idea which it involved was in the supremacy, a large degree of social unity was retained. The incoming of the city, the great city, into our American civilization, broke up that unity. It became the one center in place of many. It

drew to itself from all sources, and made no returns, corresponding to its drafts. It changed habits and it changed ideals. A great city is essentially and necessarily undemocratic. It is the home of political irresponsibility and of social indifference. Democracy rests upon a certain degree of personal responsibility and upon a certain degree of social equality. In a great city you reach your neighbor whom you want to know through a club, you reach the neighbor who needs you through a board of charity. You discharge your political obligations, when once you are aroused to the exercise of them, by supporting some extemporized organization for fighting a ring. The one theory which the city, in idea and in fact, with its violent social contrasts, and its indifference to political issues, does not illustrate and never can be made to illustrate is the equalizing and unifying principle of the American democracy. It has its inestimable value to the country at large. That goes without saying. It opens the market to all talent, it is the storehouse of art, it speaks with authority on every question outside those which are political, it is capable of a moral enthusiasm which humanity can express only in the mass. This is its value. But we pay the price for it in terms of political concern and of social unity.

I count it therefore of untold advantage, that through the redistribution of population at the smaller centers, even though it be by calling in from the outposts, we are recovering those original political and social values which were being absorbed and lost in the cities. A village or town community, after the growing New Hampshire type, thoroughly organized, well equipped, alert in its intellectual life, acting directly man upon

man, and family upon family, and all upon interests of common concern, is a laboratory in which the problems of society, state, and church are being solved. It is coming to be so understood. I could name town after town in the state which might be cited as an example in the art of good-citizenship, where men have acknowledged and satisfied through time, money, and interest, their civic responsibilities and their social obligations. A stranger cannot walk the streets of such a town without a sense of pride in the endeavor of its citizens, and of assurance from the manifest result of their labors.

And in meeting this part of the social problem much has been done toward the other part, namely the assimilation of the new population. New Hampshire has suffered far less than might have been expected from having had so considerable a part of its population, probably one-fourth, in a state of flux, through the outgoing of so much of the native stock, and the incoming of so many from new peoples consequent upon the rise and growth of the factory system. In 1850 the native population stood to those foreign born in the proportion of 303,577 to 14,250; in 1890 the proportion stood 304,190 native to 72,340 foreign born.* The relative growth of the foreign above the native population is not as large in reality as in appearance, owing to the fact that a part of the former growth represents a transient rather than a permanent residence in the state. Still the foreign growth is really large in proportion to the whole increase, and the reason why the process of assimilation has been so satisfactory is due to two causes: first, the distribution of the new population at so many centers;

* Abstract Seventh Census, page 62. Population Part I, 12th Census, page 485.

and second, the completeness of the process of assimilation with the earliest immigration. The figures given represent the foreign born. But we now number among our citizens many of the second and third generation, who with their Americanized spirit have done much to aid in incorporating and assimilating the newer comers. I have frequent occasion to see men of this type, sons of an earlier immigration, taking their place among college men, and so identified with them in spirit, and method, and aim, as to be well nigh indistinguishable.

I am convinced that under such legislation as has been taken during your terms of service, wise, discriminating, and tolerant, under the wide distribution which has taken place throughout the state, and under the business and educational opportunities which have been so fully opened, the process of assimilation of the new with the old has been rapid and sure. I believe that New Hampshire could not have met the physical or moral losses from emigration without the physical and moral gains from immigration. And in the long run I think it will appear that the state has not deteriorated in its virility.

It would be impossible to speak of the problems which have confronted the state, calling for constant legislative action without referring to the educational problem. New Hampshire has had too much at stake in the matter of education to omit the consideration of her schools at any session of the legislature. Probably the action taken has not always been as liberal and far reaching as could have been desired, but it has been on the whole consistent and reasonably progressive. If the criticism has been passed that the little schoolhouse

with its short terms and meagre training turned out some very strong men, the reply has been made and accepted, that it could not do it again, that it was not doing it now, and that you might as well expect rich harvests from a scanty sowing, or the finished product from unskilled labor, as educational results from totally inadequate means. Wherever communities have been highly organized the public school system has seldom failed to accomplish its work. The constant problem has been how to develop the schools of unorganized communities, how to reach the child of the remote district, how to pay the teacher of the small and uncertain school. Great progress has been gained through unifying and grading the schools of the different towns and cities, through improvements in school houses and school apparatus, and above all, through the training of teachers. But the educational demand is never satisfied. What seems at times like experimenting is only one way of advancing.

When I was asked to prepare this address I was assured through the Committee that such a service "would tend to knit more closely the ties which now bind the Commonwealth to the College in whose prosperity we are all so deeply interested." I reciprocate your generous sentiment then expressed. I acknowledge in your presence the policy of the state toward the higher institutions of learning which it shelters, and especially toward Dartmouth College, in such immunities and privileges as have been granted to it, in conformity with the usage of all states toward like institutions of learning, and in the direct aid which has been once, and again, and again extended to the college. In many ways the state and the college are inseparable—

inseparable in history, inseparable in fortune. We have many of the greater names, of which we boast, in common. We have given alike our sons to other states and to the country. We are at work side by side under the same conditions, and toward the same general ends. If I had not believed in the future of New Hampshire I should not have accepted the presidency of Dartmouth. If one should decline, the other would decline—the college in attendance, the state in reputation. It is not proposed that either shall decline, but rather that working on courageously and in harmony, state and college shall maintain their noblest traditions.

I have not yet touched upon the most serious matter which confronted the people of the state during the period of reconstruction, a matter which in one form could not be reached by legislation, but which in another form called for continuous and careful legislative action. I refer to the contribution out of the life of the state to the life of the nation, first through emigration, and second through the support of the war. I do not hesitate to put these together because the vital drain on the state has on the whole been greater through emigration than from the war. In 1870, 124,972 persons, who were born in New Hampshire, were living in other states and territories of the Union. There was not a single state or territory which was not indebted to New Hampshire. With the states of Maine and Vermont there was a neighborly exchange, with little advantage on either side. With Massachusetts it was different. New Hampshire gave 47,753, and received but 16,510. To the states over the Hudson and beyond, it was almost entirely a free gift—to New York 9,211, to Ohio 3,329, to Illinois 8,213, to Michigan 3,633, to Wisconsin

4,908, to Iowa 5,057, to Minnesota 3,272, to Kansas 1,158, to Missouri 1,384, to California 2,720, with lesser numbers to the southern and far western states.

This enumeration you will bear in mind is of persons born in New Hampshire. No account has been made of their descendants. But these figures as they stand are plaintive and eloquent. They tell the story, better than words, of sacrifice, and loss, of sundered family ties, and abandoned homes. They tell the story, better than words, of prosperity, and abundance, of new homes and rich fields, of rising towns and growing states. They explain without need of comment the one retrograde step in this very year 1870. They explain also, in part, the boastful numbers of older and newer states. the steady advance of the country in population from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They have a moral significance. They declare, according to their value in the general contribution of New England, the reason why good order kept pace with the advance of population in each new state, why school and church sprang up along its pathway, why freedom was entrenched at every step in justice. They show how it was, and why it was, that the great political issue which led up to the War was met and decided for liberty. They explain in no slight degree the issue of the war itself. The old Greek found the symbol of the colonies which he sent out in his ships in the legend of one of the river nymphs of the mother country, who, as she disappeared with the river emptying into the sea, reappeared in a fountain in an adjacent island. The genius of the New England civilization might seem to be lost as it mingled with many men of many types, but when the time called in far off states for the old New England spirit it was sure to reappear,

pure and undefiled, as at Plymouth Rock or Bunker Hill.

The contribution of New Hampshire, through emigration, to the population and wealth and liberty of the nation cost, and cost dearly, and ought not to be overlooked in any study of the period which we are now considering. Not that we would have had a more niggardly policy. New Hampshire holds a stronger place in the nation today by virtue of her lavish gifts than would otherwise have been possible, but she has gained it at the price of local growth and enlargement. If one would estimate her real and absolute possessions he must reckon her holdings in other states.

The second contribution of New Hampshire to the life of the nation is too familiar, too sacredly familiar, to demand extended statement. The army which New Hampshire put into the field numbered 33,427 men, of whom over 11,000 were disabled, and over 5,000 left on the field. This is not the place to make mention of their deeds. It is enough to say that through them New Hampshire gained her rights on all the great battlefields of the south. And if her holdings in the west are costly, much more precious are her holdings in the south, for which she paid in the blood of her sons. It was the task of our generation to create this army and send it to the front, to borrow money on the credit of the state, and to make provision through succeeding years for the payment of the debt. How well that task was fulfilled is told in the messages of the war governors and their immediate successors, and in the legislative acts which are on record. The enormous war debt, both of the state, and of cities and towns, has been reduced to manageable proportions, and in the case of

most of the towns entirely wiped out. The very decade which saw a decline in population was the decade which put the army into the field and began the payment of the debt. It is when New Hampshire is put to such a test as this, that one is able to take some measure of its unfaltering courage and its unflinching loyalty.

Such are some of the social and economic aspects of the history of the state during the period which I have termed the great period of reconstruction. I have not referred to the religious aspects of the period because these do not come within the outlook of the state. Church and state are distinct. The state fulfills its great duty to religion when it guarantees absolute freedom of worship and rights of conscience. It has been a part of the responsibility of citizenship to maintain this duty of the state, and to maintain all other like guarantees of freedom,—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assemblage. Each new generation comes under obligations to guard all rights of person and property, to ensure the public peace and good order, and to defend the purity of the ballot. But new duties fell to our immediate predecessors and contemporaries corresponding to the social and economic changes upon which we have dwelt. As the new industrial life was to be carried on chiefly through corporations, it became incumbent on them to define their powers, so as to ensure the security of capital, and the rights of labor. As the labor of woman was to be a larger factor in industry and business, it became necessary to enlarge her rights of property. As the population was to be so largely redistributed, towns and cities were to be incorporated, and such political divisions

provided as would give efficiency to local government. As the people were outgrowing previous systems of public instruction, the schools were to be advanced, and provision made for the higher education. And above all, the task which none could have anticipated, or if anticipated none would have dared to undertake, was put into their hands to transform the citizens of the state into soldiers, and send them out in the name of a sovereign state to defend the higher sovereignty of the nation.

And now that we have passed in review over the period of reconstruction and readjustment in the history of the state, and have seen how its resources have been developed, its industries re-established, and its population reorganized, let us take advantage of our present point of view, to make a brief inventory of the wealth of New Hampshire, new and old.

I begin with its inalienable endowments, endowments of all the powers of nature, in whose strength and constancy lie the source of our individual wealth and whose very beauty brings us tribute from afar. The rivers and lakes and mountains of New Hampshire are wealth, as truly as if they were prairies, or vineyards, or mines. And they are inalienable. As they are not quoted in the markets, they are not subject to the markets. Men may come and go with their transient fortunes, stocks may rise and fall, but they remain the enduring, unchanging, inalienable wealth of the state in its sovereignty.

I add to the inventory the history of the state as a part of its working capital. Natural endowments may be made valueless by the character of the people who possess them. Values rest upon institutions, and insti-

tutions are determined by those who make them. Heroism at the beginning of national existence is of inestimable worth, for it is a guarantee of freedom. When John Langdon gave his fortune to fit out a regiment under John Stark, "to stay," as the record runs, "the progress of the enemy on our western frontiers," the act was an assurance for all time that New Hampshire would be made habitable, safe, and free. No wonder that Burgoyne wrote in despair after his defeat, "The New Hampshire Grants abound with the most active and rebellious race on the continent." Rebellion then meant freedom now, and law, and government, and all institutions which give value to life, and worth to prosperity. You cannot fix the price of real estate by the richness of its soil alone, you fix it also by its proximity to school and court and church. You want security. Security has its origin, if you go back far enough, in heroism.

I add the industries of the State as now reorganized and developed. If anything which I have said about the present industrial life of New Hampshire has any value, it lies in the fact that the State has passed through the crucial test of its industries. Some states are yet to pass through that test. We have passed beyond the period of exaggerated and uncertain values. Nothing is speculative. We know our resources, not in full measure, but in kind and quality. There is every reason to believe that they will increase in value. The country is now so far occupied that resources which were passed by for "easier chances" are having the advantage of the return of capital and labor for their development. A second wave of improvement has begun to move over the country, and it starts from the older states.

And last, in this inventory of wealth, I name the people themselves. If labor is the ultimate source of all wealth, then a strong and inventive and willing people have the chief source of wealth in themselves. It is both the physical and the spiritual quality in the production of material wealth which tells in the final result. When a people has become thoroughly materialized it ceases to be greatly productive. The incentives to production cease to act. The disposition to enjoy becomes greater than the disposition to create. Material success depends upon the ability to resist materialism. The sons of New Hampshire have been strong in the power of this resistance. That fact alone explains their success. They have not yet succumbed to the demoralizing influence of lower surroundings. Wherever they go they still carry themselves as if they were breathing their native air, and had sight of their native hills.

On occasion of a debate in the Lower House of Congress on the admission of one of the newer states, a member from over the Mississippi said, boasting of the richness of its soil, "Why, sir, if you should take it to New England you could sell it by the peck for seed." The humor of the saying is not lost upon a New Englander, least of all upon a New Hampshire man, but he has his reply. That, he says, is not the kind of seed which New Hampshire has been in the habit of advertising in the markets. Whatever she may need to buy, the kind of seed that she has had to offer has been that divine seed with which she has been planting states and peopling the Republic, and by the grace of God, she proposes to continue in the business.

VIII

THE ORIGIN OF THE DARTMOUTH COLLEGE CASE

Speech in Response to the toast "Dartmouth College," at the Banquet of the Bar Association of New Hampshire in Celebration of the Centennial of Chief Justice Marshall, Manchester, N. H., February 4, 1901

In 1801, the year in which Chief Justice Marshall took his seat, Mr. Webster graduated at Dartmouth. Seventeen years later the case of the "Trustees of Dartmouth College vs. Woodward" came before the Supreme Court of the United States. The decision was rendered in the following February. The college had then been in existence fifty years and the Supreme Court thirty years.

In speaking to the toast, "Dartmouth College," I turn at once to the Dartmouth College Case because it was through this case that the college came into direct relation to Chief Justice Marshall. I do not however assume to speak in your presence of the legal procedure, nor of the significance of the judicial decision. I speak rather of the origin of the case according to facts with which I may be more familiar than some of you. How did it happen that this college of the wilderness, founded to further a great philanthropic end, unvexed by financial disputes, how did it happen that this college, alone among the colleges of its time, found its way into the Supreme Court of the United States? How

did it happen that this college of the Province of New Hampshire, which drew its chartered life from the British Crown, came to owe its continued existence to the illustrious Virginian whom we celebrate tonight?

The Dartmouth College Case grew out of the peculiar, the unique origin of the college itself. Unlike most of the historic colleges Dartmouth originated in the consecration, the faith, the zeal, and the courage of one man—Eleazar Wheelock. Harvard grew out of the public sentiment of the Massachusetts colony. It was established by vote of the General Court of the colony. The name which it bears represents a most gracious and pleasing personage, but the relation of John Harvard was contributory rather than initiative, consisting in the gift of his library and half of his estate two years after the founding of the college. Yale grew out of the sentiment of the churches of the Connecticut colony. Certain ministers came together and gave out of their libraries books to start a college library. Seventeen years later the name of the college was adopted in honor of Elihu Yale, in consideration of his benefactions. Eleazer Wheelock was in a very distinct and personal way the founder of Dartmouth college. He established and for fifteen years maintained at Lebanon, Connecticut, the Indian school of which the college was in due time the outgrowth. He sent a pupil of that school, Samson Occom, to England to raise funds, securing through his agency subscriptions to the value of £10,000, which became in reality though not in form the first endowment of the college. He negotiated with John Wentworth, Governor of the province of New Hampshire, for the removal of the school to this province, and by the aid of the Governor

secured the royal charter. At sixty years of age he transferred the school to Hanover, moulded it into a college for English as well as Indian youths, and for the remaining years of his life continued his work as founder through his official services as the first president. These various activities are recognized and in part rehearsed in the charter of the college. I know of no other charter which strikes and holds to the end the personal note. It is the purpose of Wheelock and his already accomplished work which constitute the sufficient reason for the charter, and also for the special powers which it confers upon him, chief among which was the right and authority to appoint his immediate successor.

"And further we do by these Presents for us our Heirs and Successors, create make constitute nominate & appoint our Trusty and well beloved Eleazar Wheelock Doctor in Divinity the Founder of said College to be President of said Dartmouth College and to have the immediate care of Education & government of such Students as shall be admitted into said Dartmouth College for instruction & education and do will give & grant to him in said Office full power authority & right to nominate appoint constitute & ordain by his last will such suitable & meet person or Persons as he shall chuse to succeed him in the Presidency of said Dartmouth College & the person so appointed by his last Will to continue in Office vested with all the powers privileges Jurisdiction & authority of a President of said Dartmouth College that is to say so long and untill such appointment by said last Will shall be disapproved by the Trustees of said Dartmouth College."

Acting upon this provision of the charter Dr.

Wheelock appointed as his successor his son, John Wheelock, then a Lieutenant Colonel in the Continental Army, serving on the staff of General Gates in New Jersey. The clause in his will covering the appointment is as follows: "I do hereby nominate, constitute, and appoint my said son John Wheelock to be my successor in said office of President of my Indian Charity School and Dartmouth College, with and into which said School is now incorporated. And to him I give and grant all my right, title, and claim to said Seminary and all the appurtenances, interest, Jurisdiction, power, and authority to, in, and over the same belonging to me, as the founder of it, or by grant in the charter to me, or by any other ways or means whatsoever."

I have no doubt that in this provision of the charter of Dartmouth College granting to Eleazar Wheelock as the founder the right to appoint his successor, and in the results which followed the exercise of this right, we have the origin of the Dartmouth College Case. Unwittingly the charter created the condition for such a controversy. Unwittingly Dr. Wheelock filled out the condition by the appointment of his son. More than unwittingly, for it was with very great reluctance that the appointment was accepted, Lieutenant Colonel Wheelock gradually became involved in contentions, local, semi-official, and finally, official which culminated in the legal controversy. It is difficult to say how much should be charged to the temperament and training of Colonel Wheelock. One qualifying fact to be borne in mind is the fact that his administration covered nearly forty years, and forty years is a good while for any man in executive position, whatever may be his temper or training, to keep down personal or official contentions.

Naturally the personal characteristics of the second president Wheelock were not the same to the eye of friend and of foe. So far as we can form a judgment of him at this day, he appears to have been a man of equal positiveness with his father, lacking his breadth of view and range of sympathy, but more insistent upon the formalities of his position. Administration was not altogether congenial to him, and he was not a great teacher. The most marked inconsistency in his career lies in the fact that, while being justly charged with negligence in the financial management of the college, he was thrifty in his own affairs, being possessed at his death of about $100,000, a sum which it was claimed by his enemies made him "the wealthiest man in New Hampshire." There is no evidence however of any appropriation of college funds, or of their use for personal ends. If we eliminate any one or all of the personal characteristics of Colonel Wheelock which may have been contributory to the controversy, it is quite easy to see that there were sufficient elements of contention in the situation itself. On the one hand the inheritance from the administration of the elder Wheelock was entirely that of a personal and paternal government. The younger Wheelock was simply asked to take his father's place. There were no other traditions attaching to the place than that of personal government. Nobody at the time had any other conception of the administration of the college. When other and broader ideas came in, after the lapse of two or three decades, especially through changes in the Board of Trustees, then occasions arose and multiplied for differences, disagreements, and contentions. The changes in the Board of Trustees during the first fifty years of

the college from the date of its founding, 1769, to the decision in the Dartmouth College Case, 1819, were very marked. This Board, consisting of twelve men, was made up at the first, in about equal parts, of the political associates of Governor Wentworth in New Hampshire, and of the ministerial friends of Dr. Wheelock from Connecticut. The War of the Revolution falling within the first decade changed almost entirely the composition of the Board. Two only of the charter members remained through the ten years' administration of the first president. Governor Wentworth withdrew at the outbreak of hostilities in 1775. The Connecticut members gradually withdrew, owing in part to their local interests in their own colony. The college thus separated from its English patrons, and from many of its supporters in the other colonies, became for the time isolated. Dr. Wheelock was obliged to rely more and more upon his personal friends, among whom may be mentioned John Phillips of Exeter. Vacancies in the Board as they occurred were filled by friends, and in two cases by relatives. The Board of Trustees in existence at the death of the elder Wheelock in 1779, which urged the succession upon his son, was in reality, though apparently without design, organized to perpetuate the family control of the college. Within twenty years the names upon the Board as then constituted disappear, with two exceptions, and thereafter quite a different type of trustee comes into prominence—Nathaniel Niles, Judge of the Supreme Court of Vermont, elected in 1793; Thomas W. Thompson, Member of Congress, in succession, in both branches, 1801; Timothy Farrar, Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of New Hampshire, 1804; Elijah

Paine, Esquire, of Vermont, 1806; Charles Marsh, Esquire, U. S. District Attorney and Member of Congress, 1809—an acquisition of legal ability which gave the Board a distinctly legal character, and which peculiarly fitted it, as occasions might arise, for controversial action.

The occasion for open conflict between the president and the majority of the trustees did not arise till after some years of friction and suppressed conflict within the Board. It is necessary to keep this fact in mind in order to understand the sudden and vigorous outbreak of hostility. A state of feeling had been engendered which led to results quite out of proportion to the specific causes put in evidence. In April, 1815, a pamphlet appeared entitled "Sketches of the History of Dartmouth College and of Moor's Charity School." The pamphlet was anonymous, but it was evident that it was instigated if not prepared by President Wheelock. It was in effect an arraignment of the trustees for the attitude of the majority toward his administration, "prostrating," as it charged in general, "the chartered rights of the presidential office," and specifically accusing the trustees of the "misapplication or perversion of funds" in the use of the endowment for the Phillips Professorship of Divinity. There was little ground for the accusation that the treatment of the Phillips foundation involved the misuse of funds. What the trustees did was to add to the duties of the Phillips Professor of Divinity, that of preacher to the College Church, but in so doing the trustees virtually took part in a local church quarrel, which action on their part gave rise to the altogether erroneous impression, which still remains, that the origin of the controversy was chiefly religious.

The Legislature of New Hampshire met in June. President Wheelock presented a memorial to the Legislature in which he charged the majority of the trustees with having "forsaken the original principles (of the charter) and left the path of their predecessors"; that by improper "means and practices" they had "increased their number to a majority controlling the measures of the Board"; that they had "applied property to purposes wholly alien from the intention of the donors"; that they had "transformed the moral and religious order of the institution by depriving many of their innocent enjoyment of rights and privileges for which they had confided in their faith; and that they had broken down the barriers and violated the charter by prostrating the rights with which it expressly invests the presidential office." The memorial concluded with the prayer that "you would please by a committee invested with competent powers, or otherwise, to look into the affairs and management of the institution, internal and external, already referred to; and, if judged expedient, in your wisdom, that you would make such organic and model reforms in its systems and movements, as, under Divine Providence, will guard against the disorders and their apprehended consequences." Previous to this memorial and before the controversy in the Board had become public, President Wheelock had proposed to the trustees that the Legislature should be asked to inquire into their differences with a view to arbitration. The trustees claimed that there was nothing to arbitrate. At this stage of the controversy the broad question of the legal right of the Legislature to interfere in the affairs of the college had not arisen. The committee appointed by the Legis-

lature in response to the "memorial" was received without dispute, and given all facilities for its investigation.

The clause in the charter of the college which gave the founder and first president the power to appoint his immediate successor also conferred upon the trustees the power of removal. The person so appointed was to continue in office "so long and untill such appointment shall be disapproved by the Trustees of Dartmouth College." On the 26th of August the trustees made reply to the charges in the "Sketches" and in the "Memorial" by stating their reasons for "disapproving" of the appointment of President Wheelock, and by removing him from office. In this countercharge the trustees claimed that President Wheelock had sanctioned "a gross and unprovoked libel upon the Institution through the publication of the 'Sketches' "; that "he had set up claims which in their operation would deprive the corporation of all its powers"; that he had interfered improperly and unfairly in the discipline of the students; that he "had been guilty of manifest fraud in the application of the funds of Moor's School" in foisting an assumed Indian upon the Scotch fund; and that he "had in various ways given rise and circulation to a report, that the real cause of the dissatisfaction of the trustees with him was a diversity of religious opinions between him and them, when in truth and in fact no such diversity was known or is known to exist, as he has publicly acknowledged before the Committee of the Legislature appointed to investigate the affairs of the College."

Therefore they resolved, "that the appointment of Dr. John Wheelock to the Presidency of this College, by the last will of the Reverend Eleazar Wheelock, the

Founder and first President of this College, be, and the same is hereby, by the Trustees of said College, disapproved"; and further, "that the said Dr. John Wheelock, for the reasons aforesaid, be, and he is hereby, displaced and removed from the office of President of said College."

In reviewing the charges preferred by either side, one can but feel, whatever may be his sympathies, how insufficient they were to bear the weight of the subsequent contention. So it appeared at the time to the clear and sagacious mind of Jeremiah Mason. The action of the trustees in the removal of President Wheelock was taken against his direct and very explicit advice. The only explanation of the origin of the Dartmouth College Case, which to my mind seems at all adequate, is to be found in the local situation at the time. The college was then in a state of transition from one order or type of government to another. This state of transition was unduly prolonged, each year showing greater and greater friction. The conflicting elements in the Board of Trustees engendered personal feelings which at last became more divisive than any possible causes of controversy. Personal government requires a great personality. Possibly another Eleazar Wheelock might have maintained the old order through the forty years following the death of the founder. But John Wheelock, though a man of no mean ability, lacked the authority to prolong the old order, and the insight and temper to initiate the new. Had his administration closed with the first twenty years it would have been termed on the whole a successful administration. The new men and the new policies, which came in with the beginning of the century, created a situation to

which he could not adjust himself, and which he could not master. John Wheelock did not live to see the issue of the contention which developed in the closing years of his administration. He died April 4th, 1817. The decision in the Dartmouth College Case was rendered February 2d, 1819. It is a fact worthy of note as bearing upon the nature of the controversy between the president and the trustees that the successor of President Wheelock, as the head of the university which was established to replace the college, was the Reverend William Allen, the son-in-law and executor of President Wheelock. Had the attempt to supplant the college with the university succeeded, the family succession would have been carried over into the third generation.

Without venturing upon the legal aspects of the controversy I may be allowed the opinion, held by many historical students, lawyers and laymen, that the Dartmouth College Case, when once it was made up on the issues upon which it went before the Court, was to reach its pre-destined conclusion in the dominating mind of John Marshall. It is difficult to see how he, with his legal and political training, could have reached any other decision, or how, under his compelling personal influence the court could have reached any other decision. Notwithstanding the circumstances which surrounded the case, giving it, as our Toastmaster has said, a high dramatic character, it seems to me that if the setting could have been changed, and even the parties to the controversy, and perhaps the very management of the case, the conclusion would have been the same. I give due credit to the indefatigable enterprise of the trustees, to the sagacity of President Brown, to the

legal ability of Jeremiah Mason, and to the argument of Mr. Webster with its marvellous combination of logic and emotion, and yet I must acknowledge the greatest indebtedness of Dartmouth College for its continued existence to Chief Justice Marshall. Whether one considers him in his judicial attitude to the case, or as a representative of the political interpretation of the constitution then coming into supremacy, he seems to have been the fore-ordained arbiter of the fate of the college.

Fortunately the two great parties in the case, the state and the college, found in the controversy the ground of mutual respect. The state did not enter of its own motion into the conflict. The president of the college appealed to the state to interfere in its affairs. The state was never exactly in the position of a prosecuting agent. The bitterness of feeling natural to a semi-political contention was soon lost in the sense of the greatness of the legal issues involved. Though defeated in the Court of final resort, the State of New Hampshire has taken increasing pride in having furnished the country such an issue, with such far reaching and widespread results, and also in the part which her sons took in the legal arguments. The college, though in a very marked way nationalized by the process, came to regard the state with a deeper interest, and to recognize more clearly its obligation to the state. Whatever animosities may have been engendered, they have long since disappeared, leaving state and college of one mind as to the honor which accrued to each from the struggle, and of one purpose in furthering the end which each then held and still holds in common.

You will pardon, as I close, a reference to the singular fortune which at the first attended Dartmouth

College in its corporate personality. It had immediate access to the high places of the world into which it was born. Before it had found a shelter in the wilderness, it had been introduced to the Royal Chamber of Great Britain, and had gained welcome entrance to the most honored families of the mother-land, from one of which it bore back its corporate name. Within half a century it had found its way into the Supreme Court of the United States, and in connection with the struggle which determined its own destiny, gave to the country the name of the case which was to affect the legal, political, and economic interests of the country for many generations. The college of today has an honorable pride in the college of the early days which found its place in this high company. Of the names which make up this company there is none which Dartmouth holds in more honorable or more grateful remembrance than the name of John Marshall.

IX

NATIONAL UNITY

A Speech on the Transfer of Battle Flags following the Presentation of Memorial Tablets by the State of New Hampshire to the U. S. S. Kearsarge and the U. S. S. Alabama, Portsmouth, September 18, 1900

Explanatory Note

On February twenty-third, 1899, General William P. Chadwick of Exeter, a member of the House of Representatives, New Hampshire Legislature, offered the following resolution in the House:

"Whereas one of the nation's new battleships under construction by the Government, and now nearing completion, has received the name Kearsarge, Resolved that in behalf of the people of New Hampshire, the Governor be asked to appoint a committee of citizens of the State to procure and present for the use of the "Kearsarge" a worthy testimonial, which shall bear with it the affectionate love of the people of New Hampshire for this noble ship, which because of the name it bears must become of all the battleships New Hampshire's special pride."

The Committee appointed by Governor Rollins representing each county of the State consisted of William P. Chadwick, Exeter; Sumner Wallace, Rochester; Thomas Cogswell, Gilmanton; John Demeritt, Effingham; Frank S. Streeter, Concord; Charles T. Means, Manchester; Francis C. Faulkner, Keene; Seth M. Richards, Newport; William J. Tucker, Hanover; Thomas H. Van Dyke, Stewartstown. Through its chairman, General Chadwick, the Committee issued a statement to the citizens of the State.

"The time has come when the Commission, charged by the State of New Hampshire with the duty of procuring and presenting to the new battleship Kearsarge a gift worthy of that historic name and worthy of the state, should lay its matured plan before the people of the state, asking their prompt and constant co-operation and support.

"In the building up of the new navy the excellent rule has been adopted of naming the battleships—the great ships of the line—for the several states of the Union. In 1896 an exception was made to this rule. Immediately after the wreck of the old Kearsarge it was proposed to Congress by Mr. Herbert, of Alabama, then Secretary of the Navy, that the newest of the battleships then authorized receive the name of Kearsarge. This excellent exception was approved by Congress and the historic name was

perpetuated. The same Congress provided for the building of another first-class battleship, which received the name Alabama.

"It was a foregone conclusion that the Kearsarge should be honored by a gift which should worthily reflect New Hampshire pride and New Hampshire sentiment. The Commission could have stopped here, and procured merely a worthy gift for New Hampshire's battleship. But it felt that if only this were done New Hampshire would have lost a unique opportunity to perform a graceful act, an act which should have a national as well as a local significance. The Commission therefore asks the people of New Hampshire to make a presentation to the Kearsarge *and* to the Alabama.

"When the two great battleships, Kearsarge and Alabama, are about to enter the service of a united nation, can New Hampshire do a more worthy act than add to the glory which surrounds the name Kearsarge by making it a pledge between New Hampshire and Alabama that they and these two noble ships are united for the defence and welfare of a common country?

The proposed gift to the Kearsarge will be a large bronze bas relief, to be placed on the forward turret between the two 13-inch guns.

"The sculptor is Mr. Bela W. Pratt, of Boston, who has done much of the important work for the Congressional Library at Washington, for Yale University, and for other great art interests. Mr. Pratt has given his close attention to the Kearsarge memorial for the past few months, and regards it as his greatest work.

"The gift for the Alabama will probably be a large design in bronze appropriately inscribed, to be placed on one of the turrets. Dr. Tucker, of Dartmouth College, has been asked by his colleagues on the Commission to prepare the inscription."

In accordance with the above request the following Inscription was prepared for the U. S. S. Kearsarge. It was placed upon the large bronze bas relief below the two figures with clasped hands, representing the reunited North and South.

FROM THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE TO THE
U. S. S. KEARSARGE
TO MAINTAIN JUSTICE HONOR FREEDOM
IN THE SERVICE OF A REUNITED PEOPLE.

The Memorial to the U. S. S. Alabama took the form of a large bronze tablet carrying the following Inscription:

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE TO THE
U. S. S. ALABAMA
THIS TABLET, COMPANION TO THAT ON THE
U. S. S. KEARSARGE, PLACED HERE BY COURTESY
OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA PERPETUATES IN
ENDURING PEACE NAMES ONCE JOINED IN
HISTORIC COMBAT.

At the Banquet which closed the day of public presentation an incident of peculiar significance was introduced. Addresses had been made by the Presiding Officer, General Streeter, by Governors Rollins and Johnston, by Secretary Long, of the Navy, and by Ex-Secretaries Chandler and Herbert, by Secretary Gage, of the Treasury, and by Admiral Farquhar, Commanding Officer of the North Atlantic Squadron, when Governor Rollins arose and addressing himself to Governor Johnston, said:

"Governor Johnston, I hold in my hand two pieces of bunting, worn and faded and stained by storm and battle: but they were once borne at the head of regiments of brave men; once two thousand stalwart youths followed wherever their folds gleamed in the wind. We do not know the names of the regiments that bore them; we do not know the states from whence they came; all we know is that they waved above Battery No. 5, in front of Petersburg, through all that hot and terrible siege, and that they were captured gallantly by the brave and fearless men of the Thirteenth New Hampshire. The man who personally took one of them was Private Peter Mitchell of Conway, N. H., who shows by his presence that he acquiesces and joins in what I am about to do; and the other was captured by Sergeant James R. Morrison, now of Pomona, Fla.

"When this celebration was first conceived and its dual character planned, General Chadwick, the chairman of the committee, suggested to me that it would be a pleasant thing to return any southern battle flags the State might possess. Upon investigation we found that such flags had been nearly all turned over to the national Government at the close of the war, but these two flags were stored in the vaults at the state house, and upon communicating with the captors, the officers and the men of the Thirteenth Regiment, we found them very willing that they should be returned.

"I, therefore, sir, in behalf of the State of New Hampshire, of the Thirteenth regiment, and of Private Peter Mitchell and Sergeant Morrison, return to you, representing the South, these mementoes of the bravery of both our peoples. And I ask you to ascertain to what regiments and states these flags belong, and to return them to those who followed where they led the way.

"This action on the part of my State is meant as a token of our love and friendship, and a testimony to your courage and bravery."

Unfortunately the reply of Governor Johnston, which was marked by much feeling, was not reported.

The speech which immediately followed, concluding the Banquet, has been reproduced from brief notes.

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Rollins, and Governor Johnston:

The heart of the nation has been waiting for such an act as that which we have just witnessed, embodying as it does so completely the spirit of this memorable day.

North and South alike have been ready to break through the restraints and reserves which naturally follow upon a civil war, and to reassert that feeling which is deeper than the feelings engendered by strife. The time has now come, we cannot be mistaken in believing, to break the silence of these past years, generous and healing though it has been—but not by words. Words cannot restore what deeds have taken away. It is the office of the fit and sincere act to bring back the old friendship. I count it the honorable and timely distinction of the states of New Hampshire and Alabama, a distinction which will certainly have its place in history, that they are able to lead the way in this really significant interchange of sentiment. Other states have been more conspicuously related to one another through their earlier past, as notably Massachusetts and Virginia. But the fortune of the recent war, shall I not say the comradeship of one of its greatest events, has given us our opportunity, and we have dared to take it. We have dared to call up the most thrilling, perhaps the most separating incident of the war; we have dared to bring together names which had thrust men farthest apart; we have dared to evoke the memory of a fight fierce and bitter unto death; and having done this what remains to be ignored, or evaded, or held back? The restoration of these flags is not a charity, it is not even a courtesy. These flags go back to you, men of Alabama, by the logic of the situation, and with them go our hearts.

I am asked to speak a brief closing word, after this act, to the toast—"The United States"—the most significant name among the nations, for it is a name which embodies a principle and a history, a name which has

thus far been justified and maintained only through perpetual sacrifice. The sentiment of unity, I do not say the principle but the sentiment of unity, is the soul of our national life. We cannot exist as a nation without a passion for unity, second only, if at all, to the passion for liberty. No nation of modern times has had an inner life like our own. Few nations have had any inner life compared with the outer life of conquest and empire. But from the very beginning the thought of the people of this country has been turned inward, and the point of solicitude, concession, and at last struggle, has been unity. At first it was unity simply as a means to an end, the end being freedom as expressed in independence, but sometimes it seemed as hard to ensure the means as to reach the end. The struggle leading up to the Revolution, and through it, was the struggle for unity quite as much as for liberty. I marvel more and more at the enduring patience, the constant forbearance, the unfailing sacrifices which wrought their sure result in our national independence. Liberty was won we say at Bunker Hill, at Trenton, at Yorktown: yes, but more clearly in the silent determination of consenting hearts, in the generous concessions of statesmen and soldiers, in the mutual support of the colonies, in the unbroken will of a people set on freedom. Liberty was won when Washington stood under the Cambridge elm and without dissent took command of the meagre but united band of patriots from North and South. Victory rested in that calm, steadfast, compelling nature. For seven years it waited, but it was as sure as was his life, the central and commanding figure among men who knew no fear, who would not yield to dissensions, who would be one to the end.

And yet when the immediate end came, and the thirteen struggling colonies became the United States of America, there began to be felt at once that great concern as to how the Union might be saved. It was not an unwarranted concern. It affected every interest of the nation. There was not a debate in Congress, however remote the subject might be—the tariff, acquisition of territory, education—which was not sensitive to the danger which threatened the Union. Before a generation had passed the political situation became tense. Then concession followed concession: compromise followed compromise. The effort to preserve the Union became pathetic. As the years went on, pathos deepened into tragedy. Public careers, the careers of many of our greatest statesmen were sacrificed. Personal friendships were sundered. Gradually we became to the outward appearance thoroughly sectionalized. At last the national tragedy came upon us. A generation went down into suffering and sorrow. To what end? For freedom? Yes, *again* for freedom, and in many ways through a nobler and more unselfish struggle than the first. I think that none of us would deny that the civil war marvellously enlarged the idea of liberty, and refined its quality. But back in all of our hearts was the conviction that the nation must live. We could not believe that it was in the plan of God, we would not believe that it was really in the heart of man that the nation should die, that the nation should cease to be the United States. The ineradicable, the indestructible passion for unity was in us all whether we fought for it or against it.

And now that the struggle to gain the Union and to save it is over, who does not rejoice in the established

integrity of the nation. Who does not feel the new sense of power, the new sense of security, the new sense of freedom. "We the people" are more than ever "we the states." We are no longer afraid to claim or to admit our mutual rights. Every state born out of the original compact, every state created out of acquired territory, every state now in the making, knows that it has the assurance of its safety and the promise of its greatness in the fact that it is an integral part of the United States. We may not minimize the perils which beset the future of the nation. No nation can guarantee its own future. But of the vital forces which are to conserve our national life we have put the two greatest to the proof. We have the right to believe that these will abide in their saving strength. When the prospect was far otherwise than it is today, when the perils to the Union were more evident than its safety, one man among us, native to these hills, who walked the streets of the city where we are met, uttered in the national Congress the memorable word of hope. Surely we cannot doubt the perpetuity of a nation which we have seen founded and refounded in "liberty and union." We of all men can least deny ourselves the hope that "liberty and union," which are ours by the rights of inheritance and by the rights of sacrifice, will abide with us according to the prophetic vision, "one and inseparable."

X

COMMODORE PERKINS

Address at the Unveiling of the Statue in State House Yard, Concord, N. H., April 25, 1902

Reputation rests upon long accumulations of character and service: fame springs out of the deed of the moment. And yet it is easier to acquire reputation than it is to achieve fame. The two are not inconsistent. The man of reputation may become famous, but not simply by virtue of those things which give him reputation. Somewhere within the years of character and service there must lie the pregnant moment out of which comes the utterance or the deed which thrills men or which makes them think. The man of fame, on the other hand, ought to be in himself evidently sufficient to say the word or to do the deed which makes him famous. He ought to be able to stand undiminished in the light which the accomplished act flashes back upon him. It is pathetic when the great act separates itself from the actor, and leaves him behind, or when in his changing career the man falls away from the hero.

Fame, to carry the distinction a little further, is more rare than reputation because of the extraordinary and sudden demand which it makes upon personal power. It is for the most part inseparable from the passing opportunity, or from the opportunity which if permanent is out of common reach. Possibly the man of thought may take his time to become famous. Discovery may wait on investigation. The man of action must

always be the man of the occasion, and occasions demand that concentration and final use of personal power of which few men are capable, even among those who have power. The number of really capable aspirants after fame is at no time large. It is not the absence of opportunity which restricts so much as it is the absence of that last element of personal power, the clearer insight or the more daring courage, which can command the opportunity when it arrives.

The high distinction, however, of fame is that it rests longest and most lovingly upon those who deserve best of their fellow men. It expresses not simply the admiration and wonder of men but their gratitude. Gratitude is on the whole the surest test of a lasting fame. So mankind marks this "survival of the fittest" by perpetuating their names, by rehearsing their deeds, by committing to the care of the noblest of the arts their very features and form that they may still have their place among living men.

The memorial of Commodore Perkins has now passed into the custody of the State of New Hampshire. The gift of his wife and daughter, it has become the property of us all, open henceforth to the public view. The man whom it commemorates is before us. The record of his deeds, above which he stands, tells us why he is here.

I congratulate the citizens of the state, and especially the residents of this city, upon the possession of this statue. The genius who has enriched other states by his works has wrought no inferior work in this his first contribution to his native state. The same touch which idealized the "Minute Man" of the Revolution has shaped the real and the actual in this hero of the later

struggle. Many a lover of art, it is safe to predict, who has made his pilgrimage to other places where this sculptor has wrought will come hither on a like errand: many a man who walks these streets will find himself irresistibly drawn here even in the midst of the weariness of the day's work: many a boy from city or country coming here in mere curiosity will stay longer than he meant to stay, not knowing why, and will come again, not knowing why, till little by little he begins to learn the power of art to interpret heroism. So much are we indebted to the medium, through which we can best express our gratitude to our noble dead, and bequeath something of their essential nobleness to posterity.

It remains to me to attempt to retell in simple words, and in its own setting, the story of the New Hampshire lad, who before he had reached the age of thirty had made for himself a lasting name, and had added a new lustre to the honor of his state. At fifteen enrolled as a midshipman at Annapolis, at twenty-eight he had earned the title of "the hero of Mobile Bay." I shall try to show how the intervening years led up to this height of fame: and also how the years which followed gave that solid support in reputation upon which the fame of the earlier years rests securely. The sources of information are open to all in the reports, histories, and public prints, which have to do with the Civil War, but I desire to make special acknowledgment of the letters of Commodore Perkins, preserved by his mother, and edited by his sister, and of the tribute so generous and so full paid by his gallant brother-in-arms, himself a son of New Hampshire and worthy of a like place in its history—Rear Admiral Belknap.

The presumption is always in favor of the well born. All honor to the man who announces himself to the world. All honor to the man who makes his own beginning, whose first step is to escape from his environment, who makes his future out of the contrast with his past. The very antagonisms of such an origin may create personal power. But the advantage is still with the well born, for a part of his birthright is freedom of spirit. The absolutely self-made man is seldom free from the tone of bitterness, or of pathos, which runs as a refrain through his life. The difference between him and other men of equal success is usually a difference in tone. The joyousness of childhood, which was never his, is always missing. The great things which go before other men, and begin life for them have no place in his life, and in their absence the spirit has no retreat into memories which can cheer and gladden it.

The characteristic of George Hamilton Perkins was his freedom of spirit. He was born free. He was a child of nature. His home was dear to him, present or absent. All the beginnings of his life, all his early surroundings, went to make up the fibre of his nature and to give it tone. His courage was natural, almost unconscious. He did not dare to do the things which boys are wont to do, he did them. And as a man, when really brave things were to be done, he simply did them. His moral courage took the character of his natural courage, simple, prompt, unhesitating, unconscious. I find in his letters no morbid apprehension of danger, no premonitions, no hesitancies. All is healthful, natural, free.

And this same freedom of spirit declared itself in unfailing good humor. "Always keep your men and

yourself in good heart," he said to De Long as he started for the North Pole. Here lay in part the secret of his own leadership. He kept his men in good heart because he kept himself in good heart. He carried into action more than coolness, a certain exhilaration of spirit which was yet utterly different from the thoughtless joy of the fray. Fighting was always sad business to him. It simply could not repress the buoyancy of his nature.

There was a close connection between his passionate love of kindred and his loyalty. He could not separate between his love of home and his love of duty. I know of nothing finer than the constancy and tenderness of this young man's affection for his mother. It was bound up in his love of country. One the eve of the battle of Mobile Bay he wrote to his mother, "I know I shall not disgrace myself, no matter how hot the fighting may be, for I shall be thinking of you all the time." . . . "O Mother, Mother, I wish I could put my arms around your neck and receive your blessing and good-by once more." And this after the first engagement: "For your sake I am glad to say that the Chickasaw has won for herself a name. I tell you this because I thought you would like to hear it. It is now nothing but fight, fight, fight, all the time. I can only tell you that I am well." Is it not of high advantage to be well born if that means the endowment of a free and brave spirit, and the inspiration of early associations in the hour of duty?

But the advantage of being well born may be easily lost if it is not followed by the even greater advantage of being well trained. It is difficult to measure the significance of the great callings in which men are

trained until we see their effect upon the fortune of a given life. Here was a fresh, gladsome, brave boy, satisfied with the ordinary routine of study and sport, but with his future entirely undetermined. The offer of an appointment for him to the Naval Academy was made to his parents. The offer was somewhat reluctantly accepted. Doubtless the chief meaning of its acceptance to young Perkins lay in the new surroundings, in that mixture of routine, discipline, and fun which the old graduates of the Naval Academy recall to us with so much of genuine feeling. The real meaning of the change was the commitment of a lad to a great and imperative calling. He had been taken out of the unorganized and undirected life around him, that his own life might thenceforth have order and direction. Such is the power of every high calling, of all the professions, over the individual life. They organize, train, and then direct it. But nowhere is the training so distinct and absolute as in the Navy. Nowhere is it so difficult to pass from the unorganized life which lies around a profession into the organized life within. The higher grades in the Navy are practically inaccessible from the ranks, not necessarily because of social disqualifications,—men enter Annapolis without social standing,—but because of the lack of scientific and professional training. The Naval Academy is entirely democratic in its terms of admission, but through the necessities of its scientific and professional training it becomes an aristocracy closer and more exclusive than can be found elsewhere in this country. The Navy as a profession has its limitations like all exclusive forms of life, but no one can fail to see its high moral bearings. It keeps the life entrusted to it in close contact with such moral

terms as obedience, honor, and duty. When the fitting opportunity comes, the life thus trained is ready for heroism. Character and training alike need opportunity.

It was in 1856 that young Perkins graduated from Annapolis. Two years later he took his final examination for the grade of passed midshipman. Even then there was no indication that his opportunity was at hand. By a singular coincidence, however, the chief service which he rendered previous to the war, his entire service after passing to the full grade of midshipman, was associated indirectly with the cause of the war. He was assigned for duty as acting master to the steamer Sumter, which was to join the United States squadron stationed off the west coast of Africa to co-operate with a British squadron for the suppression of the slave trade.

It is a fact, which has doubtless passed out of the remembrance of most of those before me who were conversant with the events leading up to the Civil War, that the decade from 1850 to 1859 was marked by a serious agitation in the South for the reopening of the slave trade. The movement naturally originated in the Gulf or adjacent states, and found its chief support there. In 1857 the committee of the South Carolina legislature, to which the governor's slave-trade message was referred, declared in italics, "The South at large does need a reopening of the African slave trade." In Georgia an attempt to expunge the slave-trade prohibition from the state constitution lacked but one vote of passage. In Louisiana a bill passed the house of representatives, authorizing a company, indentured for fifteen years, to import two thousand five hundred Africans. The bill needed but two votes of passing the

senate. It is not probable that a majority of the people, even of the Gulf states, were in favor of the reopening of the trade, but the movement itself was strong and constant, and was productive of increasing results. In 1860 Stephen A. Douglas declared that "there was not a shadow of doubt that the slave trade had been carried on quite extensively for a long time back, and that there had been more slaves imported into the Southern states during the past year, 1859, than had ever been imported before in any one year, even when the slave trade was legal. It was his confident belief that over fifteen thousand slaves has been brought into this country during the past year."

It is, of course, a simple coincidence, but a most suggestive one, that we have in the first assignment of young Perkins to responsible duty, such a vivid glimpse of the situation immediately preceding and compelling the Civil War. I say compelling, for in what other way than through war could the nation have resisted in the long issue the pressure of those economic conditions under which men were beginning to demand the revival of the slave trade; under which so sane a man as Alexander H. Stephens was led to declare to his constituents in his farewell address in 1850: "My object is simply to bring clearly to your mind the great truth—that without an increase of African slaves from abroad, you may not expect or look for many more slave states. If the policy of this country, settled in its early history, of prohibiting further importations or immigrations of this class of population, is to be adhered to, the race of competition between us and our brethren of the North in the colonization of new states, which heretofore has been so well maintained by us, will soon have to be abandoned."

It is perhaps not to be wondered at that at the time of the assignment of young Perkins to duty on the West African coast, there was little effectiveness in the attempts made to suppress the slave trade. The failure to accomplish anything is a matter of constant complaint in his letters. "We meet a good many slavers," he writes soon after arrival, "which carry on the traffic as palm-oil traders, and there are a great many vessels engaged in the slave trade; but under the present system it is almost useless for us to try to do anything to stop the slave trade. Our cruisers cannot do much under our laws, and the English make the principal captures." Doubtless something of the contrast between the efficiency of the British and the American cruisers was due to the difference in the positions of their respective governments in regard to the right of search, but doubtless more was due to a difference in the disposition of the governments. In following out their instructions the captains of American cruisers were obliged to release ship after ship of whose illegal character there was no doubt. The cruise became under these conditions monotonous and discouraging, because futile. "Our vessels," he writes under date of April 15, 1860, "cruise very little now after slavers. The captain thinks it useless under existing laws. A few days ago we overhauled a barque all ready to take her negroes on board, but after detaining her two days our captain decided there was nothing on board that was not on her manifest and so let her go. The clipper ship Nightingale has just gone ashore with two thousand negroes on board. If she gets them to Havana they will bring on an average six hundred dollars apiece; so you can calculate how much money will be made on her. This

Nightingale is a powerful clipper ship, and is the property of its captain, Bowen, who is called the prince of slavers. The first time I was up the Congo, the Sumter went up fifteen miles after a slaver under his command, called the Sultana. I had information that slavers were fitting out up the river, and told the captain, and he took the Sumter up. We found the barque Sultana and the brig Kibby with their slave decks all laid and everything perfectly ready for that cargo. We took both of the ships and detained one of them three days, and then after all our captain let her go, declaring against every proof that there was nothing in the ships but what was in their manifest. Of course these ships at once filled up with slaves and escaped—calmly sailed off—there was no 'escape' about it, and with the money Bowen made from the sale of those slaves he has purchased this Nightingale, one of the fastest clipper ships known."

It was in the midst of this disheartening business that rumors came to the squadron of the outbreak which preceded the rebellion. Under date of February 13, 1860, he writes, "The mail brings us today very exciting news, all about the Southern insurrection. I cannot take much stock in it, nor credit such an awful thing as any prospect of the dissolution of the Union." For more than a year the men on the cruise were in a state of suspense, the news reaching them only in most irregular ways, but through such word as came to hand young Perkins was forming his opinion and settling into his principles of action. "I do not say much," he writes on May 1, 1860, "but I feel and know that if I had the power I would act. I am thankful to see by the papers that the North has at last become of pretty much one

mind as to the course to be pursued in regard to the rebellion, that it must be put down and the Union must be saved."

On July 1, 1860, the Sumter was ordered to proceed at once to New York, with Mr. Perkins advanced to the position of executive officer. "This old Sumter," he said, "is pretty well used up, and they have not thought her fast enough to chase slavers. But as I am now first lieutenant of her, her power of speed will be thoroughly tested on her run home," a promise which he made good, making the run in thirty-six days, the quickest on record at the time.

Summing up the results of the two years' cruise, saved from an utterly inglorious result by the capture of a slaver just before starting homeward, he says in his humorous vein, "As I have been both navigator and caterer of the mess, I have been making some calculations and find that since we left New York we have run over fifty thousand miles, and that five of us have eaten three thousand chickens."

Such, in brief statement, was the introduction of Commodore Perkins to his career. The story which follows seems like a mere thread shot into the warp and woof of the events of the war, but it is a thread of light. It is the story of a young man just now approaching his twenty-fifth birthday, concerning whom the record often repeats itself,—"he was the youngest officer in command." It is the story of a young officer promoted from one post of danger to another. It is the story which reaches its end, not in rank, but in duty and achievement.

The war, as we have seen, was well under way when Lieutenant Perkins reached this country. As soon as

he had recruited his health he was ordered as first lieutenant to the Cayuga, then fitting out at New York and known as one of the ninety-day gunboats. The Cayuga was under orders when he joined her, but there was a delay of several weeks in sailing, due no doubt in large degree to the fact to which Lieutenant Perkins refers in one of his letters, that none of the officers except the captain had ever been to sea before in a man-of-war; and that here were ninety-five green hands among the crew to be broken in and gotten into some kind of discipline.

It was March 31, 1862, when the Cayuga reached her destination at Ship Island to take her place in the fleet there assembling, under the command of Captain Farragut, for the campaign of the lower Mississippi. The blockade of the Mississippi had been established within two months after the opening of the war, but as late as the spring of 1862 the river was in the possession of the Confederates from Cairo to the Gulf. The task of opening the river from above was entrusted to Captain Foote. Captain Foote was greatly assisted in his plans by Captain Eads through the peculiar type of gunboat which he had invented for river draft. The plan proposed for the opening of the lower Mississippi was the scheme of Assistant Secretary Fox of the Navy. The chief defenses of New Orleans, some ninety miles below the city, were forts Jackson and St. Philip on either side of the river, forts constructed by the government and greatly strengthened by the enemy. It was the daring project of running the forts, chiefly with wooden ships, and capturing New Orleans, which was entrusted to Farragut. The forts were not the only defense of the approaches to the city. Across the river

between the forts was a huge cable of rafts anchored at frequent points to hold it against the current. Above the forts lay the powerful ironclads, Louisiana and Manassas, with a complement of river boats which had been made ready for attack or defense. There was great activity in building other and more powerful ironclads. It was in part to anticipate their construction that the plan of running the forts was devised. Farragut arrived at Ship Island in the Hartford on February 20th, but it was not until April 23d that he was able to get everything in readiness for the attack. On the afternoon of that day he visited the different ships of the fleet to make sure that his orders were understood. At two o'clock on the following morning the signal to advance was given from the flag-ship. The Cayuga, which had been made the flag-ship of Captain Bailey's division of the fleet, was ordered to take the lead, and the ship was put in charge of Lieutenant Perkins as pilot—a rare tribute to the courage, judgment, and skill of this young officer, who had never been in action and who had never seen a length of the way over which he was to lead the fleet. The story of the advance must be told in his own modest but graphic words. "Captain Harrison paid me the compliment of letting me pilot the vessel, and though it was a starlight night we were not discovered until we were well under the forts; then they opened a tremendous fire on us. I was very anxious, for the steering of the vessel being under my charge gave me really the whole management of her. The Cayuga received the first fire, and the air was filled with shells and explosions which almost blinded me as I stood on the forecastle trying to see my way, for I had never been up the river before. I soon saw that the

guns of the forts were all aimed for the mid-stream, so I steered close under the walls of Fort St. Philip, and although our masts and rigging got badly shot through, our hull was but little damaged. After passing the last battery and thinking we were clear, I looked back for some of our vessels, and my heart jumped up into my mouth when I found I could not see a single one. I thought they all must have been sunk by the forts. Then, looking ahead, I saw eleven of the enemy's gunboats coming down upon us, and it seemed as if we were 'gone' sure. Three of these made a dash to board us, but a heavy charge from our eleven-inch gun settled the Gov. Moore, which was one of them. A ram, the Manassas, in attempting to butt us, just missed our stern, and we soon settled the third fellow. Just then some of our gunboats, which had passed the forts, came up, and then all sorts of things happened. There was the wildest excitement all around. The Veruna fired a broadside into us instead of the enemy. Another of our gunboats attacked one of the Cayuga's prizes,—I shouted out, 'Don't fire into that ship, she has surrendered!' Three of the enemy's ships had surrendered to us before any of our vessels appeared, but when they did come up we all pitched in and settled the eleven rebel vessels in about twenty minutes.

"The Cayuga still led the way up the river, and at daylight we discovered a regiment of infantry encamped on the shore. As we were very close in, I shouted to them to come on board and deliver up their arms, or we would blow them all to pieces. It seemed rather odd for a regiment on shore to be surrendering to a ship! They hauled down their colors, and the colonel and command came on board and gave themselves up as pris-

oners of war. The regiment was called the Chalmette regiment, and has been quite a famous one.

"Soon after this the commodore came up in the Hartford and ordered us all to anchor and take a little rest before attacking New Orleans, which was now within twenty miles. By this time our ship had received forty-two shots in masts and hull, and six of our men had been wounded. All this time, night and day, fire-rafts and ships loaded with burning cotton had been coming down the river, and surrounded us everywhere. Besides these, the bombardment was continuous and perfectly awful. I never expect to see such a sight again. The river and shore were one blaze, and the sounds and explosions were terrific. Nothing I could say would give you any idea of these last twenty-four hours.

"The next morning, April 25, we all got under weigh again, the Cayuga still leading, and at about nine o'clock New Orleans hove in sight. We called all hands and gave three cheers and a tiger!"

The first news of the passage of the forts came in a message through the Confederate lines. It ran as follows: "One of the enemy's gunboats, the Cayuga, above the forts." To follow the fortune of one man in a great fight may seem to violate the sense of proportion as much as the message which put the Cayuga alone "above the forts." But this is our present interest. We are not studying the history of a campaign nor of a battle, but the career of a young man and how he bore himself in his first fight. He was given a place of rare responsibility. The result shows that he was worthy of it.

The passage of the forts left New Orleans not only defenseless, but humiliated and exasperated. The city

was entirely unprepared for this quick change of fortune. There had been no sobering effect of a siege, only the irritating effect of a blockade. It was like a blow to a man in comparative health, unable to resist, but able to feel. As the fleet stood before the city on the morning of the 25th, the whole city was wrought up to the highest tension of feeling. The process of destruction was everywhere going on. The store houses and ships were in flames. The army of defense had withdrawn. The mob was in possession.

At noon Captain Bailey was ordered to proceed to the city hall to demand the formal surrender of the city. He chose Lieutenant Perkins as his escort. The two went alone. As they landed they were greeted with jeers, imprecations, and threats. The mob grew more violent as they passed from the levee into the streets out of immediate sight of the ships. Every step added to their danger. It was a far more perilous trip than the passage of the forts. Mr. George W. Cable, who was an eye-witness of the scene, has described it in these words: "About one or two o'clock in the afternoon (as I remember), I being again in the store with but one door ajar, came a roar of shoutings and imprecations and crowding feet down Common street, 'Hurrah for Jeff Davis! Hurrah for Jeff Davis! Shoot them! Kill them! Hang them!' I locked the door on the outside, and ran to the front of the mob, bawling with the rest, 'Hurrah for Jeff Davis!' About every third man there had a weapon out. Two officers of the United States Navy were walking abreast, unguarded and alone, looking not to right or left, never frowning, never flinching, while the mob screamed in their ears, shook cocked pistols in their faces, cursed, and crowded, and gnashed

upon them. So through the gates of death those two men walked to the city hall to demand the town's surrender. It was one of the bravest deeds I ever saw done."

The command of Farragut covered the Gulf. His squadron was known as the Gulf squadron. His first orders were "to clear the Mississippi." This he now proceeded to do, though contrary to his own judgment. Proceeding up the river he ran the batteries at Port Hudson and Vicksburg, but it soon became evident that the river could not be held until the army was ready to co-operate in full measure. So long as Vicksburg remained in the hands of the Confederates the river could not be made free. It seemed advisable to withdraw the fleet from above New Orleans. The general disappointment was doubtless expressed by Lieutenant Perkins, as he saw the movement from his position at the mouth of the Red river: "We had received orders to proceed up the Red river, but this morning we saw all the Commodore's fleet coming down the Mississippi from Vicksburg with all the troops, and there is a change of program. It seems the Commodore has received positive orders from the department to take the fleet to Pensacola and prepare for more important service. I am sorry Commodore Farragut's winding up in this river has turned out so. I cannot help thinking that if the department had sustained him the river would have been cleared long ago."

After the capture of New Orleans it was evident that the next important work of the Gulf squadron would be in Mobile Bay. It was so understood by the Confederacy; with this understanding the city and harbor were put in the best possible state of defense. No more

powerful fortifications were to be found along the Southern coast. But the chief reliance was placed upon the construction of ironclads. The largest naval station in the South was at Selma, one hundred and fifty miles up the Alabama river. The best engineers in the Southern navy were sent there to superintend the construction of new vessels. Admiral Buchanan, who commanded the Merrimac in her encounter with the Monitor, was ordered from Richmond to build another ironclad on the model of the Merrimac, but of superior power. The result was the Tennessee, the most formidable ironclad built in the South. Four gunboats were at the same time in process of construction.

The impatience of Farragut while these preparations for attack as well as defense were going on can easily be understood. His call for men, for ships, above all for ironclads, grows almost pathetic: "Can you not spare me one of the many ironclads off Charleston or on the upper Mississippi?" But the exigencies of the war held him back. More than a year was to elapse after the capture of New Orleans before the new fleet could be gathered in Mobile Bay. Meanwhile the usual and commonplace work which follows a great victory was to be carried on, that of minor expeditions along the coast and up the rivers, policing and blockading.

There seems to be no fit provision in our Navy or Army for the recognition of particular acts of superior judgment or of heroism, except through promotion in rank, which is liable to work an injustice. The skill and courage which Lieutenant Perkins displayed in his first action entitled him to that kind of recognition for which men in the service of other nations receive distinguished marks of honor. But there is one recogni-

tion of such conduct which does not wait upon any formal honor. It is the confidence of brave men who know the worth of courage. "Perkins," said General Weitzel, who was organizing an expedition of ten thousand men and a fleet of gunboats to go up through the bayous into Red river, "Perkins, you are the only man I know of fitted to go through the desperate fighting we shall have; but with you in command of those gunboats and me with my troops, we can face the devil, and are bound to win. But unless you will go with me, I have my doubts about succeeding, and I shall think twice before I go."

Word came to Lieutenant Perkins that he had been ordered to take command of the Berwick Bay fleet with the Arizona for his vessel, but before the expedition could be organized Berwick Bay was captured and the plan was abandoned. Remaining in service on the Cayuga, Lieutenant Perkins was made at the close of the year lieutenant-commander, a new grade created by Congress, and was soon after given command of the New London during the absence of the commanding officer, and upon his return was transferred to the command of the gunboat Scioto,—the best command at that time in the squadron for an officer of that grade, according to the authority of Admiral Belknap,—and assigned to duty on the blockade off the coast of Texas. He continued in this uneventful and somewhat commonplace service for nine months, when he was ordered home on leave of absence to recruit his health. It was at this juncture that, learning of the impending attack on Mobile, he asked to be allowed to remain on duty and to take part in the attack. The request was most gratifying to Admiral Farragut, who

at once acceded to it, and put him in command of the Chickasaw, one of the ironclads of the fleet. The Chickasaw was one of Captain Eads' boats, built at St. Louis, and just from the works. She was hardly complete enough for service when she arrived off Mobile. Her new commander gave all his energy and skill to putting her and her crew into condition. The crew consisted of one hundred and twenty-five men and twenty-five officers. She carried four eleven-inch guns, and had two turrets. It required fifteen engines to work her. The preparation of the ship for the fight was not confined to its material condition. The night before the fight the commander called his officers into the cabin and addressed them: "Gentlemen, by this time tomorrow the fate of this fleet and of Mobile will be sealed. We have a duty to perform and a victory to win. I have sent for you to say that not a drop of wine, liquor, or beer is to be drunk on board of this vessel from this hour until the battle is over and the victory won, or death has come to us. It is my wish that every officer and man shall go into battle with a clear head and strong nerves. I rely upon you to conform with this requirement, confident that the Chickasaw and her crew can thus best perform their whole duty."

The fleet on the day of attack, August 5, 1864, consisted of twenty-one wooden ships and four ironclads. The old wooden ship Hartford was still the admiral's ship. The four ironclads went into battle in the order of the seniority of their commanding officers—the Tecumseh, Captain Craven; the Manhattan, Commander Nicholson; the Winnebago, Commander Stevens; and the Chickasaw, Lieutenant-Commander Perkins. The chief concern of the wooden ships was with

the forts. The defense of the fleet against the powerful Tennessee, under Admiral Buchanan, lay with the ironclads. There was every reason to fear that the Tennessee might repeat in Mobile Bay the work of the Merrimac in Hampton Roads. It was the ambition of Captain Craven of the Tecumseh, which was in the lead, to meet and disable the Tennessee. As Admiral Farragut said of him, "his heart was bent on it." With this object in immediate view, and fearing through a turn of the Tennessee that the ram would pass out of his reach, he boldly set the course of his ship over a bed of torpedoes. The ship went on, neither the monitor nor the ram firing a gun until they were within one hundred yards of one another. Then came a dull, sullen explosion, and the Tecumseh began at once to sink. But there was time enough to show the heroism of her commander. As he and the pilot rushed instinctively for one narrow way of escape, Captain Craven drew back, "You first, sir." As the pilot said on his escape, "There was nothing after."

The loss of the Tecumseh broke the line of battle, which Farragut quickly recovered by pressing to the front with the more rapid wooden ships. According to the accounts of the naval experts, the battle which was now on showed some of the most magnificent seamanship of the war. Success often hung upon the boldness of orders which Farragut alone could have issued. But as Captain Drayton said to him in the first lull of the fight, "What we have done has been well done, sir, but it all counts for nothing as long as the Tennessee is there under the guns of Fort Morgan." "I know it," Farragut replied, "and as soon as the people have had their breakfast I am going for her." The

Tennessee did not wait for the attack, but herself resumed the offensive. Then came the general order, "Attack the ram not only with your guns, but bows at full speed," and to the monitors, "Attack the Tennessee."

The time of the monitors was now fully come, especially of the Chickasaw as the least disabled of the three remaining. Lieutenant-Commander Perkins carefully felt his way around the great ram to find its most vulnerable point. That proved to be the stern, and there he doggedly stuck to the end of the fight, keeping up a terrific fire from the eleven-inch guns of his ship. As the record of the naval historian reads, "From that time Lieutenant-Commander Perkins was never more than fifty yards from his antagonist, and frequently the vessels were in actual contact. He planted fifty-two eleven-inch shot on the Tennessee's casemate, most of them on the after end, where the greatest injury was done and many plates were started. A well-directed shot from the Chickasaw jammed the Tennessee's stern-port shutter so that the gun could not be run in or out, and it was not long before the rudder-chains, which were exposed on the deck of the Tennessee, were shot away. Relieving tackles for steering the ship were adjusted, but these, also, in a short time were carried away. Seeing that the battle was against him and that there was no hope of contending successfully against the fleet, Buchanan now ordered Captain Johnston to steer for Fort Morgan, with a view of seeking the shelter of its guns. Buchanan at this time was directing a gun, when a shot from the Chickasaw jammed the shutter so that it could not be moved. He sent to the engine-room for a machinist

to push out the pin of the shutter, hoping that it would fall away, thus leaving the port open; and while the machinist was endeavoring to do this a heavy shot struck the edge of the port-cover outside where the man was working. The same shot mortally wounded one of the gun-crew, and drove the washers and nuts across the deck with such force as to break Buchanan's leg below the knee. He was carried to the surgeon's table below, and while his wound was being dressed he sent for Johnston (who after the accident to the pilot had been directing the movements of the ram from the pilot-house) and said: "Well, Johnston, they've got me. You'll have to look out for her now."

It soon became evident to Captain Johnston that it was useless to prolong the struggle. After advising again with Admiral Buchanan he went on the casemate and put out a white flag, when at 10 a. m. the firing ceased. Through the courtesy of Commander Perkins the surrender was actually made to Captain LeRoy of the Ossipee. This is Commander Perkins's statement: "When Johnston came on the roof of the Tennessee and showed the white flag as signal of surrender, no vessel of the fleet was as near as a quarter of a mile, but the Ossipee was approaching, and her captain was much older than myself. I was wet with perspiration, begrimed with powder, and exhausted by long-continued exertion. I drew back and allowed Captain LeRoy to receive the surrender, though my first lieutenant, Hamilton, said to me at the time: 'Captain, you are making a mistake.' "

When the surrender was made Commander Perkins took the Tennessee in tow and delivered her alongside the Hartford.

Thus closed a sea fight second only in dramatic interest to the fight of the Merrimac and Monitor. To no single ship, not to the Chickasaw, belongs the whole glory of any one part of the conflict, but its share was glorious and has gone into history. The testimony from friend and foe assigns to Lieutenant-Commander Perkins the fatal work of that heroic struggle. The Tennessee's pilot asked, "Who commanded the monitor that got under our stern?" and added, "He stuck to us like a leech. We could not get away from him. It was he who cut away the steering gear, jammed the stern-port shutters, and wounded Admiral Buchanan." Captain Johnston of the Tennessee said, "If it had not been for that black hulk hanging on our stern we would have got along well enough; she did us more damage than all the rest of the Federal fleet." Admiral Buchanan said the Tennessee would have defeated the entire fleet if it had not been for that monitor, which seemed to move by magic. It would turn around three times to the Tennessee's once and seemed to be everywhere. The services of Lieutenant Perkins in this battle made such an impression on Captain James B. Eads, the builder of the Chickasaw, that he said, "I would walk fifty miles to shake hands with the young man who commanded her." The following extract is from the report of Rear Admiral D. G. Farragut, of August 12, 1864: "Our ironclads from their slow speed and bad steering had some difficulty in getting into and maintaining their position in line as we passed the forts, and in the subsequent encounter with the Tennessee from the same causes were not as effective as could have been desired, but I cannot give too much praise to Lieutenant-Commander Perkins, who, though he had orders

from the Department to return North, volunteered to take command of the Chickasaw, and did his duty nobly."

It was nearly a month before Fort Morgan and all the fortifications of the Bay came into the possession of the government, but with the fight of Mobile Bay the great work of the Gulf squadron ended. Admiral Farragut was soon afterwards relieved of duty, and returned to the North, the command devolving on Commander Palmer. Lieutenant-Commander Perkins remained in command of the Chickasaw until July ninth of the following year, when he was relieved of command and ordered home. On sick leave he had volunteered for the Mobile campaign, but remained in constant service for thirteen months.

At the conclusion of the war Commander Perkins took up in dignity and with efficiency the various duties to which he was assigned from time to time at home and abroad. These duties do not generally test the commander, but they do test the man. He bore the tests of his manhood as he had borne the tests of heroism. The promotion which might have naturally been expected, and which his friends in the Navy and without waited for, did not come, but no word of complaint ever crossed his lips. He continued to do his duty as if it had been fully recognized. He carried about with him the same cheer which had marked his early life. In all things and everywhere he declared himself to the full a gentleman. His fame has the constant and lasting support of his reputation. In 1896 through the efforts of the United States senators and congressmen from New Hampshire Mr. Perkins was given the rank of Commodore without pay.

There were many points in the early life of Commodore Perkins of dramatic interest, some of which might have been seized upon for public presentation: the youthful figure standing at the bow of the Cayuga in the early dawn, leading the fleet in the passage of the forts; the companion of Captain Bailey in the perilous march through the streets of New Orleans; the commander of the Chickasaw delivering over the Tennessee to his ranking officer on the Ossipee. But the sculptor has done wisely in putting before us the man in his maturity. Commodore Perkins was more than any one or all of the incidents which declare his fame. He stands before us the man of capacity, great in action, great in reserve. As one recalls his history, as one looks upon the man, one feels assured that had he gone over into the service of the late war the fame of his later years would have equaled that of his earlier years.

In placing the statue of Commodore Perkins, a hero of the Civil War, upon these grounds, the State of New Hampshire makes no comparison with other heroes of this or of other wars. The act is representative. It is the simple acknowledgment by the State of New Hampshire of that patriotism, whenever and wherever shown, which has its highest expression in heroism. And if it is asked why this revival, after the lapse of a generation, of the memories of a civil war, my answer is still the same. Heroism is priceless; the reminder of it is always timely. No nation may conserve its unity at the cost of sentiment. We have come together as a people, not by ignoring the great deeds of the past, nor by retiring those who wrought them. There has been liberty of remembrance and of expression North and South.

A few years since I went out for the afternoon from Washington to Alexandria. My errand was to see old Christ Church because of its association with Washington. But on my way my eye caught sight of a statue in one of the public squares. It was a statue, simple and unadorned, of a Confederate cavalryman, standing with drooped head, with his slouch hat under his left arm. It bore no name, but it told its story, the story of a lost cause. I came back to it again and again. My errand was quickly done that I might return once more. I acknowledged, because I felt, the sentiment which it was meant to inspire, the sentiment of respect for the heroism of a lost cause.

Let no false sensitiveness retire the heroism of the cause which won. In allowing and honoring that liberty which neither forbids nor denies to any the pathos of an irrevocable past, let us not withhold in any measure the glory of that heroism which made possible the future of a reunited land.

XI

THE OWNERSHIP OF LAND

Address at the Thirty-First Annual Session of the New Hampshire Grange, Dover, N. H., December 20, 1904

In responding to your invitation to take part in the annual meeting of the State Grange of New Hampshire, let me assure you that I do not presume upon your courtesy to the extent of attempting to instruct you in the duties of your Order, or in the methods of your work. I do not envy the man who, in these days of specialized training, undertakes to tell other men what he does not know, and what they quickly see he does not know, about their business. At the same time, for the very reason that we are being specialized away from one another, we ought to be able to know how others regard us; to know, for example, what value the public puts upon our work in the midst of the rapid changes which are going on in the valuation of the industries. There is more danger on the whole from the undervaluation than from the overvaluation of almost any calling. And if in any calling there appears to others to be an undervaluation at some particular point, the reminder of the fact is certainly pertinent and may be useful.

I venture, therefore, to speak to you from the outside point of view, of the growing appreciation by the public mind of ownership in land.

There are three kinds of power to which our times attach special value. First, personal power, as seen

in the means which are taken to ensure it. We are all trying to lift ourselves and our children out of the commonplace. The recognized means of gaining distinction in a democracy is education. We educate, therefore, with a view to personal power. We have come as a people to believe in the truth of the saying that "knowledge is power."

Second, the power of organization. The value set upon this kind of power comes largely from industrialism. The last generation gave us the self-made man. The self-made man has little or no chance today,—the smaller trader in the great cities, the non-union man at the industrial centers. The self-made man has virtually given place to the organizing, or to the organized, man.

Third, the power which attaches to ownership. Possessions have always been reckoned a source of power, but their peculiar value lies today in their utility. We ask of money, as we ask of men, what can it do? We think of money, that is, chiefly as capital. We should not rate the man who has a million dollars in specie locked up in his vaults as at all comparable in power with the man who has half that amount in productive capital.

Now in the present revaluation of the possessions of men, viewed as sources of power, there is, as I have said, a growing appreciation of ownership in land. I do not mean necessarily that land is selling for more, though, in the aggregate, this is of course true, but rather that the value of land can be translated more and more clearly into terms of social and political and moral power. And when you put this statement into the concrete, it means that influences are at work, from out-

side his business and in a sense apart from his own efforts, to give the farmer a relatively higher and higher place in the social order.

In support of this view, I call your attention in the first place to the persistence with which governments hold to the idea of the political value of private ownership in land, its value to good citizenship. Apart from guaranteeing the education of the schools to its citizens, the one thing which the government makes provision for is private ownership in land, and the end in each case is practically the same. I do not wonder that it took a long while to commit the government to this idea, to incorporate it into our governmental system. It was a stupendous scheme, involving very radical principles. To illustrate from a scheme of an entirely opposite character, it was as great and as radical a thing in its time to distribute the public lands among private owners as it would be today for the government to assume the ownership, say, of our railroads. Mr. Clay was entirely warranted in saying in the Senate in 1832 that "no subject, which had presented itself to the present, or, perhaps, any preceding Congress, was of greater magnitude than that of the public lands. Long after we shall cease to be agitated by the tariff, ages after our manufactures shall have acquired a stability and perfection which will enable them to cope successfully with the manufactures of any other country, the public lands will remain a subject of deep and enduring interest." More of course was involved in the question of the public lands than finally appeared in the Homestead Bill of 1861, but the Homestead Bill of that date was the culmination of the long contention. When Mr. Lincoln put his signature to the bill he gave effect

to one of the great acts of his administration, an act which, as you recall, grants to every applicant, who is the head of a family or above the age of twenty-one, one hundred and sixty acres of public lands, free of charge, except for registration fees, on the sole condition of actual settlement and cultivation.

Nothing, I repeat, is so unique or so radical in the relation of the government to the people as this distribution of public lands for private ownership. Next in importance to compulsory education, free of charge, as an agency in building the nation, stands this open offer of a homestead.

I have spoken of the persistency of the government in this policy. It is not a transient idea. Having nearly exhausted its supply of productive lands, the government is carrying out the same policy in reclaiming waste lands chiefly in the arid portions of the country. By the terms of the scheme for the reclamation of arid and semi-arid lands, which Mr. Roosevelt urged in one of his earlier messages and which the editor of the World's Work says will prove to be the great act of his administration, it is provided that sections of from 40 to 160 acres are to be sold at such rate as shall cover the cost of improvement, the ownership to be, as under the homestead bill, in the hands of the settler. The settler pays a rental for ten years on the irrigation plant, after which time he becomes a stockholder, to the value of his rights.

What is the object of the government in this distribution of public lands for private ownership? The primary object is not revenue. That was the object of the system which the present system displaced. The primary object is citizenship. The government regards

ownership in land as a better guarantee of good citizenship than anything which it is in its power to effect. Otherwise it would be warranted, according to the principle on which it is now acting, in starting men in some other kind of business.

This is the moral and political valuation which the public mind, expressing itself through the government, puts upon your calling. Other governments than our own go even further. Denmark has just enacted a law which enables any farm laborer between the ages of twenty-five and fifty to borrow nine tenths of the value of a house and of from three to twelve acres of land, provided he has saved the one tenth necessary for the first payment. A sum presumably sufficient for this state loan fund has been set apart. So desirable above any other class are those whom the state terms "housemen."

The state is right, here or anywhere, in this estimate which it puts upon the moral value of ownership in land. It is a kind of ownership which locates and identifies a man. You cannot identify a man so closely by stocks or by any kind of personal property. There is a church in New York City which was remodeled at great expense by one of its members who had made largely by a sudden rise in the preferred stock of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad. That church is known as "St. Paul preferred," but I do not know that the donor ever gained a like distinction.

Ownership in land is the only guarantee of continuity in the family life apart from the possession of very great wealth. Wealth can found and perpetuate a family, but in the ordinary fortunes of business and the trades which take the fortunes of the cities family life,

does not last for many generations. We take note of the abandoned homes of the country. You cannot take note of the abandoned homes of the city. The history of the average home life of the city is written in water. The government, I say again, is right in the moral valuation which it puts upon ownership in land. When a shrewd man invests his money in some enterprise of possible advantage to the public, the street looks on doubtfully and says of him, in its own slang, "he is not doing this for his health." That is precisely what the government is making this investment for, for its health, to keep up its physical and moral vitality.

I call your attention again to the significance of the private investments in land which are following the invasion of the country by the city. Every return tide of summer travel in New England leaves a permanent deposit in the ownership of land. What is the chief significance of this investment? It has a very definite social value. A man who has an estate in the country gains thereby a certain distinction. Ownership of a place in the country is coming to count for more socially than ownership in the city. There is seldom any financial gain in it. The city business has to pay for the country home, and still more for the farm. The return goes back in social value. It is the one investment of its sort which pays socially. You put your money into a coal mine or into a kerosene well, you get back more money, but no social return. The investment of city money in country places is a part of a social movement which is of equal advantage to city and country.

I am limiting myself in what I am now saying to one point—the new social value which is being put upon ownership in land. I am not saying that there is not

a great difference between the summer view of nature in our latitude and the view, or experience, of nature the year round. A traveler in Wales said to an old farmer, who lived just under Mount Snowdon, "How you must enjoy living here!" "Well," said he, "if you had lived here for eighty winters, as I have, and had the old fellow a sneezin' and a spittin' at you most of the time, you wouldn't think so much of him as you appear to." I am not saying either that owning land is farming. But the man who gets into a business half way may add something to the value of it. Owning stock in a railroad is not running the road, but it helps a good deal toward that end.

The distinction of the purchase of land is that if it is bought for residence, though only for a part of the year, the purchase carries with it certain social obligations. The man who buys the farm adjacent to you becomes thereby to a certain degree your neighbor, and to a certain degree a citizen of your town. You go down into Wall Street and buy stock in the Steel Trust or, if you don't like that investment, in the Pennsylvania Railroad. What social obligation do you assume by the transaction? How much of a neighbor do you become to the man whose name is registered next to yours on the books of the company? In the one case, in the purchase of land, the purchase carries the man with it and gives to the community the partial advantage at least of himself and of his family. In the other case, in the purchase of stock, the purchase does not carry the man with it: he is not recognized, only his money, unless his purchase implies the backing of some great financier. Just how much this private investment in land for residences is benefiting the state of

New Hampshire financially I cannot say. It is not the immediate point which I am urging. I am urging the immediate point that in so far as that kind of investment is increasing the social value of the state, it tells at first hand upon all owners of land. It makes ownership in land, of which of course the chief object is farming, more desirable in its social relations.

I call your attention still further to the fact, coming now much nearer to the business point of view, that in the revaluation of the industries, which is all the while going on, farming is beginning to share in its turn in the wealth of scientific discovery. I speak of scientific discoveries, not of inventions. Farming has had its full share in the economies, in the conveniences, and in the expansions made possible by invention. But the great scientific discoveries have worked for the most part to the advantage of other industries. Industrialism, as we term the great working force of the last century, has been the outgrowth of the development of the physical sciences. It has felt the continual impulse of discovery. The inventions of Hargreaves, Arkwright, and Crompton could never have built our cotton mills without the discovery of Watts. And from the discovery of steam as a power to the discovery of electricity as a power, the benefit has gone pretty much one way. Nearly all discovered power has been harnessed to machinery. The time seems to be at hand when agriculture has as much to expect relatively from the biologist as the mechanic arts have already received from the physicist. Both may continue to expect much from the chemist. We know, of course, the indispensable value of nitrogen to the soil, especially to wornout soils. If the scientists can succeed in restoring nitrogen to the

soil in sufficient amount, with little cost in money or labor, then they will revolutionize farming as surely as the introduction of steam revolutionized manufacturing. It is too early for even the expert to say how much may come out of present experiments in the inoculation of soils, but it is not too early to say that the experimentation now going on is of the sort which follows discovery, not invention alone. It is as yet impossible to estimate the value of the discovery of the nitrogen-fixing power of certain bacteria, but if the bacteria do anything like the amount of work laid out for them, they will rival, within their sphere of operation, the work of electricity. In any event we have the right to believe that discoveries are impending in the biological and physiological laboratories of the country which are to give a new meaning to agriculture. But here again I make no estimate of the return in dollars and cents. I am more intent upon what I may call the intellectual impulse which is beginning to take effect. During the past generation it must be conceded that the greater intellectual incentives have urged young men into other pursuits than farming. Quite apart from the return in money, work elsewhere has been more interesting than on the farm. The proportion of brain work to hand work has been larger in some of the trades and arts than in farming. It seemed to pay better as a matter of mental interest to carry on one's technical education towards some other occupation than that which the boy recalled from his farm life. It now seems as if no occupation could be more interesting, from the side of investigation and experiment and advanced study, than farming. Science seems about to open new paths through our fields and forests quite as enticing as

any which have led us, thus far, toward the office and the shop. Science seems about to be coming to the relief and refreshment and quickening of those who, with a great patience, have borne these long years the burden and heat of the day.

In this brief discussion I have kept away from two questions which might naturally arise, but which I am not competent to answer; questions also which, were I competent to answer, I could not discuss without leaving unsaid the thing which I wished most to say in your presence. If you want to know, apart from your own experience, whether farming as now carried on in New Hampshire pays or not, I must refer you to our honored Governor who, as governors come and go, will remain, I trust, at the head of the agricultural interests of the state. And if you want to know just how much better farming can be made to pay under better methods, I must refer you to my friend, President Gibbs of Durham, who will be able, I am sure, to give you a more and more satisfying answer year by year.

What I have wished to say, and what I have undertaken to say is, that in the revaluation of the callings of men under modern conditions there are a good many values—new values, some of them—which must be taken into account in answering the question in its broadest form concerning any calling, "Does it pay, or will it pay?" I have tried to impress upon you the values which are attaching to your calling, as seen under one aspect of it, namely, the growing appreciation by the public mind of ownership in land—moral and political values which are now well recognized, social values which are becoming apparent, and values which the new sciences are laying at your doors.

It has been my fortune, my good fortune as I think, to have been at work thus far in what are usually classified as among the non-paying businesses of the world. Perhaps it is for this reason that I have been led to put a pretty high estimate upon certain values which are in danger of being overlooked. I should say, as the result of my observation, that values may be divided into two classes, remunerative and rewarding, values which point to the market price and values which turn a man's thoughts within. Farming seems to me to combine, in its immediate future at least, both of these values. I believe that it can be made more remunerative. I am sure that it can be made more rewarding.

If I understand the spirit and aim of your Order, you propose to see to it that as the business of farming becomes more remunerative, the life of the farmer and of his family becomes more rewarding. You stand for the values which lie in increasing respect for one's self and for one's calling, in quickened intelligence, in widening sympathy, and in patriotic devotion.

Believing that these are the objects which you have set before yourselves, I can offer you no better wish than that you may reach them.

XII

"THE MIND OF THE WAGE EARNER"

ADDRESS BEFORE THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE OFFICIALS OF LABOR BUREAUS OF AMERICA, HON. CARROLL D. WRIGHT, PRESIDING.

What I have to say is in the nature of some reflections upon the "mind of the wage earner," an expression which I borrow from the opening sentence of the recent work by John Mitchell on Organized Labor: "The average wage earner has made up his mind that he must remain a wage earner."* I would not take this generalization in any unqualified way. The author has himself qualified it by the use of the word "average." But when reduced to its lowest terms it is, I think, the most serious statement which has been made of late concerning the social life of the country; for it purports to be the statement of a mental fact. If Mr. Mitchell had said that in his opinion the conditions affecting the wage earner were becoming fixed conditions, that would have been a statement of grave import, but quite different from the one made. Here is an interpretation of the mind of the wage earner, from one well qualified to give an interpretation of it, to the effect that the average wage earner has reached a state of mind in which he accepts the fixity of his condition.

---

*The paragraph from which this quotation is made is as follows: "The average wage earner has made up his mind that he must remain a wage earner. He has given up the hope of a kingdom to come, where he himself will be a capitalist, and he asks that the reward for his work be given him as a working man. Singly, he has been too weak to enforce his just demands, and he has sought strength in union, and has associated himself into organizations."

Having reached this state of mind the best thing which can be done is to organize the wage earner into a system through which he may gain the greatest advantage possible within his accepted limitations. I am not disposed to take issue with the conclusion of the argument (I am a firm believer in trade unions), but I do not like the major premise of the argument. I should be sorry to believe that it was altogether true. And in so far as it is true, in so far, that is, as we are confronted by this mental fact, I believe that we should address ourselves to it quite as definitely as to the physical facts which enter into the labor problem.

If "the average wage earner has made up his mind that he must remain a wage earner," we have a new type of solidarity, new at least to this country. No other man among us has made up his mind to accept his condition. The majority of men are accepting the conditions of their daily work, but it is not an enforced acceptance. This is true of the great body of people engaged in farming, in mercantile pursuits, and in most of the underpaid professional employments. In the social order one of two things must be present to create solidarity, pride or a grievance. An aristocracy of birth is welded together by pride. It perpetuates itself through the increasing pride of each new generation. An aristocracy is an inheritance not of wealth, for some "families" are very poor, but of an assured state of mind. An aristocrat does not have to make up his mind, it has been made up for him. An aristocracy is in this respect entirely different from a plutocracy. A plutocracy is at any given time merely an aggregation of wealth. People are struggling to get into it and are continually falling out of it. There is no mental

repose in a plutocracy. It is a restless, struggling, disintegrating mass. It has no inherent solidarity.

Next to pride the chief source of solidarity is a grievance. The solidarity may be transient or permanent. It lasts as long as the sense of grievance lasts. Sometimes the sense of grievance is worn out: then you have to invent some other term than solidarity to express the deplorable condition into which a mass of people may fall. But whenever the sense of dissatisfaction is widespread and permanent, it deepens into a grievance which creates solidarity. The human element involved is at work to intensify and perpetuate itself.

Now when it is said that "the average wage earner has made up his mind that he must remain a wage earner," the saying assumes unwillingness on his part, the sense of necessity, and therefore a grievance which, as it is communicated from man to man, creates a solidarity. If you can eliminate the grievance, you break up the solidarity. The wage earner then becomes, like the farmer, the trader, the schoolmaster, a man of a given occupation. The fact of the great number of wage earners signifies nothing in a social sense, unless they are bound together by a grievance, unless they have made up their mind to some conclusion which separates them from the community at large or the body politic.

We have come, it seems to me, to the most advanced question concerning "labor," as we find ourselves in the presence of this great mental fact which Mr. Mitchell asserts. What can be done to so affect "the mind of the wage earner" that it will not work toward that kind of solidarity which will be of injury to him and to society?

It is, of course, entirely obvious that a greater free-

dom of mind on the part of the wage earner may be expected to follow the betterment of his condition. This betterment of condition is the one and final object of the trade union. I doubt if one-half of that which the trade union has gained for the wage earner could have been gained in any other way. I doubt if one-quarter of the gain would have been reached in any other way. Trade unionism is the business method of effecting the betterment of the wage earner under the highly organized conditions of the modern industrial world.

But trade unionism at its best must do its work within two clear limitations. In the first place, every advance which it tries to make in behalf of the wage earner as such finds a natural limit. The principle of exclusiveness, of separate advantage, is a limited principle. At a given point, now here, now there, it is sure to react upon itself, or to be turned back. Organization meets opposing organization. Public interests become involved. Moral issues are raised. The co-operating sympathy of men, which can always be counted upon in any fair appeal to it, turns at once to rebuke and restraint if it is abused. The wage earner in a democracy will never be allowed to get far beyond the average man through any exclusive advantages which he may attempt by organization.

In the second place, trade unionisms can deal with the wage earner only as a wage earner, and he is more than a wage earner. There comes a time when he cannot be satisfied with wages. The betterment of his condition creates wants beyond those which it satisfies. The growing mind of the wage earner, like anybody's mind, seeks to widen its environment. It wants con-

tact with other kinds of minds. When once it becomes aware of its provincialism it tries to escape from it, a fact which is clearly attested in the broadening social and political relations of the stronger labor leaders.

But while I believe that trade unionism is the business method of enlarging the mind of the wage earner through the betterment of his condition, I think that the time has come for the use, or adaptation of other means which may give it freedom and expansion.

One means of preventing a narrow and exclusive solidarity of wage earners is greater identification on their part with the community through the acquisition of local property. Mobility is, in the earlier stages of the development of the wage earner, the source of his strength. He can easily change to his interest. No advantage can be taken of his fixity. He can put himself, without loss, into the open market. He can avail himself at once of the highest market price, provided his change of place does not affect injuriously his fellow workers in the union, an exception of growing concern.

But in the more advanced stages of labor the wage earner gains the privilege of localizing himself, and in so doing he takes a long step in the direction of full and free citizenship. A good deposit in a savings bank adds to his social value, but that value is greatly enhanced by exchanging it for a good house.

I am aware that in advocating the acquisition of local property I touch upon the large and as yet undetermined question of the decentralization of labor. If the great cities are to be the home of the industries, then this idea can be realized in only a partial degree through suburban homes. But if the industries are to seek out or establish smaller centers, then the wage earner has

the opportunity to become more distinctly and more conspicuously a citizen.

Another means of giving freedom and expansion to the wage earning population, in place of a narrow and exclusive solidarity, is by giving to it ready access to the higher education. There is no reason why the former experience of the New England farmer and the present experience of the western farmer should not be repeated in the family of the intelligent wage earner. The sons of the New England farmer who were sent to college identified their families with the state and church, and with all public interests.

They lifted the family horizon. I have said that this experience may be repeated in the families of the wage earner. It is being repeated. Let me give you an illustration with which I am familiar. The students at Dartmouth are divided about as follows, according to the occupation of their fathers: Forty per cent are the sons of business men, twenty-five per cent of professional men, fifteen per cent of farmers; of the remaining twenty per cent, more than half are the sons of wage earners. The per cent from the shops now equals that from the farm. I have no doubt that this proportion will hold in most of our eastern colleges and universities. The home of the wage earner is becoming a recruiting ground for the higher education, which no college can afford to overlook. As Professor Marshall, the English economist, has said, "Since the manual labor classes are four or five times as numerous as all other classes put together, it is not unlikely that more than half of the best natural genius that is born into the country belongs to them." And from this statement he goes on to draw the conclusion that "there

is no extravagance more prejudicial to the growth of the national wealth than that wasteful negligence which allows genius which happens to be born of lowly parentage to expend itself in lowly work." So much for the necessity of fresh, virile, and self-supporting stock to the higher education, if it is to discharge its obligation to society.

Virility is as essential to educational progress as it is to industrial progress. I am in the habit of saying that, from an educational point of view, it is on the whole easier to make blue blood out of red blood, than it is to make red blood out of blue blood.

The reaction from the higher education upon the family of the wage earner is yet to be seen, but no one can doubt its broadening influence. As the representatives of these families become more numerous in our colleges and universities, and as they have time to make a place for themselves in all the great callings, they will of necessity lift those whom they represent toward their own level. Some of them will become captains of industry. I believe that in that capacity they will also become leaders of labor. For, as it seems to me, the settlement of the relations of capital and labor is to be more and more not in the hands of men who have been trained away from one another, but in the hands of men who have been trained toward one another. If we are to have industrial peace we must have the industrial virtues. These virtues are honesty in work and in the wage of work, absolute fidelity on both sides in keeping agreements at whatever cost, and above all, that sense of justice which can come only through the ability of one man to put himself in another man's place. This last virtue ought to be the product of the intellectual and ethical

training of the schools. It is their business to teach us how to think rightly, as well as how to feel rightly toward our fellow men.

I mention another source of freedom and breadth and power to the wage earner, a source which is common to all, namely, satisfaction in his work. The wage is not, and never can be, the sufficient reward of labor. This is just as true of the salary as of the wage. The difference at present lies in the fact that the person on a low salary is apt to take more satisfaction in his work than the person on a high wage—the school teacher on $800 or $1,000 a year in distinction from the mechanic on $4 or $6 a day. The present ambition of the higher wage-earner seems to incline more to the pecuniary rewards of his work than to the work itself. Doubtless this tendency is due in no slight degree to the fact that the wage earner is brought into constant and immediate contact with the money-making class. He sees that the value of the industry is measured chiefly by its profits. Sometimes the profits are flaunted in his face. At all times the thing most in evidence to him is money. I deprecate this constant comparison between the workman and other men whose chief reward is money. The old time professions still live and maintain their position through a certain detachment from pecuniary rewards. The exceptional doctor may receive large fees, but his profession forbids him to make a dollar out of any discovery which he may make in medicine. The exceptional minister may receive a large salary, but his profession puts the premium upon self-denying work. Even the law is more distinctively represented by the moderate salary of the average judge, than by the retainer of the counsel for a wealthy corporation. The

skilled workman, the artisan, belongs with these men, not with the money makers. In allowing himself to be commercialized he enters upon a cheap and unsatisfying competition. His work is an art, and he has the possible rewards of the artist. Under mediaevalism the guild and the university were not far apart. I should like to see the relation restored and extended.

I am not speaking in this connection of the unskilled laborer. There is a point below which it is impossible to idealize labor. The man who works in ceaseless and petty monotony, and under physical discomfort and danger, cannot do anything more than to earn an honest livelihood, if, indeed, he receives the living wage. But he is as far removed from the advanced wage earner of our day as he is from any of the well-supported and well-rewarded classes. For him we are all bound to work, and to act, and to think, not as an object of our charity, but as a part of our industrial brotherhood. And whenever a great labor leader, be he John Burns or John Mitchell, goes to his relief and tries to give him self-supporting and self-respecting standing, we should count it not a duty but an honor to follow the leading. But equally do I hold it to be a duty and an honor, on the part of the wage earner that as he advances in intelligence, in pecuniary reward, and in position, he should take his place without any reservation whatever among those who are trying to meet the responsibilities which attach to citizenship in a democracy.

I have not attempted to enter at all in this brief discussion into the technical aspects of your work, but I am aware that I have covered ground entirely familiar to you. Very likely your broader judgment and clearer insight into details may modify

some of my positions or make them untenable. But viewing the present disposition and purpose of the best intentioned leaders in the ranks of organized labor, with many of whom you have to do, I am convinced that their avowed object is not commensurate with their opportunity. I am convinced that the interpretation put upon the mind of the wage earner, if it represents a present fact, ought to suggest a duty toward the mind of labor. That duty is to give it freedom, breadth, expansion, to incorporate it into the common mind of aspiration and hope, the American type of mind. In saying this I do not overlook or minimize the imperative duty to raise the lowest wage earner to the highest place to which he can be lifted, and to give a future to his children and to his children's children. I would urge in the full apostolic sense the old apostolic injunction, "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak." But I would not stop with this duty. I would make the wage earner as he grows stronger a helper all round, a partner in all the serious work of the republic, an active power in that commonwealth which draws no line within the wants or hopes of man.

XIII

THE REPEAL OF THE CHARTER OF THE NEW ENGLAND BREEDERS' CLUB

Address at a Meeting of Citizens of Manchester, N. H., January 14, 1906

The New England Breeders' Club is a chartered institution of the State of New Hampshire. The fact regarding it now before the people of the state is the fact of occupancy. The institution is here, established within our borders, intrenched in its chartered rights, with large investments already made, and with preparations well in hand for its first season. The question of its admission to the state is not the question before us. If that question of a year ago could be recalled, if it were still an open question, if it had ever been an *open* question, it would have taken, or would now take, no longer to deny it a place in the state than it took to give it a place in the state.

The New England Breeders' Club is not here by accident. The ease with which it found its way into the state is a mark of the intelligence of its promoters, but it does not measure their intelligence. Their experience, their skill, their resources of every kind have hardly as yet been drawn upon. These are largely in reserve for use in resisting any attempt at dislodgment, and if successful in this resistance, for use in evading the law. Let not the people of the state repeat the mistake already made of underestimating the craft or power of this institution.

We must approach the issue then with which we are now confronted through this fact of possession. We have to deal with something chartered, established, and making ready to operate. Hence the question that lies at the very threshold of all discussion and of all effort. Have we sufficient law to control this institution and restrict its operations within legitimate ends? If we have, if the Supreme Court shall so decide, provided it is asked for a decision, then the moral forces of the state must be aroused to secure a vigorous and relentless enforcement of the law. If we do not have law enough, law which can be guaranteed by the sufficient authority, then we must have more law, and the sooner we proceed to make it the better. The recall of the Legislature in special session to repeal the charter of the New England Breeders' Club would accomplish an insufficient result, should it do this only, and not proceed straightway to enact laws against gambling in connection with race-tracks, sufficient to prevent any illegitimate operations of the New England Breeders' Club, should it return and incorporate under the general laws of the state. A special session of the Legislature might retrieve a great mistake, and incidentally it might do much to clear the air of personal suspicions, but it would not do the business of the hour, it would not bring its business up to date, unless it should give us laws called out by, and commensurate with the present emergency. The immediate and ultimate question, as it seems to me, in this whole matter is the question of law, about which we want, as nearly as possible, absolute certainty.

Here is the significance of the petition of the Committee of Twelve now before the Governor and Coun-

cil. The petitioners ask for an authoritative and decisive answer to this question. The Governor and Council, acting upon this petition, may act in one of two ways. They may refer the question of the sufficiency of existing laws to the Supreme Court, or declining such reference, they may assume the responsibility, as the executive officers of the state, of trying to prove by the enforcement of existing laws that these are sufficient to prevent gambling, in the sense of betting on the races, in and around the Salem race-track. The sub-committee of the Committee of Twelve did not understand from the consideration of the opinion of the Attorney General (kindly submitted to it before formal presentation), and we do not understand from the reconsideration of it, since it appeared in print, that the Attorney General offered his opinion to divert an appeal to the Supreme Court, nor do we understand that the opinion is urged to the *extent of guaranteeing the sufficiency of the law* for the purposes of executive action. If the Governor and Council shall deem it wise to decline a reference to the Supreme Court, or if, in the event of reference, the Supreme Court shall decline to answer, or if, in the event of its consideration of the question referred, it shall decide that we do not have sufficient law for dealing with the operations of this Club, then the way seems to me straight and clear for an appeal for a special session of the Legislature. The sub-committee virtually say this in their petition to the Governor and Council:

"If it shall be determined that the means at our disposal are inadequate to meet the exigencies of the situation, you will then be in position intelligently and fearlessly to decide the question which will inevitably

arise,—whether it is your duty to call a special session of the Legislature to repair legislative errors and omissions of the past, by repealing the obnoxious charter or removing its objectionable features, and by providing laws which shall beyond all question cover all possible forms of race-track betting, with such administrative features as shall make them capable of prompt enforcement, and with such penalties as have elsewhere been found effective.

"Whenever the legislature may assemble, it should know the precise evils to be remedied, and the limitations, if any, upon its powers to remedy them. It should not pass laws which may afterwards be held to be beyond its legislative powers; nor should it be deterred from the adoption of proper measures by the cry that its contemplated action is 'unconstitutional.' It should know the extent and the limits of its powers, and the precise exigencies of the occasion calling for their exercise.

"We cannot too strongly urge upon you the importance, before this corporation shall be established and in operation on New Hampshire soil, and so strongly intrenched in its position that it can be dislodged only by the most strenuous efforts, if at all, of assuring yourselves and the people of this state that we are in a position to control with a strong hand the operation of this, to us, unfamiliar institution."

Now that we have really discovered what the situation is,—it has been a slow process—it seems almost impossible that we should waste further time in uncertainty as to the grounds of action. So long as we do not know what it is necessary to do, we are weak. When we know what we can, or cannot do, further delay is

culpable. Personally, I have believed from the first, and still believe that the Legislature through which this institution was unwittingly let into the state should have the opportunity of retrieving the mistake. When any open minded man has made a mistake, involving serious consequences, his first impulse is to correct it. We often get the wisest actions from those who in their simplicity are closest to nature. An old colored preacher, to whom it was pointed out, as he came down from the pulpit, that he had given the wrong meaning to his text, upon being convinced of his error, went straight back into the pulpit and cried out in a great humility, "The Lord help dis old man to unpreach dat sermon." Let us, by all means, if it be possible, give the Legislature the chance to uncharter this institution. And having done this, let it improve the occasion to make laws, if we need them, which shall be equal to this or any like emergency. And as I intimated a moment ago, I believe that the recalling of the Legislature will give the fit opportunity for direct personal statement on the part of men who have no reason for concealing the truth, but who lack the fit occasion for personal statement.

Whatever interpretation, however, the Governor and Council may put upon this opinion, or upon the argument of the petitioners, for reference to the Supreme Court, we are not to anticipate that there will be any desire on their part to evade the broad and serious question before them, and, therefore, pending their action, we may proceed to address ourselves as *citizens* to the underlying question,—Why should we concern ourselves about the chartering of the New England Breeders' Club and the establishment of its race-track at Salem?

It is not an agreeable task for any man to turn aside from his chosen and urgent work to take up some otherwise neglected duty which belongs, in common, to all citizens. But unless men are willing to do their duty as citizens, in an emergency, I do not know how the Government can do, or can be expected to do, its duty effectively. Law cannot take command of new moral situations, except as it can act in a bracing moral atmosphere. The supporting power must be an aroused public sentiment. The motives which may create this public sentiment will vary, certainly in their intensity. In this case many citizens will act chiefly for the honor of the state or for the public good. Others, among whom you are to be reckoned, have an added motive from the danger which lies at your very threshold. There is not a city in the lower Merrimack which is not threatened by this invasion. There is not a shop, or a store, or an office, or a home in all this region which is not in danger from this new and fascinating dishonesty.

And yet a good many citizens are asking, why should we concern ourselves about this business? Why not wait and see what will happen? What is there which calls for this agitation in advance?

It is not possible to make men feel a future calamity. No prophet has ever been able to do that. But it ought to be possible to undeceive thinking men who are indifferent to an impending danger, and to prepare their minds for action when the time for action arrives. As one, therefore, of those who have been asked to investigate the organization and purpose of the New England Breeders' Club, and whose duty must largely rest at this point, I will tell you briefly, though at the risk of repetition, why I believe that this Club should not be

quietly accepted as a chartered institution of the State of New Hampshire.

In the first place, it is evidently not what it claims to be. It claims to be an organization for "raising, importing, and improving the breed of horses and other domestic animals in the state of New Hampshire." That is not, and never was, its essential object. It introduced itself into the state as an organization under the management of New Hampshire men. It proved to be an importation from New York. It offered a charter, apparently proof against gambling in all forms. Its charter was virtually a copy of a New York law devised to allow and sanction gambling, under which eight race courses in the state of New York have been in successful operation for ten years as gambling institutions. The presumption created by this process of studied concealment and misrepresentation cannot be explained away to the satisfaction of any honest minded man. When a man has been imposed upon, when a man's state has been imposed upon, he is in no mood for smooth words.

In the second place, not only is the New England Breeders' Club evidently not what it claims to be, it is in part only what it appears to be. It appears to be an organization for legitimate sport, and that it is in part; and in so far as it is that we have no concern with it. Personally I may go further than some of you in my advocacy of out-of-door sports. I believe in them. Recreation is not enough. Sport, organized sport, has a legitimate place in our modern life. The game which interests the public as well as the player is on the whole a healthy stimulus. I do not say that our great public games are free from evils. I do not say that our aca-

demic sports are free from evils. I am not here to utter cant. But I do claim that there is a vast difference between an evil, like that of betting, which may be incidental to any contest (men may bet on an election), and that same evil organized into a sport and made by the majority the sport itself. And this organization of the evil of betting into the sport until it becomes the chief element in the sport itself, is what the race track at Salem means. The five dollar enclosure for betting is just as much a part of the institution as the track itself. I do not know that the proprietors and managers of the New England Breeders' Club have ever sought to conceal the fact that they propose to bet on the races, they and their friends. What they propose avowedly to do is to retire book-making and pool-selling. Book-making and pool-selling make betting democratic and therefore vulgar. The distinction in the avowed code of the club is a social distinction. Within the enclosure betting; without the enclosure gambling.

It is just this attempted distinction between vice which is vulgar and vice which is gilded, of which the American people are becoming weary. Social pharisaism is not a whit better than religious pharisaism. Things do not change their nature by changing their name. Gambling does not cease to be gambling through any sifting of the people who gamble, nor through any refinement of the art. When District Attorney Jerome attacks and breaks up Canfield's, he attacks and breaks up a gambling house for gentlemen.

There is moreover a certain recklessness in the use of social influence which is characteristic of organizations like the New England Breeders' Club. It is a part of the unseemly vanity of the idle rich and of their craze

for publicity. Why should this club set itself up at a point in this state accessible to nearly one half the population of New England? Why should this club plant itself in the midst of the industries of the lower Merrimack? Why should its devotion to betting, under the guise of sport, be carried out regardless of the effect of its practices upon the vast numbers whom it expects to attract to its grounds?

One cannot go far in this questioning about recklessness without going over into the suspicion of purpose and design; but accepting for the moment these men at their best, allowing them the benefit of their denials, what are they here for? By what rights, private or social, or public, do they introduce their corrupting speculation, and unwholesome excitement? By what right do they change the atmosphere of this valley from that of sober but cheerful industry to that of unrest, speculation, and unwholesome excitement? By what right do they flaunt their superfluous and idle wealth in the face of the toiling earners of the daily bread? It is just such reckless, wasteful business as this, which is causing men elsewhere to ask what society calls dangerous questions, to think what society calls dangerous thoughts, to do what society calls dangerous things.

What appears to be a sport, and what is in part a sport, is in reality, and in the greater part, nothing but gambling; and the greater the social distinction attaching to it, the greater the temptation. There is no evil spirit which can be set loose in a community which will do its work so quickly, so surely, and so thoroughly as the gambling spirit. It is the spirit which seeks entrance into this community under the most deceptive and attractive guise. I believe that the majority of

men in this state who want the sport do not want it imbedded in a gambling institution. I believe that among the men who might not hesitate to bet at a race, there are many who as citizens of this state do not want this institution here. For the difference is wide, and manifest, between an evil which may be incidental to any sport, and that same evil (in this case betting), organized into a given sport, and made the essential part of the sport itself.

In the third place, contrary to what it claims to be, contrary also in greater part to what it appears to be, the New England Breeders' Club is a commercialized institution, belonging by its history and its affiliations to a great gambling system operating throughout the country. This is no ordinary gentlemen's club, made up of summer residents, for purposes of private amusement. It sets up an amusement, at the moral expense of the public, for private gain. The gambling business of the country, so far as it is associated with racing associations and jockey clubs, is a monopoly, or if it is not a monopoly it is not for lack of effort to make it such. Here lay in part the significance of President Harrison's veto of a bill similar in character to the charter of the New England Breeders' Club. It is this monopolistic system which is trying the doors of our legislatures as occasion may offer, the system which has recently suffered repulse in the states of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Missouri. Its principles are the same everywhere; its methods vary only according to its evasions of law; the men who operate the system are in good part the same. The Governors of the New England Breeders' Club are well known figures on the various race-tracks of the country where gambling flourishes

unchecked. The subordinates who manage affairs at the races, and preside at the various functions, are interchangeable. And yet we are asked to believe that in the setting up of this establishment at Salem, at an expense equal to that of other properties of a like nature, we are asked to believe that in the operation of this particular part of the system, the principles which obtain elsewhere are to be disowned, the methods which obtain elsewhere are to be discarded, and that this establishment is to be operated with a very great doubt as to its being able to make the ends meet, but with a view at any cost of furnishing healthful amusement for the people in the neighborhood of Salem!

I do not care to presume upon your time, or seem to distrust your intelligence, by further exposition of the character of this institution which has begun its chartered existence in our state. When once we are convinced of the character of an institution of this sort, nothing is gained by familiarity with its more repulsive details. There is this, however, to be said, that through the invasion of our state by this great gambling system, we are brought into sympathy with other states which have suffered or are suffering at its hands. Certainly if it should come into operation here, you would read with different eyes the record of defalcations and suicides, of loss of employment and failures in business, and of the breaking up of homes, which follows the annual season of every chartered race-track in the state of New York—the models of the course at Salem. God forbid that our sympathy should wait upon experience. We are also reminded to the degree of impression, as we begin to realize the grasp which this institution already has upon our state, of the immense power of

corrupt and corrupting wealth. This power is no longer an abstraction. We have not yet shaken it off. The test is yet to come. It may be humiliating to us, it *is* humiliating to us, as citizens of this state that for any reason New Hampshire was chosen as the seat of the New England Breeders' Club. Let the sense of humiliation remain upon us till we have taken measures sufficient to recover the honor of the state.

XIV

THE TREATY OF PORTSMOUTH IN RETROSPECT

ADDRESS AT THE UNVEILING OF COMMEMORATIVE TABLET IN THE NAVY YARD AT KITTERY, ME., SEPTEMBER 5, 1906

The unveiling of the tablet which records the date of the signing of the Treaty of Portsmouth, brings back the day itself with a distinctness which is almost vivid. The days which had immediately preceded, as many of you will recall, had been days of grave suspense. Enough was known outside the sessions of the envoys to make it evident, not only that the questions at issue were becoming more and more acute, but also that the personal feeling attending the discussion was becoming more and more tense. The representatives of the press, especially those from abroad, who had been trained to study and interpret the various phases and moods of diplomatic controversy, gave us naturally, as the result of their daily observations, changing and often conflicting reports. The procedure, as it appeared to those without, was not a slow, steady advance from point to point toward a probable conclusion, but an uncertain though strenuous effort which might at any moment terminate in disheartening failure. No one knew the actual powers of the envoys themselves, what influences, financial or other, might interfere with their personal choices, or what absolute authority might interpose to command their decision. Every one interested had to take counsel with himself as best he could, accord-

ing to his reasoning based on the course of events, or according to the scanty though suggestive bits of information which were continually coming to hand, or according to his own temperament. Of all the persons, whom I chanced to know who were indirectly concerned with the proceedings, or who were close spectators, the only one who was consistently hopeful to the very end was his Excellency, Governor McLane.

When, therefore, the announcement of the signing of the Treaty came with such startling suddenness, the joy of the news was that of a great relief rather than that of an assured result. The feeling of suspense simply gave way to anxiety. Men began to ask what was the meaning of the settlement? The terms of the settlement were evident, what did they mean? Would the nations, rulers and peoples be satisfied with the agreement? Was the agreement to be peace, substantial and lasting peace?

The answer to this question is very much clearer in the retrospect of the year than it was at the time. When the treaty was signed, Russia was suffering too keenly from defeat to allow any terms of settlement to be acceptable. The people of Japan were expecting an indemnity, and anything less in the way of settlement was sure to be a bitter disappointment. Whatever judgment may be passed upon the diplomatic struggle, it cannot be said that the result of it, as expressed in the terms of the treaty, was popular with either nation. The reaction, affecting the immediate fortune of the chief agents, was in fact pathetic. Baron Komura encountered marked popular disfavor upon his return, though his action was officially approved, and subsequently confirmed by his appointment as ambassador

to England. Count Witte, in spite of his brilliant diplomatic service, was not acclaimed by the people of Russia on his return, and he did not long retain the full confidence of the Czar. The interest which each had awakened by his personality—Komura, reserved, serious, the scholar in diplomacy; Witte, accessible, skillfully bold and aggressive, the man of affairs—the interest which each had awakened and which followed after both, was that of respectful and affectionate sympathy, as each went his way to new responsibilities and to new trials. In no sense could any one have affirmed at the time of its acceptance that the treaty was a finality.

But what might not have been accomplished by the treaty through its terms of settlement, the treaty did accomplish as a fact. It ended the immediate conflict, and, in so doing, it became a new point of departure for both Russia and Japan. It set free for each people the internal forces which were ready for action. Immediately upon the adoption of the treaty each nation became entirely preoccupied with its own affairs. Russia and Japan are today as clearly unrelated to one another by dangerous questions of mutual concern as any two nations of Europe. The preoccupation of each nation with its own imperative concerns is the guarantee of peace, a condition made possible and brought into evidence by the treaty.

I quote from a recent letter of a correspondent in Japan, who has returned to his native land after an absence of ten years: "The general appearance," he says, "(in all things) is that the nation is straining its nerves to do more than it can actually do, simply because it must. There are weak spots on every side, and there is hardly any surplus power in anything." It is evi-

dent that the spirit of sacrifice, which was so magnificently illustrated in the war, must be still further shown in the recovery and advancement of the nation. The part which Japan aspires to take in the development of the Far East requires a corresponding development of her own resources. Nothing but years of peaceful development can make Japan the arbiter of the East.

The task before Russia seems more formidable and more exacting. It is possible to measure the economic reconstruction of a nation. It is impossible to calculate in any certain terms the political regeneration of a people. The political regeneration of Russia may come through revolution. It may come through the orderly processes of legislation. In either event the problem can be solved only by the protracted concentration of the nation upon itself. No diversion of power, as through a foreign war, can meet the issue. The immediate future of Russia is pledged to its own political life.

So far then as the Treaty of Portsmouth has given to the world a guarantee of peace, it has furnished that guarantee chiefly through the opportunity and the incentive which it gave the two great nations at war to go their separate ways, in fulfillment of their imperative individual necessities.

But what shall we say of the return to our own nation for the part which it took in bringing about the Treaty of Portsmouth? We have made as a nation two ventures into the larger life of the world, first when by the fortune, if not by the accident of war, we took possession of the Philippines, and again when at the invitation of the President of the United States the warring states of the East were brought together on this spot to confer upon the conditions of peace. I have spoken of the

Conference as the result of the invitation of the President. It was more than an invitation which he sent to the rulers of Russia and Japan. It was an earnest though dignified appeal in behalf of the nations themselves, and in behalf of the wide kinship of nations. I cannot overestimate the educating power of this action, with its attendant result, upon the people of this country. In our occupancy of the Philippines we assumed great obligations, international as well as national. We put ourselves under the eye of the world, where our behavior would be judged by standards new to us. The responsibility which we then undertook has had increasingly a sobering effect upon the nation.

The effect of the bringing hither of the representatives of Russia and Japan upon so momentous an errand was different. In a superficial way it appealed to our imagination, perhaps to our vanity. But in a far deeper sense, at least to all thoughtful minds, it broadened the vision of this people and taught us the great lesson of humility. The nations, which came together on this spot through their envoys, represented races which have in their keeping, perhaps as much as we or our kindred, the future of the world. In the modern sense they are yet nations in the making. It is from the nations which are still in the making that we have most to fear, or to hope, as it is from the nations that are made, the finished nations, that we have most to learn. History teaches that power lies with the last comer. It is the unspent force among nationalities or races which has in it the latent power of rule. Such a force may suffer waste as in Russia, it may require economy as in Japan, but it belongs to the future.

It was a timely and much needed lesson taught the

American people by the coming together of these rising peoples, that not we alone belong to the future. It was a timely and much needed lesson which came to us from actual contact with national characteristics which we had not understood, and from actual contact with national virtues to which we had not attained. I doubt if any act of hospitality on the part of any government ever gave back so large a return in the instruction of its people, as the invitation of President Roosevelt to the powers of Russia and Japan to convene upon this territory, and to settle their contention in the presence of this people. The tablet which blends so happily the emblems of the United States with those of Russia and Japan illustrates none too strongly the international bearing and results of the Treaty of Portsmouth.

I congratulate you, Rear Admiral Mead, that the event which we commemorate today took place during your period of service, and under your immediate care, as Commandant of the Navy Yard. I congratulate all of you who through official or personal relation to this locality have thereby been identified with so beneficent and so far reaching an event. It is yet to be written, but the page of history on which it shall be written lies open, that here, within these walls, business was transacted, which gave new life to nations coming hither from afar, and which taught the people of the land among whom for a little time they sojourned how to measure their own place beside the coming peoples of the world.

XV

WHAT HAS PATRIOTISM THE RIGHT TO DEMAND OF EDUCATION?

Address at Union League Club, February 22, 1906

I think that you will agree with me as I say that patriotism cannot be completely defined in terms of sentiment. Patriotism is obedience. When the duty is instant and definite it means, of course, the surrender of self to country. Patriotism is then an act, involving all the consequences to the individual of an act. But when we cannot satisfy patriotism by an act, then it follows hard after us with its inexorable question as to how we are to conduct ourselves generally, how we are to manage our affairs, how we are to set our ambitions with a view to the good of the country. When patriotism does not speak the language of the imperative, as in times of national peril, its most effective language is the language of the interrogative, How about your business, your influence, your thinking in its every-day bearing on the public welfare?

It is in this spirit that I interpret the question to which I am to speak:—What has patriotism the right to demand of education? I accept the question as personal to myself and to men of my business. I do not feel called upon to tell you, who are in other kinds of business, what patriotism demands of you. Probably if I should attempt the task you might recognize the fitness of three-fourths of what I should say; but criti-

cism, like art, to be effective must be all right, never off key or tone. As a bright woman once said to Mr. Sumner, who in his omniscience was criticising a musical performance, "Why, Charles, what are you talking about; if you should try to sing Old Hundred you couldn't sing more than seventy-five."

So, then, as for myself and for men of my kind, what does patriotism demand of us in our business of education, especially of the higher education?

First of all, I should say that patriotism has the right to demand of us that we do our best to keep not only the idea, but the fact of democracy, free and open to all men. Education is a leveling-up process. There are other like processes. But some of them have already broken, and are no longer working as formerly upon the lower ranges. The most serious word which has been written in our generation, in so far as it declares a fact, is the opening sentence in the recent book of John Mitchell on "Organized Labor": "The average wage-earner has made up his mind that he must remain a wage-earner." If this be true, whatever may be the cause, then organized industry has ceased to be the aid and helper of democracy. For democracy requires, as the first necessity of its existence, mobility of condition as opposed to fixity of condition. The moment the average man of any class ceases to aspire, and accepts his condition as fixed, that moment he ceases to express in himself the spirit of democracy.

Turning to education, and especially to the higher education, I find that the leveling-up process is at work here without any break. The mental movement is going on through the ranks of the people, and the path of intellectual progress is open from the lowest place to

the highest. There is not a college or a university, so far as I know, however richly it may be endowed, which acknowledges any distinction except that of brains, and which is not, therefore, as much the home of the poor man as of the rich man. Even the incidents of the higher education tend to equalize men. One justification for athletics is that they are tremendously democratic. College estimates and college honors go, as the almost invariable rule, with the man. Indeed, as it seems to me, the interests of the higher education are bound up in democracy. Our colleges and universities must have their recruiting stations everywhere, at every point of mental possibility, otherwise they will be scant in intellectual power. The intellectual life must have its roots in virility. I have had occasion to say elsewhere—it may be proper to say it in your presence—that from an educational point of view it is on the whole easier to make blue blood out of red blood than it is to make red blood out of blue blood. But the higher education cannot afford to ignore intellectual power of any kind, I had almost said of any quality. It needs the powers which come to it through generations of culture, and it needs the powers which come to it fresh from nature. All of which is but saying that education, if true to its own interests, must keep alive the idea, and keep open and free the fact of democracy; and in so doing it meets and satisfies the first demand of patriotism.

I should put as the second demand of patriotism upon education—a demand which I am by no means sure that we are meeting with the same success as the one which we have considered—that our colleges and universities train men on the side of mental conscience. There are a great many men of good intentions whose consciences

never seem to get into their brains. They know how to feel rightly better than they know how to think rightly. Or, what is more often the case, they ignore the moral element in their thinking, that is, in their opinions, their plans, their schemes of life. Education is no safeguard against this indifference to honest thinking, unless honest thinking is made an equal element of education with acute thinking.

I quote from a letter which recently fell under my notice, written to a great benefactor of education. "Now and then," says the writer, "quite possibly too often, I find floating through my mind doubts about the purely moral value of so much education as is now being provided for. Nearly every time I mix in business affairs I have the fact forced upon my observation that college graduates are quite as dishonest and as expert sharpers as their less fortunate and more ignorant brothers. I fear that I am gradually being forced to the adoption of a new motto—fewer churches, less learning and more honesty. How do you like it?" That was the impatient, half earnest word of a well-known lawyer, a gallant soldier and reformer, and a lover of books beyond most scholars.

I take the truth which lies in the banter. It is entirely possible to disconnect the processes of thought from their moral consequences. It is really very hard to weave moral fiber into the warp and woof of our thinking. It is harder to be just in our opinions than it is to be accurate in our calculations, but justice toward men means precisely what we mean by accuracy in respect to things. When we treat human nature as we treat nature, the law of gravitation, for example, we are at work very close to the golden rule. Respect

for our fellow men is, on the whole, the best kind of sympathy. And the indoctrinating of all students into this primary quality is, I believe, one of the chief functions of the higher education, especially in the training of men for leadership.

There are three training schools among us for political leadership, about as far apart as you can space such training, and each school has the danger of its environment. These three training schools are the saloon, business, and the college. It is quite useless to ignore the first, when a man of this training has it in his power today to dictate the nomination of one of the national parties for the presidency. This dictator is one type of the political leader. It is foolish to overlook the training which creates the type. The saloon is the center of comradeship, and so the place for personal influence, later for personal authority, then for organization, finally for political combination. We think of the sordidness of the surroundings. The real peril lies in the narrowness of the training which inculcates simply loyalty to one's set. The "gang" is social, the "ring" is mercenary. The social becomes the mercenary through its narrowness. Honor does not extend to the outside man. The interests of a city or of the nation do not enter into the sphere of thought, except in the rare circumstance when a leader extricates himself from the mental condition of his political training.

In quite a different way we may come to suffer in our thinking for the best ends of the state from the mental environment of business. We may come to see things more clearly and in larger proportion than we see men, and so to act and legislate for things rather than for men. The opening of markets is a great civiliz-

ing agency, in some instances the greatest, but if pushed without regard to local condition it may mean the closing of markets. The flooding of India with foreign goods has driven the native people back into agriculture. It constitutes a grievance which makes British rule there still one of the uncertainties of the remote future.

In still another way the academic mind may fail to make its proper contribution to the state. When men say that a question is academic they mean, of course, that it is not yet worth the attention of the street. There is not much danger today that the academic mind of this country will not adjust itself to the ways of the world. The greater danger lies in the fact that the adjustment is apt to take place too early in the process of training. In the change, in such large degree, of the subject-matter of the higher education to subjects of immediate utility, the moral element seems to have been relegated to a second place in modern education. There can be no doubt but that success is a word nearer to education than it used to be, and that duty is a more remote word. Success is, of course, the cheaper word. It is cheapening our generation, which, but for that, would be one of the very greatest generations in the world's history. The moral problem of education is how to get the thought of duty well set in the whole process of mental training. I think that we are gaining, because we are coming to understand that the morality of the intellect is not altogether a question of the subject on which the intellect is exercised, and we are also learning that in so far as the subject is material to moral training, we have in the matter of modern education subjects of the most vital concern to human life. If the

old education led us to think of man, the new leads us to think of men, and right thinking toward men ought to serve the uses of the state quite as much as right thinking about man.

There is one other demand which patriotism has the right to make upon education in a more marked degree, perhaps, than upon any other agency, namely, that it should give distinction to the national character. No one is satisfied, in thinking of his country, with the commonplace. You cannot so enlarge the idea, you cannot give it such bulk and volume, as to gain the quality of distinction. We want to have fine things attach themselves to our national reputation. We want to feel that the capacity for fine things is in us as a people. There is no American of today who is not secretly, if not openly, proud of the fact that the nation can produce a man capable of guiding its diplomacy in the politics of the world, or a man capable of the new and strange work of ruling a great dependency with justice, or a man capable of reorganizing its military service to the last demands of the national power. These are not exhibitions of the commonplace. They are outside the commonplace and above it. They are on the plane of distinction.

I am far from saying that education is the only source or measure of the capacity of the people for doing fine things. The capacity, when individualized, declares itself with the unexpectedness of genius. There is not an industry or trade or business or calling, of any honest sort, which may not at any moment show a man, or put forth an act bearing the mark of distinction: and yet, say what we will, we all know that the lasting distinction of a people lies in its power to think great

thoughts and to leave them as the endowment of the race. It is intellectual power applied to high themes, or to high ends, which alone can satisfy the finer demands of patriotism. On my last visit to England I chanced to go into the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. It is not bigger, as some of you will recall, than a department library in a great university, but as the curator took me from alcove to alcove and uncovered, first the manuscript of Lord Bacon's Novum Organum, and then, in turn, the manuscript of Milton's Paradise Lost, the manuscript of Newton's Principia, a canto of Byron's Childe Harold, Tennyson's In Memoriam, and Thackeray's Henry Esmond—all the product of one college in one university—I said to myself, "England may multiply her wealth, and increase her navy, and expand her empire, and she will still live more surely in the names which will outlast her power." Turning to our own country, the surprising thing about our academic training is the variety of its intellectual product, sometimes in the same college, sometimes in the group. I represent a little group of old-time colleges, which illustrates, as many another group might, this variety of intellectual power of which I am speaking. One of my neighbors gave us Hawthorne and Longfellow, and a little later Thomas Reed and Chief Justice Fuller; another gave us Emerson, Holmes, and Lowell, and two Presidents; another Storrs and Beecher; another Garfield and Armstrong; another Olney and Hay; and my own, according to a somewhat different order still, Thaddeus Stevens, Salmon P. Chase, Rufus Choate, and Webster. These all, even those who are living, were the product of the old training. They antedate in their training the modern university. Out of the ris-

ing universities will come the same results and more, not great men alone, but great discoveries, the re-endowment of the nation with the new wealth of science.

When Phillips Brooks preached his memorable Fourth of July sermon in Westminster Abbey he said that the cry of one nation to another the world over was: "Show us your man." That is the cry which ought to run as a challenge from every part of the working life of the nation to every other part, from industry to commerce, from commerce to education, from education to religion, and back again. The man whom we should like to show, we who are in the business of education, is the man great, not as he separates himself from other men, but great as he is able to take up the most of other men into himself, type in himself of a true democracy; great also because he is not unwilling, or afraid, or unable to put his conscience into all his mental operations; and great again by the distinction of quality, with a capacity for saying or doing things with the unmistakable fineness of power. I do not expect that we shall overwhelm the country in any department of its life with this type of men, but I do think that we shall meet our obligations to the country and come a little nearer to this end, as we try to carry on the business of education as a patriotic duty, under the incitement of days like these.

XVI

THE HISTORIC COLLEGE: ITS PLACE IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Inaugural Address Dartmouth College, June 26, 1893

Some of the more careful observers from abroad, who have described our national characteristics, have pointed out one exception to the otherwise confident and exuberant tone in which we are wont to speak of our institutions. They have noted the fact that we fall into the language of apology, and even of depreciation, when we refer to our higher institutions of learning. The common school system of the country is much exploited in our speech, as they observe, on account of its relation to our political idea and the working of our political machinery. It is when we talk of our colleges and universities that we seem to temper our speech under the evident sense of their immaturity. And yet it is at this very point of the higher learning that one of our most recent foreign critics bids us revise our judgments, and put a different estimate upon the relative value of our achievements. "If I may venture," Professor Bryce says, "to state the impression which the American universities"—under which term he includes the more advanced colleges—"have made upon me, I will say that while of all the institutions of the country they are those of which the Americans speak most modestly, and indeed deprecatingly, they are those which seem to be

at this moment making the swiftest progress, and to have the brightest promise of the future."*

I am not unmindful, as I make this quotation, of the sweeping criticism of Dr. von Holst in his address at the first convocation of the University of Chicago,† to the effect that there is in the United States not a single university in the sense attached to this word by Europeans, every institution bearing this name being a compound or hybrid of college and university, or a torso of a university. But widely as these critics seem to differ in view, and especially in tone, their criticisms are not altogether inconsistent. For the immediate point of comparison with Mr. Bryce is not the American and European university, but the rate of progress which we as a people are now making through our colleges and universities compared with the general progress of the country. The comparison at this point is, I think, unmistakable. The present advance in the educational development of the country is far greater than in its social, or political, or even religious development. I have elsewhere referred to the present as an educational epoch, as distinctly marked as any material or moral epoch which may have preceded. Every sign points that way, though the most evident signs are not of necessity the most significant. Any one can see where the current of beneficent wealth is flowing; any one can see the establishment and enlargement of the great schools; but more significant than these signs, to those who are in a position to discern it, is the spirit of the new scholarship, which craves the severest personal discipline, employs the most rigorous methods, and is content only

---

* The American Commonwealth, vol. ii., p. 553.

† Published in Educational Review, February, 1893.

with truth at the sources; and more significant still, the hunger and thirst of the multitude, that growing appetite for knowledge among all classes, which is beginning to compete with the passion for money.

Now, among the direct results of this vast educational movement, there is one result which, though in a sense of secondary importance, claims our special attention, namely, the re-distribution or re-classification of the higher institutions of learning. A process is now going on which is testing the capacity, and determining the scope, and fixing the relative grade, of these institutions. As clearly as if the question were put to each one, what position do you propose to take, under what limitations do you propose to work, what exact end do you propose to satisfy, the logic of events is forcing an answer. Indefiniteness of purpose, irresolution, inaction at this time on the part of those in control, will certainly cost any existing institution its rank, and quite possibly its existence.

What, then, I ask, as the object of our direct concern, is the legitimate place, under the new educational conditions, of the historic college, obviously distinct from the technical school, and also distinct, though not as obviously, from the university? I ask the question, of course, in supreme thought of our own college, and my answer will fit most immediately its conditions. And yet I have in mind, as I speak, that large and honorable fellowship in which we stand. Dartmouth College belongs to a group of foundations, now of historic dignity, which have retained the name, and which continue to exercise the functions, of the college, in distinction from the school of technology or the university. With the exception of William and Mary College, which

divides with Harvard, though at long distance, the honors of the seventeenth century, and with the possible exception of the College of New Jersey, and Brown University,—my doubt here being in regard to the proper classification, not as to the date,—Dartmouth is the oldest of this particular group. Its charter dates from the provincial era, bearing the signature of George III. In close company, however, in time, were Rutgers, Hampden-Sydney, Union, Williams—which celebrates its centennial the present year—Bowdoin, and Middlebury, all falling within the last century. These are illustrations of what I have termed the historic college. The college idea, the type which they introduced into our American educational economy, has shown a remarkable persistence. It reproduces itself with little variation in the newer states, and competes not unsuccessfully with other types. There are many weak colleges throughout the country, as there are many weak educational institutions of every name. But it is doubtless fair to say that the idea is vital and germinant. It is a somewhat significant fact that, in the organization of the higher education of women, the independent endowments follow chiefly the college type.

The question, which I have proposed as to the legitimate place of the historic college in the present educational development, may be brought into clearer discussion if I divide it, and ask,

First, What is the essential and permanent characteristic of the college?

Then, What is the capacity of the college to meet the widening demands of the new education?

And finally, and with special reference to our own environment, What relation may a college sustain to

associated institutions without attempting the functions of a university?

What is the essential and permanent characteristic of the college? In my conception of it, it is best expressed in one word, homogeneity. To say that a college must have unity is to say no more than ought to be said of any great educational body. A university has a unity as well defined as that of a college, but it is made up of heterogeneous elements working in separate ways and towards divergent ends. Concessions must be made to these diverse elements, which affect the whole internal economy of a university, making it entirely different from that of a college. Discipline, for example, is reduced to a minimum by the elimination of questions which, under other conditions, might be of vital importance.

The homogeneous character of the college finds an extreme but very expressive illustration in the colleges which make up the English universities. An Oxford or Cambridge man is such only by second designation. He is first of Trinity, Kings, Emmanuel, Oriel, Merton, Balliol. Hence those remarkable groups of young men which have been formed from time to time in each university, and out of which have sprung many of the greater political and religious movements of England.

The analogy of the colleges in the English universities holds good only at a single point. The system itself is absolutely unique. But as the college idea was transplanted into American soil, and as each college grew up, not in a cluster, but separate and alone, drawing its scanty nourishment from its immediate surroundings, and exposed to all the vicissitudes of the colonial and early national life, the idea which they represented

in common was naturally intensified in the history of each. The New England college took its own strength and its own shape from the circumstances of its origin and development.

As I am to speak altogether of the historic colleges, which are still colleges and expect to remain such, I may make a passing reference to those colleges, most of them of even an earlier date, which have exchanged, or are now exchanging, the college idea for that of the university. The change on their part seems to me to be entirely justifiable because natural, or in some way necessary. It is being wrought out by them under conditions which make it feasible, or in response to demands which express an obligation. Most of them occupy central positions, represent various interests, and are already equipped for the initial work of a university. And yet I count it of untold value that these ancient colleges, which with our heartiest godspeed are now parting company with us on the way to their own future, were permeated and possessed in their growing life by the college ideal. And as compared with institutions whose foundations are now being laid on another level, and which are never to be known as having been other than universities, there are, I believe, compensations and advantages which will grow more rather than less apparent in favor of those institutions which are reaching the same level through a college history.

The causes which have been operative in preserving to the colleges, of which I am to speak, their essential characteristic are not remote, nor difficult to find. They may be said to exist as much in their history as in their idea, except as the idea made the history. Indeed, it is to be assumed that this homogeneity is due in part to

moral causes, and that it is to be maintained in part through these causes.

Perhaps the most evident cause of their continued homogeneity has been the perpetuation in some form of the original impulse. The colleges originated in a common impulse. Broadly stated, the impulse was religious, the force, that is, behind the colleges was the spirit of consecration, of service, and of sacrifice. Most of them were established to carry on the Christian ministry, because that seemed at the time to be the channel of the best service. Dartmouth College was a graft upon a missionary stock. The pilgrimage of that early Indian preacher over the seas, bearing his letters to George Whitefield, introduced to the Earl of Dartmouth and other English philanthropists, and gaining an audience with his Majesty the king, has become the romance of our history. But in its time it was no romance. The result of that pilgrimage was ten thousand pounds, the name which the college bears, and the interest and goodwill which secured the charter. The charter itself bears the impress alike of the political sagacity of John Wentworth and the apostolic zeal of Eleazar Wheelock. It is at once broad and serious, fully abreast of the present in its spirit of intellectual freedom, and glowing still with the religious feeling which inspired it.

What was true of Dartmouth was equally true, though in a less picturesque way, of the other colleges: and one distinction which they have since had in common has been the perpetuation in some definite form of this original impulse. I do not for a moment deny the utmost seriousness of purpose, or earnestness of endeavor, to any class of educational institutions. I

arrogate nothing unreal or arbitrary in the name of religion. But there is a clear difference in the method and in the result of intellectual training, as you strike at the beginning the religious note, or the note of utility, or the note of culture. In other words, the college differs widely from the technical school, and measurably from the university, in the provision which it allows and makes for the working of the religious element. I am aware that the presence of this element may give rise from time to time to vexing questions of administration. In respect to these contingencies I have little concern. For the principle of action is clear both on its negative and positive side. Religion must not be set to do the menial tasks of the college; it must not be made an instrument of discipline; it must not become through any kind of indifference the repository of obsolete opinions or obsolete customs; it must not fall below the intellectual level of the college; it must not be used to maintain any artificial relation between the college and its constituency. Religion justifies the traditions which give it place within the college, as it enforces the spirit of reverence and humility, as it furnishes the rational element to faith, as it informs duty with the sufficient motive and lends the sufficient inspiration to ideals of service, and as it subdues and consecrates personal ambition to the interests of the common humanity. The college fulfills an office which no man, I take it, will question, as it translates the original and constant religious impulse into terms of current thought and action, making itself a center of spiritual light, of generous activities, and, above all, of a noble, intellectual, and religious charity.

Another cause contributing to the homogeneous char-

acter of the historic college is to be found in the limits of its constituency. The actual area covered by the college is more restricted than that of the university. A college is in its very nature a localized institution, bounded either by territorial limits or by the reach of its working idea. The constituency, therefore, of a given college is a constant quantity. It cannot even be transferred to a neighboring institution. If any college in the group to which we belong should go out of existence, there would be a very considerable and irretrievable loss. But, as I have said, a college may be localized by its territory, or by its working idea. This latter distinction may give it an extended, while it gives it also an assured, constituency. Williams College, for example, is without a territory, but it has its idea. My friend, President Carter, is in the habit of saying, as the college sends out a class, that he does not know where the next class will come from, or whether it will come at all. The college of Hopkins and Garfield and Armstrong can never want for a constituency. There is an invisible realm over which a college holds sway by the power of its traditions and history, the names of its nobler alumni, the ideals which it puts forth, the work which it is seen to accomplish. No man can define these outer possessions, but they are a part of the growing inheritance. Students are drawn, not simply by solicitation, but more surely by affinity. Like begets like. A constituency once established, wherever it may be, reproduces itself in steadfast loyalty, and reacts upon the college to preserve its essential character.

And it is because of this power of a college to protect its life, and to extend its influence by the force of its working idea, that I do not share the fears entertained

by some as to the future of our New England colleges under the changes in the home population. The colleges themselves have very much to say, if they will, as to what the real nature of the change is to be. They are not hopelessly dependent upon the old stock, if they have the insight to interpret and the patience to develop the new. History teaches the lesson, which no educated man should allow himself to ignore, that in the order of Providence it is the privilege of great institutions, like the church and the school, to replenish and invigorate their life by the constant introduction of new and undeveloped material. Not the chosen races alone, but the gentile, the alien, the barbarian, have their place in the higher social economy; not immediately as such, but as they become mentally naturalized. So men come and go, and populations change, but institutions abide, and preserve their character, if they use their privilege.

But without doubt the chief cause of the homogeneous character of the colleges lies in the simplicity of their function, namely, to teach. I am about to borrow the distinction which John Henry Newman* has made at this point, though with a large qualification. He draws, as you recall, the careful distinction between the diffusion or extension of knowledge, and its advancement. The advancement of knowledge he assigns to institutions like the Royal Academies of Italy and France, or the British Association; the diffusion or extension of knowledge, to the universities. In the comparative absence of such societies as exist abroad for the advancement of learning, we have assigned that task largely to the universities, and the teaching function more distinctively to the colleges. Or, to be more exact, we

* Preface to The Idea of a University Defined and Illustrated.

relegate to the secondary school the early disciplinary work, the formation of habits of study,—the actual making of the mind; we carry over something of this disciplinary work to the college, and assign to it the further task of expanding, liberalizing, and informing,—the teaching function: we carry over much of this function to the university, and commit to it the special business of research, investigation, discovery,—the absolute advancement of learning. Now, while some such division of intellectual labor actually exists, and applies as indicated to the college, it must be accepted with this broad qualification. No man is fully prepared to teach, in the sense of communicating knowledge, who is not himself at work at the sources. Professors are not mere intermediaries. Contrary to the assertion of Cardinal Newman, elsewhere expressed, that to discover and to teach are separate functions seldom united in the same person, I believe that discovery stimulates teaching, and that teaching necessitates discovery. The teaching ideal is undergoing a very radical change. The ideal of yesterday was the man of many and easy accomplishments. The ideal of today is the man of single-minded, thorough, and if possible, original knowledge. Doubtless we may go to our own extreme, but we cannot return to the former pattern.

There has been preserved on our files the original "Agreement" between the first president Wheelock, acting for the trustees, and Mr. John Smith, one of the early tutors, who was promoted to the professorship of languages in the college. The agreement begins as follows: "Mr. Smith agrees to settle as Professor of English, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, etc., in Dartmouth College, to teach which, and as many of these and other

such languages as he shall understand, or as the Trustees shall judge necessary and practicable for one man, and also to read lectures on these as often as the President and tutors with himself shall judge profitable for the Seminary." This is not precisely the model of the later agreements. Within the limited time which I have been able to devote to the interests of the college since my election to the presidency, it has been my special aim to promote the twofold object of extending the departments and dividing the labor; and the policy thus indicated will be pushed to the utmost limit which the funds of the college will permit. As I conceive the situation, the greatest incentive to good teaching is time to study. Apart from the immaturity of far too large a proportion in the teaching force in some of our colleges, nothing is so much to be deplored as the wasteful overworking of the maturer minds in a faculty. And this I say, not now in the interest of university work, but in the interest of college work. Teaching is that divine art which takes its authority and its inspiration from the certainty and the abundance of the thing known. The glorious gift of communication, even when most personal, is always proportionate to the conscious reserves of knowledge. The personality of a teacher, what is it? Not the man himself, but the man living at the heart and in the secret of nature, of history, of literature, of truth. And what is teaching, except making, or letting, nature itself speak to the asking mind—and no less, history, and literature, and truth? Here is the relation of master and scholar, paraphrased in the matchless words of the older Scriptures, "him that awaketh and him that answereth." And this is the distinctive function of the college, research, investigation, discovery, with time and

facilities for their accomplishment, but all tributary to the one supreme end of teaching.

If I may now assume that I have shown that the distinction of the college lies in its homogeneity, and that I have rightly interpreted the causes which are at work to preserve that distinction, we are ready to take up the next part of our question and ask, What is the capacity of the college to meet the widening demands of the new education? Is there anything in the subject-matter, or method, or general discipline, introduced by the new education, which excludes the historic college from a share in it, or remands it to an inferior place? The answer to this question changes somewhat our point of view.

Thus far we have been concerned more with the contrast between the college and the university. We shall now be concerned more with the contrast between the college and the school of technology. Yet for the moment we remain in the former field. By long tradition there are certain subjects requiring continued and specialized treatment which have been put quite without and beyond the college curriculum. These subjects have been chiefly connected with the great professions. It is now to be noted that there is a tendency to throw back a considerable amount of elementary work from the professional schools into the colleges. Allowance is made both in time and in the larger choice of studies, in the schools of medicine and of theology, and in some cases of law, for those who have taken elementary courses in the colleges. A college student may, if the college so provides, elect his way, up to a certain point, into a professional school. But for the most part the subject-matter of the professional schools must be altogether different from that of the college.

Exception must also be made in reference to those subjects which are still in too tentative a form to offer proper material for instruction. Subjects are today under investigation in the universities which are as yet unorganized and unformulated, but which, when organized and formulated, will take their place in the college curriculum. Examples of subjects which have just passed this stage, and are now beginning to find their way into the colleges, are to be found in several of the branches of natural and social science. We have here a pertinent illustration of the work of the university as related to that of the college. It is one function of the university to develop and organize new subject-matter for the college curriculum.

But the chief question at this point, as I have intimated, is in regard to the relation of the college to the new subjects, chiefly in the natural and physical sciences, for which special provision is now being made through the schools of technology. What ought to be the attitude of the college toward the subjects of the new learning, and toward the method of the new training? My answer is twofold, and equally positive in both parts. The college needs the new education in subject-matter and in method, and the new education needs the discipline of the college.

In saying that the college needs the newer subjects, and the methods which they bring with them, I am speaking in behalf of what we term a liberal education. If by that term we mean the education which enlarges and disciplines the mind irrespective of the after business or profession, then we cannot ignore or omit the training which attends the exact study of nature. The broader and finer qualities which belong to the habit of

careful observation, the patient search for the immediate and sufficient cause of phenomena, the imagination which creates working hypotheses along which the mind theorizes its way into the realm of fact,—these certainly are the qualities of an educated mind. We may not be able to subscribe entirely to the statement, but we cannot fail to see a certain reasonableness in the claim of Virchow, that "mathematics, philosophy, and the natural sciences give the young minds so firm an intellectual preparation that they can easily make themselves at home in any department of learning."

Certainly unexpected results have already followed from the scientific training. No one would have ventured to prophesy that one result would be the art of literary expression. Yet such has been the case. With few exceptions, the greater scientists among us are taking their place in literature. They are recovering the original qualities of style,—simplicity, clearness, vividness. Some of them have caught with remarkably close ear the accents of the English tongue. The literary development of the scientists has been as unexpected as the absence of the philosophical temper.

Or, if by a liberal education we mean the introduction to the broader ranges of thought, we cannot leave out the study of nature, or of man as a part of nature. Notwithstanding some of the materializing effects of this study, it has its own office in the humanizing and even spiritualizing of the human intellect. "I have never been able," President Eliot has said in these reverent words, "to find any better answer to the question, What is the chief end of studying nature? than the answer which the Westminster Catechism gives to the question, What is the chief end of man?—namely, to glorify God

and to enjoy Him forever." Bred as I was in the old learning, and loyal to it as I am in all my feeling, my professional observation has taught me the value of that type of mind which is formed by the study of the natural sciences. I have learned to welcome the methods of thinking, the point of view, and a certain reality in the apprehension of truth, although more restricted in its range, which I have found to characterize the students of theology, who have had the scientific habit. And if I were to repeat my professional training, while keeping as before in the old courses, I should not omit to gain the clear and careful knowledge of some one of the sciences as a part of the better discipline which is now possible to the Christian ministry.

Of course the very practical problem arises, Where is the room for the old and the new? The sufficient and only answer to this problem is the elective system. Under a complete and continuous prescribed course the college must shut out the new, or give a smattering of the old and new. The elective system, if properly regulated and consistently applied, insures thoroughness within a reasonable variety of study. But the elective system is not a mere expedient. It holds a principle. One part of the college discipline is the development of the power of intelligent choice. The only question is in regard to the proper time at which the choice is to be made. And here, I think, the answer is not to be found in the nature of the studies, provided the order and succession is rightly guarded, but in the student himself, the average student. Experience may modify my present view, but I am not now prepared to advise the opening of the courses at entrance upon college. The necessary condition of an intelligent choice, as it seems to me,

is a certain familiarity with college methods and opportunities, as compared with those of the previous schools. Otherwise the student may fall back too much upon his advisers, the habit of advising developing in turn into a veritable system of paternalism, and thus defeating the whole disciplinary end of an election.

Thus far the need on the part of the college of the new education. I am equally confident that the new education in its more advanced form needs the discipline of the college. Mere specialization can offer no equivalent to the advantage of a liberal education followed by specialized study and work. Science itself must inevitably suffer from such a course in the long result, in the reputation of scientists, in the validity of their conclusions, at least to minds otherwise trained, and in the actual scientific product. And as respects those who enter the various scientific professions, I cannot see how they can take rank with men in the other professions, who first liberalize and then specialize, except by a like course. This is not the opinion simply of an advocate of a college training. The senior professor of our own Thayer School of Civil Engineering has said in a report: "Those who desire to study civil engineering are strongly urged to take a full collegiate course, either on a classical or scientific basis. In addition to the knowledge of the special preparatory subjects above named, the student will thus obtain a broad and liberal training, which in civil engineering, as in other professions, constitutes a preparation of the highest value." The "Engineering News" of May 26, 1892, commenting editorially on these words, characterizes them as "golden words, which we could wish that every engineering school would adopt and make permanent;"

and then adds, "The graduate who knows nothing but engineering, and has no knowledge of letters and general culture to aid him, has an up-hill road before him."

The technical schools, which offer low terms of admission, and which afford no wide provision for general culture, may be admirable schools of apprenticeship, but they are not strictly scientific schools. And in so far as the tendency in some of the higher schools of technology is toward greater specialization, the college must offer its own scientific courses as a corrective. These courses are altogether theoretical. The work of the laboratory is not that of the workshop; neither does it take its place. The claim of the college is that the theoretical knowledge of the sciences, properly related to other kinds of theoretical knowledge, should precede the specialized application of the sciences. It is not assumed that this theoretical knowledge prepares one for his business or profession. There is no reason why a college graduate should not take a practical graduate course in a technical school. He may do that, or serve his apprenticeship in connection with one of the great industries. It is granted that one or the other is necessary. The college does not assume to make immediate connection with engineering or manufacturing, any more than with the practice of law or medicine.

The comparison of the college with the technical school brings out the fact that, while the capacity of the college seems to be enlarging so that it covers an increasing territory, its function remains single and undisturbed. It is always and everywhere the function of the college to give a liberal education, beyond which and out of which the process of specialization may go on in any direction and to any extent. The college must con-

tinually adjust itself to make proper connection with every kind of specialized work, not to do it. This very simple but very great function of a college is at present confused,—I think needlessly confused,—by the variety of the degrees which it confers. I will not now pause to argue the matter, but I will express the conviction that the time will come when the legitimate work of the college will be represented by one degree: by which statement I mean, on the one hand, that the college will gradually come to do a work through every possible combination of courses open to a student, which will entitle him, as he takes it, to be known as a liberally educated man without any differentiation from his fellows; and, on the other hand, that opinions will gradually become so equalized in respect to the relative value of the different studies which find place in the college curriculum that it will be acknowledged that the college has but one standard, and represents through its degree a single and complete unit in education.

It remains to consider that part of our question which I have said was largely local, and yet which I trust may be of interest to those of other colleges who are present, namely, What relation may a college sustain to associated institutions without assuming the functions of a university? In answering this question I pass from whatever is theoretical to that which is historical. The policy of Dartmouth College in this matter is written in its history. The history of Dartmouth College may teach any like institution, which cares to learn the lesson, how not to become a university. If any college has been tempted in this regard, Dartmouth more. I will try to tell briefly the story of its refusals, and also to show what it has done, and what it proposes to do, in place of becoming a university.

Naturally I might be expected to dwell upon the enforced attempt to change the college into a state university; but as this attempt represented the design of the state to gain possession of the college, rather than to change its essential nature, I pass it by. It is the somewhat remarkable succession of opportunities to develop from within into an aggregation of professional and technical schools to which I desire to call attention.*

One of the earliest benefactions to the college was an endowment towards a chair of divinity bearing the honored name of John Phillips. The chair has been variously utilized in connection with the religious instruction of the college; but when it is remembered that the pious intention of Samuel Phillips, the nephew of the donor, expressed in establishing Phillips Academy at Andover, was made the occasion of developing a theological seminary in connection with that institution, it is not unwarranted to suppose that Dartmouth College might easily have had a like development.

In 1798 the trustees of the college voted that "a professor be appointed whose duty it shall be to deliver public lectures upon anatomy, surgery, chemistry, materia medica, and the theory and practice of physic,

* The term "university" is used in what follows in the traditional American sense,—an aggregation of professional schools usually centering around a college. The form in which the university idea is now developing most rapidly is best represented by the degree of Ph. D. In the use of method it is difficult to distinguish the university from the college, except in degree. The principle of electives, supplemented by full facilities for individual research and investigation, gives approximately the results gained by the methods in use at the universities. The extent to which this method may be carried in graduate work in a college like Dartmouth, will depend entirely upon the endowments which may be secured to this end. The actual value of graduate work to a student depends upon the time which can be spared on the part of the professors from their undergraduate work, or upon the number of men who can be introduced into a faculty with this end in view, with an equipment in libraries and labratories to correspond.

and that said professor be entitled to receive payment for instruction in those branches, as hereinafter mentioned, as compensation for his services in that office." In accordance with this vote such a professor was appointed, lectures were given, a code of medical statutes was adopted, and degrees were conferred, by Dartmouth College, first of Bachelor of Medicine, and afterwards of Doctor of Medicine. This action seems like the initiative toward a university, and it might fairly be so construed, were it not that the subsequent history of the Medical School has hardly justified such a relation to the college. Practically the administration of its affairs is in the hands of its faculty. The state has a property interest in the school, through an appropriation for the Medical Building, so that it has been known as the New Hampshire Medical College as well as the Dartmouth Medical School. And recently its interests have become specially identified with the Mary Hitchcock Hospital, a distinct corporation. As, however, the question of the status of the Medical School is now before the legal committee of the board of trustees, I will not anticipate their report. I am, however, prepared to say that, whatever may prove to be the exact legal relation between the two bodies, the college proposes to give to the Medical School the fullest and most direct material aid in its power. The evidence of this is to be found in the proposed enlargement of the department of chemistry through an increase in its equipment, and in the establishment of the department of zoology. With these increased advantages on the side of the college, and with the very unusual facilities offered by the Mary Hitchcock Hospital, it is believed that the Medical School will not only maintain its exceedingly

honorable history up to the present time, but that it will also demonstrate the practicability of a medical school in the country.

Chief Justice Joel Parker, of the class of 1811, for a long time Royall Professor of Law in Harvard University, contemplated the founding of a Law School in connection with the college. To this end he bequeathed to the college his law library, a considerable landed estate in Virginia, and property to the value of $60,000. When the bequest came into the possession of the trustees, it seemed inadvisable to them to establish a law department. Happily the terms of the will, as interpreted by them and by the executors, allowed the use of the money for purposes germane to the intent of the donor, within the college curriculum. It was therefore decided to apply the bequest to the endowment of a Parker Professorship of Law and Political Science, and to kindred uses.

In 1851 the faculty received from the will of Mr. Abiel Chandler, of Boston, the sum of $50,000 for "the establishment of a permanent department, or school of instruction, in the college in the practical and useful arts of life." Two special provisions accompanied the bequest: first, the establishment of a perpetual board of visitors, who should "have full power to determine, interpret, and explain" the intentions of the bequest; and, second, a clause to the effect that "no other or higher preparatory studies are to be required, in order to enter said department or school, than are pursued in the common schools of New England." At the first meeting of the trustees following the gift, they proceeded to "constitute and organize a school of instruction in connection with the college and as a department

thereof, the said school to be denominated The Chandler School of Science and the Arts." At first the school covered only a two years' course. Gradually the curriculum was extended, the faculty was enlarged, and other endowments were received. Meanwhile students were constantly presenting themselves prepared beyond the requirements for entrance. It was also found that a very considerable amount of work was duplicated between the professors of the college and those of the Chandler School. After conferences between a committee of the trustees and the two faculties, the trustees decided to ask the visitors, as interpreters of the will of Mr. Chandler, the following questions: first, whether under the will the standard of the school can be so high that its discipline and scholarship shall be equal to that of the college, and, as a condition to this, whether the terms of admission can be made to require such attainments in the modern languages and scientific studies that students entering shall already have a good degree of mental discipline and attainments; and, second, whether the condition of the will establishing a "department or school in the college" is met by the maintenance of a department and course of instruction in the college, without such a separate classification of students as would require them to be made responsible to a purely separate faculty. The visitors, in a careful and elaborate opinion, answered these questions in the affirmative, interpreting the clause in the will referring to the common schools of New England to include the high schools which prepare for college. Acting upon this decision, a plan was adopted which will go into effect the ensuing year, whereby the Chandler School is more formally incorporated into the college as the Chandler

scientific course, carrying with it, as before, the degree of B. S. Through this incorporation the endowment from the Chandler fund, now amounting to about $175,000, is brought into more economical adjustment to the funds of the college, though the fund will be kept distinct, four professors are added to the college faculty, and a considerable body of students to the college enrollment.

The Thayer School of Civil Engineering and of Architecture was established in 1871, during the lifetime of the founder, by General Sylvanus Thayer, of the United States Corps of Engineers, a graduate of the college in 1807. The various sums given for the school aggregate $70,000. The college holds these funds in trust. It has no absolute control of the school. Its management is vested in a board of five overseers, which is self-perpetuating, except that the president of the college is the president of the board. The school covers a course of two years, and represents entirely the higher grades of study in civil engineering. Connection has, however, been made with the scientific course of the college, so that it is possible for a student by careful election of his studies to take the college and engineering courses in five years, the senior year in the college counting under certain rigid conditions as the first year in the Thayer School.

In 1866 the legislature of New Hampshire passed an act establishing the "New Hampshire College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts," on the basis of the congressional land grant, and located the college at Hanover, and in connection with Dartmouth College. This connection was in the form of a specific contract, terminable on one year's notice by either party at the

expiration of fourteen years. In 1891 the State was induced by the terms of the large bequest of Mr. Benjamin Thompson, a native of Durham, to remove the Agricultural College to that place. The buildings which it occupied while located at Hanover have now become the property of Dartmouth College, partly by purchase, and partly by the virtual remission by the state of its interest of $15,000 in Culver Hall.

From this brief survey of the actual course which the college has pursued in its relation to associated institutions, or to plans for such institutions, you can determine at once its policy. That policy has not always been definitely expressed, perhaps not always clearly conceived, but it has been historically consistent. The college has always been willing to accept in trust such funds as have been confided to it for purposes related to its own, though not precisely the same, and to see to it that the intent of the donor was carried out in strict fidelity. It has been ready to incorporate into its own life such interests as have been attached to it, whenever such incorporation has seemed to be of mutual advantage. And it has sought to strengthen and support any other foundation, which could be built up to the better advantage of each, in comparative independence. Dartmouth College has not been ambitious to become a university in name or in fact. The college has been, and is, and will be, ambitious to stand, with its increasing years and in its enlarging strength, as the type of the historic college.

I have now said what I intended to say in respect to the present place of the historic college in our educational system as it is becoming more clearly defined. Each college has its own questions of readjustment and

development. Within the past year the phrase has become current amongst us,—the new Dartmouth. I interpret the phrase to express our decision and our enthusiasm in the work to which we are called in the readjustment and development of Dartmouth. And yet let me say at once, we cannot make too great an acknowledgment of that which has been done before. The chiefest factor in the new will be the old. Each administration of the college, from the first to the last, has made its own contribution, more often than otherwise in self-denial and sacrifice. We build upon strong and wide foundations. More than this, the very resources with which we at least begin to build represent the earnings of a past generation, not of our own,—the accumulations which have been waiting in trust for our use.

Still, whatever may be the relative place of the past and the present in the existing situation, there are aspects of it which are new, new not only in opportunity but also in advantage and responsibility. For the first time in its history the college is practically under the government of its alumni. The government of the college is vested in a single board of twelve members, and, excluding the president of the college and the governor of the state, one half of the remaining number are directly nominated and virtually elected by the alumni, —a larger proportion than in any college in New England and probably in the country. The advantage of this responsible representation will depend upon the character, the educational and business qualifications, and the personal time available for the college, on the part of the alumni trustees, and also and equally upon the spirit of unity, of co-operation, and of active loyalty

which it assumes in the alumni at large. I draw no unwarranted inferences from this action in respect either to men or money. I make no unreasonable demands upon the alumni. Not every alumnus who has a son to be educated can send him here. Not every alumnus who has money to give can put it here. I recognize other obligations. And yet in these and innumerable ways an interested alumni will make their interest tributary to the college. In the breadth of the opportunity it is scarcely possible to go amiss. And something can be done in collective ways. The many can unite for common ends. The younger alumni have begun with athletics. They have already fitted up one of the best athletic fields in the country at a cost of $15,000, and are now preparing to renovate and equip the gymnasium at a like cost. The beginning thus made has been appropriate and helpful. Athletics have a rightful place in the modern college. They represent a discipline, a culture, an enthusiasm, which are a part of the college life. Let a wise and generous provision be made for this interest, not as a concession, not as a means to some ulterior end, but in recognition of one of the varied elements which go to make up the training and the culture of the college-bred man.

It is also new in the history of the college that the opportunity has come for a symmetrical enlargement. The progress of the college has been continuous and steady. Each period has added its own proportions to the inheritance. But the additions have been made one by one, and at comparatively long intervals. The opportunity is now at hand to enlarge with more symmetry because with more relative completeness. This is chiefly owing to the Wentworth bequest, held in trust

until it should reach $500,000, but which now becomes available, under the recent appraisal, in two years. Meanwhile the State has very generously anticipated in part the first income which we may expect to derive from the estate, by an appropriation of $7,500 for each of the next two years. The annual income from the Wentworth fund will be at first about $10,000, which may gradually increase to a final annual income of from $15,000 to $20,000. By this addition to our income we are enabled to establish certain chairs of instruction which will avail to enlarge and complete, for the present, some of the departments of the college; though this addition cannot at the best accomplish all that the college now needs in the way of instruction, and of course its wants will steadily increase. It is also to be understood that a part of the income from this fund is to go to the increase of the salaries of the professors.

The Butterfield bequest opens the way to a proper grouping of the departments. It provides a home and suitable support for the department it creates. It is my desire to see each of the general departments in a separate building; or, when this is not altogether necessary, that allied departments shall be brought together in the same building, and provided with proper facilities for their work. Suitable reference libraries, in connection with recitation and lecture rooms, are as necessary to successful teaching in the literary departments, as are laboratories in the scientific department.

The material improvement of the college presents both an opportunity and a problem. The beginning of the problem has been most happily solved by the harmonious co-operation of the precinct with the college in introducing a sufficient supply of water into the town

at an estimated cost of $60,000. The town is already supplied in part with pure drinking water, and with a sewerage system.

But the question of the location of new buildings in other than an isolated and haphazard arrangement offers great perplexities. The village of Hanover is so compact that there is no vacant room for a proper grouping of buildings for convenience or architectural effect. The building committee of the trustees is at work upon this problem under the best professional advice, and is agreed that no building shall be erected until a plan has been prepared and adopted which will secure a convenient and harmonious arrangement of such buildings as the college is likely to need and obtain within a somewhat extended future.

That, however, which contributes most largely to the present advantage of the college is the very thing which it shares with all the colleges, namely, the general advance in educational methods and appliances. I return for the moment to the idea with which I began, that this is an educational epoch. The educational spirit is abroad, informing and stimulating the intelligence of the country; the facilities for good teaching are becoming more abundant and more available; and, what is of far greater value, the material for good teachers is rapidly increasing through the attendance of students for graduate work upon our own or foreign universities. So wide and abundant is the provision for higher education that no one college can gain anything at the expense of any other. The colleges are moving abreast and in inspiring fellowship.

Gentlemen of the college, of the past and of the present; as we in our own persons increase in years,

though it may be for long time with augmenting strength, we know the inevitable limit. The life of an individual cannot attain to the dignity of history. The approach to that dignity marks the lessening of one's future. It is not so with the life of a great institution. The historic college moves on from generation to generation into its illimitable future. Each generation waits to pour into its life the warmth and richness of its own, and departing, bequeaths to it the earnings of its strength. The college lives because nourished and fed from the unfailing sources of personal devotion.

I congratulate you, gentlemen, as the living embodiment of the college, upon the present signs of personal devotion to Dartmouth. It is evidently as true now as when the words were uttered,—"There are those who love it." May there be now and always the like wisdom in those who are called to serve it. If that can be assured,—and may God grant it,—the place of Dartmouth College in American letters and learning is as secure for the future as in the past.

XVII

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE MODERN COLLEGE

Address before the Wonolancet Club, Concord, N. H., December 7, 1905

The colleges of this country date from the period of that small group which preceded the Revolution—Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Princeton, Pennsylvania, Columbia, Brown, Rutgers, and Dartmouth, each one coming into existence under the hard conditions of colonial life—on to the period of colleges and universities born in a day at the close of the last century, and endowed with its wealth, of which Chicago and Leland Stanford are conspicuous examples. But whatever the date of their founding, all existing colleges are modern in a common sense. The modernizing process has brought the whole college fraternity into substantial unity of purpose and method, and especially of administration—the point of emphasis in this address. The process does not reach back of the Civil War, and in most cases it has shown its results most clearly within the past decade.

I will state briefly the conditions which have necessitated the present attention to administrative work within our colleges.

In his reminiscences of life at Harvard, Senator Hoar has recently said—"I do not think that Harvard College had changed very much when I entered it on my sixteenth birthday in the year of 1842, in manners,

character of students or teachers, or the course of instruction, for nearly a century. There were some elementary lectures and recitations in astronomy and mechanics, accompanied by a few experiments. But the students had no opportunity for laboratory work. There was a delightful course of instruction from Dr. Walker in ethics and metaphysics. There was also some instruction in modern languages—German, French, and Italian—all of very slight value. But the substance of the instruction consisted in learning to translate rather easy Latin and Greek, writing Latin, and courses in Algebra and Geometry, not very far advanced." It was not, we must remind ourselves, till the first of October, 1859, that Mr. Darwin sent out his abstract, as he termed it, on the Origin of Species, accompanying the volume with the modest prophecy that "when the views entertained in this volume, or analogous views are generally admitted we can dimly foresee that there will be a considerable revolution in natural history."

From the philosophical point of view account had to be made at once of the revolutionary character of modern thought, but from the administrative point of view account had to be taken of the marvelous expansion which it effected. Within our generation the subject matter of the college discipline has trebled in volume, through the incoming of the sciences with the scientific method, and through the incoming of the new "humanities" based upon history with its application to economics, politics, and sociology, and upon the modern languages and literatures. This trebled volume of knowledge has been made workable through the principle of electives, a matter very largely of administra-

tion. As constant study is called for today in the construction of a curriculum in our schools and colleges as in any one department of investigation or instruction.

A second condition grew out of the equally large increase in the numbers entering upon the higher education. The second condition is related to the first, but not altogether as a result from it. A part of the increase is due to social causes. If you go back to the catalogue of a generation ago of any one of the earlier group of colleges with which you may be familiar, Harvard, Yale, Brown, Dartmouth, Princeton, you will see that the number of undergraduates has at least trebled. The contrast is much more striking, if you turn to the greater state universities. I will give the statistics of four for illustration, shortening the period of comparison to twenty years.

	1885.	1904.
University of Michigan	524	2900
University of Wisconsin	313	2810
University of Minnesota	54	3700
University of California	197	3057

In 1875 the total number of students, men and women, in all the colleges and universities of the country was 26,353. The number in attendance last year was 85,581. It should be said in passing that the chief instrumentality in bringing about the increase has been the high school, which has made the higher education accessible to the masses.

A third condition, consequent upon those already mentioned, has been the development of the college plant. The physical setting of the old time college was very simple, sometimes impressive, often picturesque,

but always simple. Frequently a decade or more would pass without a new building. The nature of the work did not call for physical enlargement. Growth was altogether intensive. Whatever may be the sentiment of any one toward the older college, none of us can fail to see that if it was to take an influential place in the modern world its growth must be extensive. Otherwise the college would remain, as some one has said, "a persistent anachronism." The modern world is organized in a large way. It demands what President Lord used to call "scope." It does its business by first securing the requisite facilities. Results must be gained by the best methods, else there will be loss. Change of method is in large part the explanation of the modern world. We live differently, we work differently, we think differently. As Mr. Balfour has recently reminded us, we are obliged to do our thinking "in a new mental framework."

The modern college plant is an outcome of the change of method in education, and of certain changes in social life. The laboratory is not another college building, but a new and typical building. A college dormitory is no longer so many rooms. A house without steam, or electricity, or a bathroom, is a house, but you do not build houses that way to put upon the market. A college plant may consist of more than educational facilities. It may be necessary to create certain public utilities which shall insure proper sanitation or general conveniences. The college of the country not infrequently owns in part or wholly its water supply, its heating and electric plant, its system of sewerage; and very likely it may be obliged to own and maintain an inn for the special benefit of the alumni and guests of the college.

I shall refer later to the financial bearings of the college plant. For the moment, I speak of it as a very great factor in college administration.

A fourth condition affecting the administration of the modern college was the incorporation of the alumni, through their authorized representatives, into the governing board. Alumni representation is now in some form characteristic of every college which is self governed, and it is beginning to find a place in institutions governed by the state. Representation on the governing board changes the relation of the alumni from that of sentiment to that of responsibility. It virtually unifies the whole body academic. In the old walled cities there are places known as so and so "within," or "without." Every college today has its "within" and its "without," but they are one. And in their oneness very much of the new power of a college lies.

These are some of the conditions which have given a prominence to administration in academic life far beyond any former recognition of its necessity or value. I am asked to show what the administration of the modern college means, in what it consists, toward what ends it is set. In answering this cumulative question I shall have very little to say about college administrators, not out of modesty, but because they cannot be described as a class. No one knows where the next president of any college is to come from. He may or may not be a member of the board of trustees or of the faculty. He may or may not be a graduate of the college. He may be a minister or a layman, and if a layman a man from some of the professions, or a man of affairs. The assumption is that he will be familiar with some phase of the higher education, perhaps a specialist in some department, but

this presumption does not have the force of a tradition. There is nothing to say about college presidents in the abstract. No two men are set to the same task. One of the most efficient of the younger college presidents in the West went to Mark Hopkins for advice on his election to office. "Not a word of advice will I give you," said the wise old counsellor; "you will do better to find out things for yourself."

But the administration of a college is something very definite and tangible, very real in its objects, and reasonably well defined in its methods. In answering then the first question which naturally arises in your minds—what is the chief concern in college administration, I say, without a moment's hesitation, the student. Colleges and universities are human institutions. Colleges are for men, not men for colleges. It is only by keeping this fact constantly and sensitively in mind that we can keep our institutions of learning from institutionalism. This concern of college administration for some fit outcome in the individual student expresses itself in various forms. Speaking broadly, very broadly, the German university has in mind the scholar, the English college the gentleman, the American college and university the citizen. This generalization if pressed too far becomes untrue. But it is sufficiently evident to indicate the task before our colleges and universities, namely, to educate a democracy. It would be a far more congenial task to most of those upon our faculties to educate the scholar after the German fashion, it would be a far easier task to determine the social standards of a college through those rigid inquiries which guard the entrance to academic life at Oxford and Cambridge, but it would not be our task. Our task is

difficult because of its breadth. We are set to the task of taking the average product of a democracy, of qualifying as much of it as possible for independent scholarship, of moulding as much of it as possible into the habit of the gentleman, and of fitting it all by all the means and incentives at command for the high estate of influential citizenship. Whatever is done towards these, or any other ends, must be done in consistency with personal freedom. Personal freedom is the keynote of college life. Paternalism will destroy the moral power of any college. Where it saves one it weakens and demoralizes the whole body. Personality is always a timely and inspiring force. But this must somehow be incorporated into the spirit of the college itself. It must never be a separate thing. A college is a world of incentives and tests, with corresponding temptations. Not all can live to best advantage in this world. The process of elimination is constantly going on. It is a part of the business of administration to supply incentives, mental and moral, to create a healthful and bracing atmosphere, but equally to maintain standards. Nothing is so costly in college administration as any lowering of its standards in the assumed interest of those who cannot or will not accept them.

There is one feature of college administration in its relation to student life which is apt to be overlooked, namely the necessity for taking account of leisure as well as of work. It is the recognition of this fact which has let into, or brought into the modern college organized athletics. Athletics has proved to be the best employment of the leisure of a college which has been devised. It has displaced a very considerable amount of mere idleness and of gross dissipation. I lay more

stress upon its mental than upon its physical effect. Physically, organized athletics affects the few, mentally, it affects the whole body of students. I am well aware of the charge of mental preoccupation. The charge is true, but on the whole I would rather take my chance, were I an instructor, with the student who comes into the class room from talk about the game, than with one whose leisure would be pretty sure to be taken with more frivolous or more demoralizing talk. I heard it said, a day or two since, that athletics had "cleansed and dulled the mind of a college." I think that athletics has done far more "to cleanse" than "to dull." The cleansing of mind is evident. If the mind of a college is dull in its appetite for knowledge, by comparison with the reported zest of earlier times, I think that there are nearer and more evident reasons for this dullness than are to be found in athletics. In this general view, I am sustained by the practically unanimous opinion of the older members of the faculty at Dartmouth, who are able to compare earlier with later periods of college activities.

Having had this much to say about athletics in general, I cannot fairly pass over the immediate question in college athletics now before the public mind. I have always taken a certain pride in foot-ball as the most distinctly academic among our national games. I have noted the fact that it has not been taken up as a sport by the rougher elements in our cities. The reason for this surprising fact seems to lie in the game itself. It is so strenuous, it requires so clean a physical condition, it demands so much mental tension, and so much willingness to sacrifice individual choice to the good of the team, that it would be almost impossible to find men

16

able and willing to play the game, outside our colleges. I should not want to see a game with these strong and really noble features ruled out in favor of weaker and less invigorating games. I believe that the same wise, concerted, and determined action, through which most of the evils incident to the game have been eliminated, will ensure the elimination of any which may remain. The game has been made clean; it can be made safe. It ought not to be allowed to lose academic standing.

Next to that concern in the administration of a college which centers in the student I should say that the most direct and constant interest was to facilitate the work of instruction. It is the direct function of the administration of a college to make it possible for every member of a faculty to do his work to the best advantage within the limitations of mutual service, and within the restrictions of the ordinary financial stringency.

The first step in facilitating the work of instruction is taken by relieving the faculty as a whole of the details of executive work. The result is effected in two ways, by putting the routine of the internal life of the college in charge of one person, and by delegating as much of remaining details as possible to standing committees. The dean of a modern college controls the daily movement of its life. He sets the time of day. Personally he is concerned with the immediate relation of the college to the students, but his offices are business offices where all the routine of administration goes on. Every day's work is put on record. The standing of any student can be seen at a glance by those entitled to know. The office is a clearing house for the departments.

Committee work is irksome or enjoyable according to the taste of the individual instructor. Faculties as a

whole, and individual members, vary in their desire or reluctance to relinquish the control of details, especially those details which are intimately connected with the students. The most obstructive detail is discipline; but as college discipline is now almost entirely connected with deficiencies and failures in scholarship, it remains, of course, a matter of interest to instructors. The tendency, however, is to delegate discipline of all kinds to some fit committee. Virtually the authority of the faculty is exercised and declared through delegated power, leaving the faculty as a body comparatively free for the discussion and application of educational methods. This statement should be qualified by the fact that there has come in a very great increase of executive work in connection with the departments. Each department must be organized according to its own needs. In the growth of the college there must be a large increase in "directive power." Careful organization is the chief means of saving waste and of facilitating work.

Beyond this the work of instruction is dependent for its efficiency upon the general resources of the college, upon the special equipment of a department, and upon assistance, particularly upon the last. The constant and perplexing question of administration is how to keep the right proportion between instructors and students. There is no unit of measurement here. Everything depends upon the nature of the work and the intellectual ability of the student. There is no such thing as an average student upon whom you can base a calculation. Students are of all grades intellectually. The poorest students require the most instruction, that is, there must be smaller divisions if these are grouped. On the other hand, it may be the greatest educational

economy to give a disproportionate part of the time of the best instructor in a department to directing the study of five men.

It is not possible to have very small divisions and at the same time to give all students of every grade access to the strongest men in a faculty. In the old time colleges, where the classes rarely exceeded sixty or seventy, a professor had a whole class in a given subject, and usually the whole class together. Sixty would be considered a very large division (apart from a lecture) in the college today. The unit for division work is twenty-five, more often less than more. But the process of division and sub-division in instruction necessarily brings in the immature, if not inferior, instructor. There are not enough superior instructors in the country to go round among the colleges. Money cannot altogether remedy this deficiency. It was in part because of this deficiency in able and stimulating instructors that the lecture system was introduced in connection with the increase of students. There were other reasons for its adoption as transferred from the lecture room of Germany, but the practical reason, apart from its assumed economy, was to give all college students access to the best men in a faculty, or, at least, under the elective system, to the best men in a department. At the present time there is a markd reaction against the lecture system and an equally marked tendency to emphasize the sub-division of instruction. The attempt is being made to guarantee the work of the class room.

And where this is unnecessary, so far as the disposition or quality of the student is concerned, the attempt is being made to impart greater inspiration and direc-

tion through personal contact with exceptionally qualified men who are yet in the earlier stages of their professional service. Of course a college needs the best of each method—the impact of the great mind, the quickening of the mass, and personal contact with the instructor, the close and careful work of the laboratory or library, the discipline of exacting attention to detail. But every college is compelled to struggle toward its ideal of instruction; no college is resting in the enjoyment of it. There are, I repeat, not enough superior instructors to satisfy the demands of the higher education. If salaries were doubled there would probably be an increase, but not a sufficiency. Hence the changes which are all the while taking place in the emphasis put upon the methods of instruction. I should give the wrong impression if I said that the higher education was in a state of experimentation, but it is continual, though varying problem how to secure satisfactory results from insufficient means. This is at present the most acute problem of administration. The variety of method called for by different departments affords some relief, and account must also be made of the variety of talent in a faculty. The constant endeavor, however, of a college administrator is how to keep the right proportion between instructors and students, not as a numerical ratio, but as a matter of efficiency in teaching, and of interest in study.

In the distribution of the time of an instructor regard must be had also to his own intellectual advancement. I am not speaking now of the research work of a university nor of the technical work of a professional school. Every college professor should have time and opportunity for research, investigation, original work of some kind. And in exceptional cases special provision should

be made for research or production. Nothing is more stimulating to a faculty than work of this kind carried to some high degree of excellence by one or more of its members. While few are fitted to reach any high degree of excellence in original work all are capable of feeling the effect of it when attained by others. Wherever the capacity exists, or may be developed, it is poor economy which forbids suitable provision for it, in regard either to the time of the instructor or to equipment for his task. Perhaps the nearest approach to a fit opportunity for personal advancement on the part of all the permanent instructors in a faculty lies in the Sabbatical year now granted in all the better colleges.

A new and rapidly growing department of administration lies in the relation of a college to its constituency—the alumni, the parents and friends of students, the state, and the public at large so far as its interests extend. Every college has also its inter-collegiate relations. It is a part of a vast educational system. Of course, it is the office of whoever may be the head of a college to represent it on public occasions, to declare its policy, and to adjust its formal relations to other educational bodies. The direct connection of parents with the college is through the dean's office. But between these lies a wide reach of administrative work now covered by a new officer, namely, the secretary of the college, whose business it is to present the college in proper ways to its constituency, through correspondence, through publications, and, as occasion may offer, through personal intercourse with those who are concerned with the affairs of the college. At Dartmouth the secretary of the college is the general secretary of the secretaries of classes and of alumni organizations.

This department, as I have said, is recent, even in the colleges where it has been formed, but it illustrates the growth of purely administrative work.

I pass through this department of administration to that which is represented altogether by the governing board, namely, the financial management of a college. The universities of Germany are under the financial control of the state. The English colleges are managed much more completely from within. The American college or university is under the control of the state, or of a corporate body usually self-perpetuating, except as modified by alumni representation. I refer in what follows to the financial management of endowed colleges under the control of boards of trust. These boards vary in size. The original idea seems to have been that of influential representation. The modern idea is efficiency. It may safely be assumed that the efficiency of a board is in inverse ratio to its size.

As you may at once infer, the colleges of the country were quite unprepared financially for the new burdens which were to fall upon them through the increase in the number of students, and through the increased cost of education due to change of method and to the augmented volume of subject matter. Furthermore it was manifestly impossible to increase endowments to keep pace with the new demands, especially in view of declining rates of interest. The saving idea which came in was the development of the college plant, through which the college might increase its earning power. This development of the college plant as a means of financial aid marks the advance in the financial treatment of the modern college. Money apparently sunk in buildings and equipment re-appears in greatly enlarged

income through tuition. In the larger colleges the receipts from tuition are now equal to or greater than the income from invested funds. In many cases the earning power of an institution has increased fivefold within a generation, or even within a decade.

It is also true that as the necessities of colleges and universities became apparent, and much more as their capacity became apparent, they became the recipients of large gifts. The period just passed has been a period of endowment, as well as of increased earning power. The question naturally arises, will the wealth of the nation be permanently interested in education, or, more exactly, in existing educational institutions? The answer seems to me very doubtful. The interests of wealth are changeable, especially the interests of men of sudden and vast wealth. There are indications that the interests of wealth are either centering in great educational trusts, or passing over to other and newer objects of benefaction, perhaps in the region of the arts. In any event, I believe that the financial future of a college does not lie in some lucky access to money at large, but in its steady access to permanently interested money. Soon or late every college must fall back for its support upon those who belong to it by inheritance, or association, or indebtedness. Nothing has been more suggestive at this point or more inspiriting than the quiet but prompt response of the alumni of Harvard to a call for a teaching fund of two and a half millions. This, I say, is suggestive of the future sources of financial aid to our colleges. The permanent source of supply is interested money. It is this interest which has made the appropriation of the State of New Hampshire to Dartmouth College for the past years of so much

value to the college. The heart of the state has gone with it. It is this interest which made the gift of Edward Tuck of such value to the college. His heart was in it. It is through this avenue of possible interest that Dartmouth, or any college, has the right to approach any man of means whom it would like to identify with itself. I believe that a college has no right to ask any man for his money when it simply wants his money, but does not want him. That sort of business is not fair play. An invitation to give ought to be also an invitation to come. The roll of the benefactors of a college should be as honorable as the roll of its graduates.

As the trustees of a college turn from the sources of financial supply to the needs of the college, there are two constant and pressing needs which differ from others. There is always the demand for something of better quality or of larger amount. It is a trite but honorable saying that it is the business of a college to be poor. When it has no wants which outrun its income, it is a serious question about the inner life. But the needs to which I now refer come with a personal pressure. The first has to do with the pay of competent instructors. I suppose we shall never reach the ideal state in the support of college professors set forth in the theory on which a call is extended to a minister in the Presbyterian church. According to the book of discipline the call must read as follows: "And that you may be free from worldly cares and avocations we hereby promise and oblige to pay to you the sum of ———————— during the time of your being and continuing the regular pastor of this church." It would take a good deal of money to set most of us free from

"worldly cares and avocations." The question of salary has to do with market values and yet is distinct from them. On the one hand, the man who gives himself to the calling of a college teacher gives himself to a calling for which he has to make costly preparation, a calling which makes large social demands upon him, and a calling which stimulates his tastes, but which continually mocks him with its financial returns. On the other hand, the college which invests in him to the extent of a life investment takes the risk of deterioration in personal enthusiasm or in some other form of personal efficiency. The position has the advantage for the average man of the lack of competitive valuation. The exceptional man of market value always fares well enough anywhere. It would be a poor relief to the professor in an American college to subject him to the competitive tests of the German lecturer, or to open to him the uncertain opportunities of the English don. We pay the price of dignity, permanency, and equality in low salaries. But the demand is no less real and urgent for an advance of salary on some grades of instruction in every college. On the whole, more money is earned by the faculty of a college than is received. This holds true when all considerations of a social and spiritual sort are taken at their full valuation.

The other demand of this human kind comes from students to whom the cost of a college education is well nigh prohibitive. It is not well to make the way through college too easy. A college education is worth a great deal of struggle and sacrifice. But in our endowed colleges we ought to have means to relieve, without loss to the college, all proper appeals for aid through scholarships. Whenever a deficit occurs in our colleges it is

due in good part to the draft upon their funds in the aid of men in the honorable struggle for an education. A college is a business corporation, but it has a soul. If administered ruthlessly or unfeelingly, it violates the charter of its rights.

I have been asked to give you a descriptive view of the administration of the modern college, to show the nature of the change from the old to the new. Having attempted to meet this wish I simply refer in closing to a question which has recently been mooted—whether or not a change in the method of administering our colleges and universities, like that of turning over their management to the faculty, would be to their advantage. We can all see disadvantages in the present divided methods of administration. But I doubt if it will ever be possible to change college administration at the root. The root is in the soil in which it grew. The American college, though the latest educational variant, is not necessarily the best. Its value lies in its adaptation to its work. It will probably still do its best work under those methods of administration which have proved themselves more effective in practice than promising in theory.

XVIII

THE RIGHTS OF THE PERIOD OF EDUCATION

An Address Given at Several Gatherings of Teachers 1899

In the early summer the statue of Thomas Hughes was unveiled at Rugby in the presence of very many old Rugby schoolboys, and men of Oxford, and also of many friends of the higher education in England. The Archbishop of Canterbury presided, and the chief address was made by Mr. Goschen, First Lord of the Admiralty. This apparently personal event was not simply a tribute to the personality of the author of "Tom Brown at Oxford." Its significance lay in the fact that it was a recognition and an acknowledgement of the change which had taken place, within the generation, in the sentiment of the great schools of England. The change was hardly less than a revolution, and it was effected not from without, but from within, not from above even, but from within. It was brought about by schoolboys and undergraduates themselves under the inspiration, if not under the leadership of Thomas Hughes. Mr. Goschen struck the keynote of the occasion to which I have referred, when he said that "Thomas Hughes was the most distinguished schoolboy that ever lived." That was a fine thing to say of a man who had been known as lawyer, author, member of Parliament, and founder of a colony. But he might have said still more. For Thomas Hughes gave high and

permanent distinction to all that life of which he was the personal representative. He created a new world for the play and movement of it, introducing new habits and customs, new ambitions and new ideals of manhood.

What Thomas Arnold was among masters, that Thomas Hughes was among schoolboys, or undergraduates. Without Thomas Hughes the work of Thomas Arnold would have passed away with his generation. It would have been a personal and local work. Thomas Hughes caught the ideal of the great master, and translated it into fact, as schoolboy at Rugby, as undergraduate at Oxford, and finally into the young life of England wherever it was in training. That ideal was so single that it could be apprehended by any one, and so true and fine that once understood it became contagious. It was simply the assertion of the natural, the genuine, the manly, as against the conventional, the artificial, the unnatural if not the unmanly. Dr. Arnold, as I have said, was the prophet of the new order in the educational life of England, but the new order was actually brought in through the agency of the young men whom he inspired. The change was really effected through the awakening of self-respect, and the sense of social obligation, and loyalty to the best instincts of their nature on the part of those who were within the process of education. It was a change from feudalism in education to democracy.

The effects of the change were manifest. It broke up the old conventional relations between master and scholar. It substituted character for mere authority, and attainment for dogmatism, on the part of the master: and honor and loyalty, in place of fear or evasion on the part of the scholar. It established the principle

of fair play in every school and college: it put down the mean and cowardly: it taught fellows not to lie, or cheat, but to be honest and plucky at any cost: it made sports genuine and manly: it built up athletics in place of degrading pastimes: it abolished flogging, and fagging: it set up as the true type of the schoolboy (or undergraduate) the clean, wholesome, well trained, fearless, honorable fellow, who won fairly, if he won at all, in study or play.

And this ideal of school life was made possible, as I have been reminding you, through the awakened consciousness of the schoolboy himself. As soon as he saw that the world in which he was living was really his world, having its own rights, and pleasures, and opportunities, and responsibilities, he became interested in it, and interested in trying to make it the right kind of a world.

I am grateful for the timeliness of this reminiscence of Thomas Hughes as giving me the natural approach to a somewhat inaccessible subject, about which I have for some time wished to write or speak—namely—The Rights of the Period of Education—the acknowledgment of which represents the next advance in popular education. I am convinced that whatever importance we attach to popular education, we attach far too little importance to the period of education, and to the moral results which take place within that period. A good many of our educational difficulties grow out of the fact that we allow ourselves to think of the educational period as a fragment, or at best as merely preparatory to something which is to follow. The actual educational period is a fragment with the majority, but so is life itself a fragment with the majority. And yet we do not

allow ourselves to think of life, the life of any individual, as a fragment, but always as a whole. Life would be robbed of all its greater enthusiasms if we thought of it in broken terms, or even in any terms short of the maximum. Nothing has its first power over us which we do not think of in its unity and completeness. Education when arrested, as it is with the majority, after a few years, means a thousand times as much to them as it would mean if others were not going on with it to completion. The part of the whole which they enjoy is infinitely more than a little unit would be, measured by their alloted time.

And in like measure as regards our thought of the period of education as altogether preparatory to the after life. We may lay far too much stress upon this aspect of education. We may lose more than we gain by over-emphasizing the preparatory idea. In the order of Providence there is always a certain distinctness, even separateness, in the rate of advance. We cannot safely overlook it. If we try to make a child anything other than a child, we simply get a prig. Even in the relation of this life to the next, the divine order is, one world at a time. We must have enough separateness or distinctness to ensure unity, if we are to get the value of any period of our lives. The period of education is no exception to this rule. I urge the right of this period to as distinct and separate a place as may be necessary to secure its essential objects without interference, its right to create a sentiment, a spirit, an atmosphere of its own, and therefore the right to lay claim to time without the charge of intrusion. For the boy, who is living and acting fitly in the world of the school boy, is learning in the best possible way how to live and act

fitly in the larger world of men, the world of citizenship.

The rights of the period of education ought to be proportionate to the responsibilities which are put upon it. If I were to reduce the object of an education, as applied to the individual, to its simplest terms, I should say that it aimed at three things, first, to enable the individual to find himself, second to enable him to make sure of himself, and then to enable him to relate himself rightly to others. These are very simple aims, but they are far reaching. It is quite evident that one remains essentially a child until he begins at least to know himself: it is equally evident that one does not reach any degree of maturity until his powers have begun to work with some degree of certainty: and it is evident that he has made no approach to manhood till he has learned how to live with others. Self-knowledge and self-reliance are the first plain, everyday, practical results of an education,—the self knowledge which comes from the awakened faculties, the self reliance which comes from the trained faculties. We expect, in a word, from the school room some intimation of that mental character foreshadowed in the familiar line: "Self reverence, self knowledge, self control." We judge the schools by the results they give us at these points. We have no patience with schools which turn out dullards and blunderers. Whether the time of education be long or short, we demand that the minds of scholars shall be alert; and if the time be long enough to secure such a result, we demand that their minds shall be accurate and reliable in their working. I grant of course that no guarantee can be given for this outcome. A boy may go through school and college and remain uneducated; that is, his powers may not have been led

out. Now and then we find a mind which cannot be led out. It must be driven out. It must come under the sharp stimulus of necessity, such as usually attacks one only in after life, to come to any development. There are men who were failures in school who are successes in the world. But they are rare, the very rare exceptions. That is why we hear so much about them. The exceptional interests us more than the ordinary. Interest, recognition, acknowledgment of the exceptional is legitimate: the fallacy comes in, and it is always a tremendous fallacy, when we begin to reason from the exceptional.

The business of education is to deliver each incoming generation into the hands of society reasonably well developed, reasonably well trained, reasonably well informed, and reasonably well adjusted to the moral relations of life. That is the responsibility resting upon our schools and colleges. Beyond this work lies the vast range of investigation open to the few, the very few who have committed themselves to the high ends of research and discovery.

Now if such responsibility as this falls within the period of education there ought to be in the public mind, a corresponding distinctness of object attaching to this period. It is just as clear and distinct an object to organize the mind of a generation as it is to employ that mind afterwards in any given trade, or business, or profession. I am not pleading for a theory of education: I am pleading for the period of education. I want to see a change brought about in this regard, in the attitude of the public mind. An education is commonly regarded as a means to an end. I would have it regarded also in the light of an end in itself. A well

organized mind is as distinct an object as character, and as worthy an end as a fortune. I would change the presumption in this whole matter, that whereas the presumption is now in favor of no more education than is called for by some specific object to be gained in the after life, I would have the presumption in favor of so much of an education as the individual is capable of, with a view to the largest thing which he can do when the time of action comes. I think that we shall agree that the normal man amongst us is to be the educated man, in the sense in which I have used the term, the man that is, who has learned to know himself, to make sure of himself, and to relate himself properly to others. Education in this sense is the outfit to which one is entitled, the capital with which one ought to be able to begin the business of life.

It has not been found practicable to abridge the period of education. In order to become educated men and women in the full sense of the schools, we must put behind us not less than one-third of our lives before we enter upon what is termed our life work. This proportion between mental growth and maturity, or between study and production, does not essentially change from one generation to another. We may economize in time to some extent, we may recover considerable tracts of intellectual territory which have been allowed to run waste, but these savings are quickly appropriated in the interest of new subjects and a more careful knowledge.

Two forces guard this period to its full limit—nature and society. Nature resolutely protects the season of mental growth by demanding time for play as well as study, by protesting against haste, and by enforcing with exact penalty the laws of growth. And society,

at the other end, refuses all applicants who cannot show the proper credentials. Society welcomes the child of genius with his own credentials, and is appreciative of all self-educated men who have results to show. But her claims are becoming more and more exacting from those who assume the culture of the schools, and who assert the advantage of a liberal education. An educated man can no longer justify himself to society unless he can show those results in mental character which it is the business of education to insure and guarantee. For education, we are always to remember, is more than instruction. The distinction has been so well expressed in a recent word from Professor Jebb that I venture to quote it, "It is no new thing," he says, "how far and how best we can combine education, that is, the bringing out of the faculties, with instruction, that is, the imparting of valuable knowledge. Modern life, so complex, so restless and so competitive, naturally tends to insist first upon instruction; but as no progress of science can enable men to think faster, a sound economy of educational time depends on the same principles as ever."

I shall refer in a moment to the various practical limitations of which account must be made, in considering the subject before us, but just now I am intent upon emphasizing the one idea in its singleness, that the period of education is as distinct a period, with as distinct an object, having as great a responsibility and entitled to as undisputed right, as any period in our lives. Let us put the idea into the concrete and see what it means to accept it under practical conditions. We at once ask, what is the period of education, when measured by time? Suppose we allow the educational

period to reach to the age of eighteen for the minimum, and to twenty one for the maximum average. We will not say that education should be compulsory even up to the minimum age; that is not what I am asking for; but we will assume that public sentiment should be strong enough in favor of that extension to put the burden of proof upon those who would deny it. Suppose that in actual fact the majority in our schools should reach that limit, and only the minority fall out by the way. What then? What are the practical objections of a definite and positive sort? Let us consider them.

First; there is the objection from cost, the direct cost in money and the indirect cost in time. All education must be paid for directly through public taxation, or through private endowment; in the newer states by the former means chiefly, in the older states by the latter means beyond the range of the public schools. It is impossible to calculate the precise cost of the period of education if it should be virtually extended to the ages of eighteen or twenty one, but I think it safe to say that the cost of the advance would be no greater than was the cost of the original advance into the region of the higher education. It cost far more to advance beyond the three R's, into the wide territory covered by the public school system than it would now cost to make that territory available to all below the age even of twenty one. The first cost is passed, that of establishing the wider educational foundations, and of providing facilities for advanced instruction. The increased cost would consist in multiplying appliances already existing. It is cheaper to enlarge high schools, academies, technical school, and even colleges, than to create them

in the first instance. The existing plants are of great public value.

The question of the indirect cost, in time, the time of the individual, is more serious. It costs the family without fortune, but with children, more to give up the time of the children in school, than it costs a family without children, but with a fortune, to pay its share for the support of the schools in taxes. It requires sacrifice, often heroic sacrifice, to give up the earnings of children beyond a certain age, even if nothing is paid out for their education. It means a great deal often for parents to give children "their time." It means a great deal for parents to identify themselves to this extent with the fortunes of their children. The most pathetic scene in the early educational history of New England is the interview between Mr. Webster while a student in college, and his father, about sending his brother Ezekiel to college. The farm had been mortgaged to send Daniel. To send Ezekiel the scanty personal property must be exhausted. The father replied, "I should be willing, if it were not for your mother. I must consult her." The mother who had overhead the conversation at once said, "I am willing, I can trust my boys."

That was the old New England spirit. It was the spirit of sacrifice. It was the spirit which made New England. It put a relatively large share of the family capital into the education of the children. That was the favorite investment of that earlier time. We can see that it paid, that nothing paid like it, but it required faith, and often heroism. It is at just this point that there is beginning to be the most appreciable decline in the old stock. There is less ambition to secure a full

education for children at the cost of personal and family comforts. Meanwhile the new stock is beginning to show something of the same quality which the old stock is losing. The families who have much to gain socially are willing to make sacrifices to secure their ends. This is especially true of foreigners of the second and third generation. Those who have not given direct attention to this change would be surprised to know how far reaching it is. A clergyman in Boston, who had investigated the subject recently told me that there were twenty-six ministers of one denomination in that city, who were, as he expressed it, sons of immigrants. He was one of them. That is a very remarkable result. Twenty-six men in one branch of one profession, sons of men who were not born in this country—a remarkable showing for the second generation. But any one who knows what is going on in our schools and colleges, knows that there is a steady incoming of those from the newer peoples who are pushing their way into the higher education through the social or general ambition of their parents, and this always means sacrifice, the willingness as I have said, to give up the time of their children, their first earning power, and in many cases the willingness to add the aid of money. In asking for an extension of the period of education within the limits named, I am pleading for a revival of the old spirit which gave New England its educational prestige, and which must be revived if New England families of the old stock are to hold their birthright.

A second objection is of a more general character: the extension for large numbers of the period of education would withdraw too many from productive labor. Here again it would be impossible to give statistics, but

without doubt the number would be large enough to make some impression upon the labor market. Would the reduction be an economic loss? Is the country in need of more laborers who are minors? Occasionally a great industry makes some extraordinary demands, but the ordinary demand is for work, not for laborers. The most exacting requirements are made by labor unions to extend the time and conditions of apprenticeship to the various trades: and the steady contention is for reduced hours of labor, partly with the view of making work go round. The usual condition of the labor market is that it is overstocked, with the liability of being congested. It is wonderful how large a number can be withdrawn from production and allow uninterrupted if not increasing national prosperity. Germany withdraws 600,000 men from the labor market, yet Germany is today in many respects the most successful commercial nation in the world. The standing armies of Europe make enormous demands upon the people for their support in peace as well as in war, but it is an open question whether the men themselves are needed for productive purposes, outside an undeveloped country like Russia. It is a serious draft upon the labor market of that country to have 265,000 men of twenty-one years of age conscripted each year to serve for five years, making a total of nearly 1,000,000 producers under arms.

The movements of old countries all look toward reduction of the aggregate amount of labor, either in numbers employed, or in time of service. Colonization was long the favorite scheme for relieving the home labor market. Now it is long apprenticeships, reduced hours of labor, and old age pensions. It is interesting

to note that Japan, which is coming into view as an industrial nation, retires men from the activities of life at a comparatively early age. A traveller who landed recently at San Francisco, after having spent some time in Japan, said that he saw more bald headed men on the ferry boats running from San Francisco to Oakland than he had seen engaged in business during his residence in Japan. The question of production is no longer the question of numbers, but of skill, of capacity for rapid work to match machinery, of endurance under exhausting conditions, and of ability to adjust oneself to others, of working in a team. There is no economic reason why boys should be hurried into the labor market. There may be a sufficient reason, as I have said, why they should contribute to the support of a given family, but no trade needs them or business. No city calls for them: the country at large does not need them. The best economic use to which you can put boys and girls is to educate them in the sense in which I have been using the term, that is, to enable them to find themselves, and to make sure of themselves, not to rush them into trades or business.

A third objection has to do with the character of education. It is said that education unfits for common work, and that for the higher grades of work or business it is necessary to unlearn much which the schools have taught. This objection has a certain force, but it is becoming of less and less significance, chiefly because the schools are becoming more practical. In fact the great difficulty today in all grades of education is to withstand the undue commercial tendencies of the time. Education is set in all departments, apart from investigation, toward some end of utility. The new wealth

of the nation lies in the new sciences, or in the new knowledge of the old sciences. There is more available wealth lying in the laboratories of biology, chemistry, and physics than in the gold fields of Alaska. Any one who is familiar with the variety and character of the courses of instruction in the better schools will see that there is everything to learn, and little to unlearn, for the practical uses of life. The individual may make mistakes, but the way is open from the time of first choice to the end, into the actual employments which are to follow.

As to the incompatibility between study and work, nothing can be said apart from one's knowledge of the individual. My observation is that a boy who leaves school or college full of conceit and self sufficiency would have shown the same results under any circumstances. Conceit is a personal quality. I have never seen the discipline sufficient to drive it out. But the greatest foe to conceit is knowledge, provided it can have the chance to show its power. The moral effect of an education is to teach self respect, and the best expression of self respect is in not being ashamed to work. Manual work is being constantly ennobled by those who see capacities in it which the untrained eye and hand cannot find. Half the drudgery of the world has already been brought up to the plane of labor by those who have not been ashamed to stoop to lift it up. I have no fear from this objection about the effect of the school in unfitting for work, when once the subject is fairly investigated. If it be really true, then there is no stopping place in mental decline until we reach and accept slavery as the normal condition for work.

Are there any valid objections against the endeavor

to extend and enrich the period of education? Suppose the number of those going on in the schools until eighteen, or even twenty-one, were doubled, would society be the loser? Would it be if the number were trebled? Where will you fix the proportion between those who should and those who should not have the advantage of a relatively full period of study, provided the world of study be made in all parts a live world?

I take the opportunity in the time remaining to speak of the effect of the extension of the actual period of education upon the life of the average school. In my judgment it would invigorate the whole school system. The most stimulating influences work from above down. It is the university as the home of research that invigorates the college, it is the college with its broad courses and generous activities which quickens the secondary school, it is the secondary school with its close application and definite object which gives quality and tone and direction to the elementary school. All this is true in a strict educational sense. One of the failures of American education lies in the fact that it does not carry education far enough along to feel its social effect. The common school is a democratic institution, but it is more democratic the higher it reaches. The high school is more democratic than the primary school, because those who reach that grade know the meaning of the common social life. The average college is the most democratic institution in American society. It is far more of a social democracy than the average church. The tests of merit are accessible to all; the test may be scholarship, it may be athletics, it may be good fellowship. We ought, in the interest of American society and politics, to bring a larger and larger number under

the influence of education in those grades where it works most directly to the ends of our national life.

And when you pass to the influence of the upper grades upon the individual you find that the influence multiplies in proportion to the degree in which one feels that he is a part, a necessary part, of the school. That is what membership in a great school, with great traditions, with large purposes, with a broad and generous life, means to every member of it. It makes the constant appeal to his loyalty, to his honor, to his enthusiasm. When Mr. Goschen said that Thomas Hughes was the most distinguished schoolboy that ever lived, he meant that he was the most of a schoolboy possible in his time. He lived the real life of a Rugby boy, he took all the best there was out of the school and put the best he had into it, unconsciously but really.

The mission of a great school is to accomplish a like result in every member of it. There are a great many schools which are doing this very thing. We are beginning to recognize the fact. Every year the graduates, not only of colleges but of academies and schools, come together to recall the stimulus which came out of the old school life, not yet a spent force. I attended recently the celebration of the 150th anniversary of a church in the state of New Hampshire. The figure that came up out of the past with most frequent reference was that of an old time school mistress in a district school, whose scholars had organized themselves into an association bearing her name. We want to increase this kind of influence by every possible means. We want to make the school as such, every school, have a spirit, a sentiment, an atmosphere that every member of it may feel. We want to enlist the enthusiasm of every schoolboy in

this purpose. We want to make it an object of ambition and pride to be a distinguished schoolboy, as much so as to be a distinguished man in any business or profession. We can do this as we try to give a more ample meaning to the period of education; as we learn to look upon it ourselves as a distinct unit of time, and not as a fragment; as we acknowledge the fact that it has its own distinct work in organizing mind and character, as great as any which may follow; and as we give to this world of early struggle and work and sport and fellowship its appropriate and well earned rights.

And this result, if it come at all, must be brought about from within. That is why I am speaking to you who are teachers, or friends of education. We can make just as big a place for the educational spirit to inhabit as we are capable of making. Outward circumstances will gradually yield to the large and vital idea of education which we believe in and know how to illustrate. I have gone into a town where the schools were of no value—without efficiency in training, without enthusiasm in study or even play. Again I have seen that same town with a well organized system, suitable buildings, and teaching that gave impulse and growth. The justification for the old state of affairs was that the town was stingy and the people indifferent. The reason for the new state of affairs was that a live teacher and organizer had come into the community and begun his work. The community could not withstand him. Interest was awakened, and money followed as a matter of course.

I have seen the like result in the effect upon the young life of a community, schools which were left as soon as the growing boy could get away from them,

changed into schools which held him to the end and then sent him to college. And the change had the same reason. There is nothing impossible in any local situation to a great teacher. Given Thomas Arnold, and you have Thomas Hughes, and then in due time another Rugby, another Oxford, a new educational life in the country at large.

XIX

ARRESTED EDUCATION—HOW DISCOVERED

Delivered at Rutland, Vt., before the State Teachers' Convention

If the subject which I introduce this evening follows you out of school hours and beyond the immediate technique of your business, I see no reason for apology. I think that I have the right to assume that we are concerned not only with the methods of our work, but quite as much with its result, and especially with the final outcome of it as it appears in the general social development. Of course we are intensely interested in the individual future of our pupils. Every teacher follows the career of those whom he has taught with pride or with anxiety, until the individual is lost to view. But we are interested in the direct future of our pupils in a much broader way. Those who go out from our public schools, whether by graduation or at any earlier stage by withdrawal, become the proper subjects of a wide social study, a social study in which I believe that we ought to engage as a legitimate after part of our work. We ought to know, that is, what becomes of those educational tendencies which we have developed, and guarded, and tried to direct. Do they return into the life of the growing boy or girl to be undistinguished or lost for want of continued discipline? Do they materialize and harden into business capacity, and find their equivalent in a certain commercial value to the individ-

ual and to the community? Or are they also perpetuated along more advanced educational lines, the man, whatever may be his vocation, still at school in the world, never quite able to outgrow the impulse which we gave the boy?

Now these are not questions of statistics. I am not asking how many of our pupils enter the professions, how many engage in business, how many build houses, how many fall back into the commonplace, how many fall below that into demoralization and disgrace. My question is more profound and vital. I want to know, as one whose business is education, what becomes of the educational impulse upon which we have been at work, and which we have been trying to develop and save. Is that preserved and given a chance after the days of school, or does it grow weak and fail when it touches the world? And if it fails whose fault is it? Is it the fault of the individual, or of his education, or of society? And especially as to the last, does society, as we know it, make a proper educational connection with the public school? Does it offer incentives and inducements to the further development of the intellectual life?

It is into this region of inquiry that I would lead you for a little time. And to be as definite as possible, I restrict myself to the single question of the educational in distinction from the commercial outcome of the training of the public school.

In making this distinction I at once concede and affirm that there is a commercial value which is the legitimate outcome of the training of the public school. It is entirely proper to transmute knowledge into dollars and cents. Knowledge as it is clear, and exact, and rare has a market value. There should be no separation

between education and life in its most necessary and in its most burdensome activities. I confess to a growing respect for the man who knows how to earn his living, and who proposes that his children shall know how to earn their living. It is becoming more and more necessary that every capable man shall see to it that no child of his shall become a burden upon society. Society is already staggering under the burden of the incapables, a much heavier burden than that of its actual paupers. The capacity to earn an honest livelihood, even though the occasion for it may not always seem to be present, is the demand which society has the right to make of all its members. This is the primitive demand, and we can never get safely beyond it. An honest livelihood is the starting point in all our social progress, and the point to which we are always obliged to return whenever we ignore it.

More than this, an honest livelihood is the foundation of the social sentiment of a community. The earning power of a young man determines first the fact of a home, and then the character of the home. The extra knowledge, the additional mental discipline, which can be commuted into the extra wage means more comfort, more refinement, more social prosperity. There is a material element in family affection. When a family is too poor to be decent it is too poor to be affectionate. We are never to allow ourselves therefore to think of the commercial value of an education as representing anything mercenary, especially in its lower stages. An education which stands for an honest livelihood is the foundation of the social structure within which the virtues and affections, all those qualities which go to make up the fine sentiment of a people, are safe. It is for

this reason that we ought to encourage in all ways the establishment, wherever practicable, of manual training schools.

And yet when I acknowledge and emphasize, as I now do, the commercial outcome of the training of the public school, I wish to emphasize still more the fact that there is another outcome which is more possible and more practicable than we are wont to conceive, namely, the educational. And I hope to show as I proceed how greatly the opportunities are increasing for the expansion and refinement of the intellectual life, when once it has been awakened under the training of the school, even though the process may stop short of what we term a liberal education.

It is a marvellous thing, is it not, that any one of us should be able to have the intellectual possession of the world, able, that is, to see it with his own eyes, to hear it with his own ears, to handle it with his own hands, to call the world at some point or in some part his own. And the marvel of this kind of ownership increases as men multiply, and knowledge grows, for the faculty to possess is very great, even if the creative faculty be wanting, if, as Matthew Arnold says, one may not "compose the poem in his soul." That one may understand and interpret to himself in some measure the outer world in which he is to live is certainly one of the simplest and most primary offices of education. What is it to miss altogether that understanding and interpretation, to be as if one were living in any other world, if such indifference could be called life! It is the commonplace of the preacher when he would enforce the idea of a present moral responsibility, "we shall not pass this way again." It should be, I think, the like

commonplace of the teacher in enforcing the present intellectual opportunity, "we shall not pass this way again." Whatever may be the intellectual future of any human being, none of us can repeat the conditions of present knowledge. To know this world of nature which is becoming more and more accessible, this world of living men which is becoming more and more interesting, though sometimes with a painful interest, this world of historic thought and achievement, this world of obligation and duty and sacrifice—knowledge of this sort must come while we are in and of the world. And something of this knowledge is now possible and easy. The average person can have a reasonable share in this intellectual ownership. Unconsciously, often unwillingly, he is put in the way to gain it. The veriest truant in our streets may be brought to the sense of his intellectual birthright, and made to see the value of his inheritance.

I do not wish to speak in any exaggerated way of the purely educational function of the public school. I have already allowed that under present conditions we must be satisfied, in the great majority of cases, in reaching the true commercial end of the school, provided only that we never lower our ideals here and suffer the commercial to degenerate into the mercenary. But there is a growing chance, I believe, to maintain and perpetuate what I have called the educational impulse. Opportunities are increasing for boys and girls, for young men and women, to carry on their intellectual work after leaving school. Out of that large class which leaves school between the ages of fourteen and eighteen there are many who would continue if it were possible. Their minds have been fairly organized and developed

for study, their ambition has been aroused, their imagination quickened, and their taste refined. It is a personal grief to some of them to be obliged to forego further study. Meanwhile it is becoming possible to aid many of them in carrying out their unfulfilled desires. The system of evening schools in the larger towns, classes organized under the auspices of various associations, social and literary clubs, free public libraries, university extension, are indications of the movement in society to perpetuate the work of the public school, especially when it cannot be completed in the regular way. The principal of the Evening High School in Boston said to me this week that it was entirely possible for a young man of seventeen, who, as he expressed it, knew nothing, to carry on his work by day, and fit himself for college in seven years. The point which I now wish to urge is that we, as teachers, shall inform ourselves in regard to all existing facilities for extending the work of the public school, that we shall encourage all endeavors in this direction, and that we shall urge our pupils to avail themselves of these aids whenever practicable; in a word, that we shall do what we can to stop the enormous waste of educational force, which has been generated in the public school, for want of continued employment.

I am about to speak in some detail of these educational aids to the public school, but for the moment let me pause to remind you of the danger of a degraded education. All elementary education may open the mind to the evil side of the world as well as to the good side. It is quite possible to over-estimate the moral safeguards of education. A certain amount of mental training is necessary to some kinds of vice, and to some

kinds of crime. The awakening of the mind, especially the imagination, introduces its own danger into the young life. "I would have you wise," Paul wrote to the men and women in Rome who were just beginning to awake under the stimulus of the new faith and to whom the city was therefore a more serious danger, "I would have you wise to that which is good, and simple concerning evil"—not simpletons, but single-minded. True, the education of the book is no more dangerous than that of the street without the book, and, unlike that of the street, it has its own corrective: still we must face the fact that we sharpen the mind to bad thought and bad purpose when no care is taken as to the application of mental power. The danger from a degraded education lies almost entirely in the want of opportunity to put it to noble service; at least there lies the greatest amount of preventable danger. So that our interest in the more human side of our work goes over into the provision which society has made, or may make, or may be made to make, for the use or continuance in some form of an elementary or even higher education.

But quite apart from this danger of a degraded education, lies the problem, with which I am now chiefly concerned, of an arrested education. Every teacher continually laments the loss of some of the brightest minds in the school who are obliged to put the education they already have to commercial uses prematurely. There is no doubt that they will put it to faithful use, but they cannot be satisfied with the earning power of an education. The sacred fire has begun to burn, and they would not quench it. The impulse within them is strong and urgent for a larger knowledge and a richer culture. Now is it possible for any considerable num-

ber of those who are obliged to leave school for work, to continue to study, read, think, to carry on and develop the ordinary processes of the intellectual life? Well, an illustration is better than an argument. And you will allow me to take the illustrations I use from personal knowledge.

I have knowledge of a club in Boston made up of young men and women in about equal proportions, numbering some seventy five members. The ages range from eighteen to thirty. The club is composed of several nationalities, about one third being Americans, one third Irish Americans, and the other third from the various peoples now coming into the city. The members also represent different trades and occupations, painters, hatters, tailors, clerks, reporters, type-writers, seamstresses, and, in one or two cases, teachers. Most of the number attend as far as possible the Evening High School. This club, made up of seemingly heterogeneous material, but actuated by one purpose, meets every Saturday evening, at the South End House. The average attendance is from forty to fifty. An evening may be spent in the familiar discussion of an author read in common, or of an historic character. Sometimes the session takes the form of an intellectual experience meeting. What was the first thing which wakened you, what book, what incident, or who, if a person, were questions which recently drew out a most vivid and instructive discussion. There is an occasional diversion in the way of music or art. And the present year the club will attempt more directly continuous work than heretofore, embracing at least one course of lectures in literature, and another in natural science. In the summer the club makes an occasional pilgrimage, not an ex-

cursion, but a pilgrimage, as notably a recent one to Concord, Mass. The club, it should be said, is known as the Emerson Club.

I doubt not that this club can be duplicated a good many times over in the different cities of the country; the more times the better for my argument. I have referred in detail to this particular one, because it has come under my notice, and because it illustrates, as well as any, one way of perpetuating the educational impulse of the training of the public school.

Another illustration, a little older, and therefore of more assured value, is before me. When I entered upon my professional life in the city of Manchester, New Hampshire, I found there quite a body of young men of my own age, or a little older, identified in various ways with the educational, literary, and social life of the town, who were not college graduates, but who were taking their place side by side with those who were. Upon inquiry I learned that their intellectual standing in the community was due chiefly to the fact that they had organized, as they were obliged to leave the public schools, what was then known as a lyceum, into which they had put their intellectual holdings, and from which they drew in time an abundant return. That was their way of putting their money to the exchanger's. And as a result, they earned for themselves and still maintain a most enviable intellectual position in the community, which they are bequeathing to their children.

Now in these and like cases no one can overestimate the enrichment of life which results from these endeavors for continued self-improvement. This world means to these young men and young women something quite different from that which it would mean to them, if it

were bounded by the shop, the store, the street, or even the daily paper. There is precisely the same difference in mental thrift that there is in industrial thrift. One mind spends as it goes, and never has any deposit to its account, much less any capital. Another mind appropriates and saves a share of the intellectual wealth of the world—the only wealth of which there is enough to go round, and about which there can be no question as to the standard of value. And it is a wealth, too, in respect to which we are to remember that he who saves contributes as well as he who earns. The maker of a good book evidently increases that wealth; so does the reader of a good book; for intellectual wealth lies in the amount of mind there is in the world.

Not to delay, however, upon these peculiar means, let me urge upon you as a further means to the end before us, a more complete alliance between the public school and the public library. I speak of an alliance between the free public school and the free public library, for I am not sure that it is of advantage to make the library a part of the school system of the state. There are states where this is done, but with less result as a rule than when the two interests are separated under different managers. In your own state the attempt was made, I have been told, some years ago to found agricultural libraries, but with comparatively little success. The books were soon scattered and lost. Through the kindness of J. A. DeBoer, Esquire, of Montpelier I learn that your law empowers towns to establish and maintain public libraries, and appropriate for suitable buildings or rooms, and for the foundation of such a library, a sum not exceeding two dollars for each of the ratable polls in such towns in

each preceding year; and also to appropriate annually for the maintenance, care, and increase thereof a sum not exceeding one dollar for each of the ratable polls in the preceding year. This is the act of 1884, which doubles the rates of the act of 1867, which allowed one dollar for establishing, and fifty cents a poll for maintaining a public library. I also learn from the same source that in 1892 out of 243 towns in the state 92 had public libraries; and 24 out of these 92 were free public libraries.*

Massachusetts, as you are aware, has gone a step further, and by the enactment of 1890 furnishes a certain amount of state aid, as a stimulus to the establishment of free public libraries by the towns. This act, after constituting a board of library commissioners, authorizes the payment of a sum not exceeding one hundred dollars for the purchase of books wherever any town not having a free public library shall establish one. The act further requires that any town accepting this aid shall provide by tax the sum of $50, or $25 annually, according to the valuation of the town, for the maintenance of a library.

Fifty-two towns have already complied with the conditions of this act, so that out of the 352 towns and cities of the state 227 contain free public libraries which are entirely under municipal control, and 72 contain libraries which are practically free but not altogether under municipal control. There are now but 53 towns in the state, and this number is soon to be lessened by four, (a little less than one fifth of the whole number,) which have not public libraries.

* Without doubt more recent statistics would show a considerable increase above the facts given, but the facts as given illustrate the method urged.

The free public library represents, I believe, the next step in popular education, provided the people know how to use it. It is at this point that the public school must come to the aid of the library. When one has been taught to read he has by no means been taught how to use books. The use of books is a distinct art, in a certain sense quite distinct from the art of reading, and one part of the art is to know how not to read a book, and yet how to get out of it all that one needs or wants. A very small per cent of literature is for study. Another per cent, hardly larger, is for reading, for that delightful inspiration and enjoyment which comes from the interchange of thought between an author and reader. As for the great mass of literature, including much that is of greatest value, it is simply for reference, or mere acquaintance. And unless the child learns how to make this distinction he will be simply overpowered by books, or will read without discrimination. Indiscriminate reading is intellectually demoralizing. A well trained mind may choose to read a comparatively foolish book, (by foolish books I do not mean humorous books which are sometimes the wisest we have,) but choosing to read a foolish book is a very different thing from reading it because one does not know any better. Desultory reading, which comes from the want of ability to choose what to read, or how to read, is at the farthest remove from education. It untwists the fibres of the mind which the training of the school had begun to weave into a strong and compact force.

The teacher therefore can do an immense service for those whose early training is to close with that of the public school, if he shows them in simple ways how to use books. That school is very poorly furnished, which

does not have a small reference library, where children can be taught in this art. The same connection should be made between some text books and a library as between other text books and nature. Nature does not confuse a child taught to make the right use of it: neither should the world of books. And the boy thus taught may continue his education if he will in the public library, rather than be left to the demoralizing effect of merely desultory reading.

I go a step further and refer to the aid which may come in time in solving this problem of an arrested education through the working of the system of university extension. Strictly speaking we are not yet ready for university extension. The university method, which is that of research, investigation, discovery, is hardly established as yet in our higher schools and colleges. It means personal and original work. It is not simply listening to lectures: it is reading, studying and experimenting with a view to producing something. It can hardly be said that we have as yet in our best communities an amount of trained mind, outside that which is already fully engaged in intellectual pursuits, which is prepared for it. Intelligence is not a sufficient basis for university extension to work upon. It differs, for example, quite widely in its method from that of the old lyceum, which had such power in forming opinion a generation or more ago in New England. The aim of that method was largely moral. The subjects which it introduced were for the most part very earnest subjects. Most of the lecturers were reformers. The spirit of the institution was embodied in the reply of Wendell Phillips to a committee man who asked him for his terms—"Let me take my subject," which was

always some phase of the anti-slavery question, "and I'll come for nothing: for any other subject $75.00" And even then it should be said that the payment of the $75.00 seldom precluded the introduction of the subject somewhere.

University extension has an important part to play as an adjunct of the public school system. As its method is adopted with proper adaptation in the lower grades of instruction, the more advanced pupils of our public schools may graduate into it. It combines some of the best features of the club and of the class. I have no doubt that it will in time absorb a considerable part of the somewhat aimless leisure of the trained minds in many of our smaller as well as larger communities.

It was not in the original intention of my subject to speak of the increasing opportunity for making the public school more tributary to what we term a liberal education, but it is entirely germane to my subject, and I will not close without referring to it. The channel from the public school to the college is now entirely clear and open. We of the colleges are continually making claims upon the secondary schools, and yet we are obliged to confess that the school has made greater relative advance during the last twenty years than the college. It could not well have been otherwise. The college is set down within fixed limits in the early years—say from eighteen to twenty two. At the very best therefore it can cover only a certain discipline and a certain range of subject. The school has the longer chance, though years of course are not alike in value, for improvement in method and for advance in the subject matter of instruction. A pertinent illustration of the relative gain of the school upon the college occurs to

me within my immediate knowledge. Forty years ago a scientific school was established in connection with Dartmouth College by the bequest of a citizen of Massachusetts. The permanent condition of the foundation was that the school should always make connection with the public, or, as he termed it, common school system of New England. The requirements for admission should never be advanced beyond the studies taught in that system, and subjects were prescribed which should be taught in the school. Gradually the public schools grew upon the original requirements, and finally outgrew some of the subjects actually prescribed in the course. Students began to come overfitted. It was necessary to eliminate the subjects which they had already pursued. At last the gain was so great that the school was incorporated into the college as its scientific course, and put on a par under certain conditions with the classical department. The public school system, that is, had earned its way into the college, while at the same time the college had been making its own advance.

The question then is no longer one of connection between the public school and the colleges. It is partly a question of pecuniary means in the case of individual students, but it is chiefly a question of motive. Who shall induce the boy or girl to pass over into the region of a liberal education? In the majority of cases the teacher more often than the parent. And if it be asked why the motive should be urged—what is the real advantage to a considerably larger number of the pupils in our public schools of a liberal education—I should give an answer which may perhaps surprise you, but which I believe holds a vital truth. The advantage of the liber-

ally educated man over the self trained man lies in the greater amount of the human element which he takes up into his life. The self trained man may know nature, or books, or the world with an equal carefulness and perhaps greater certainty. I know self educated men who can hold a better argument within the range of their education than most college men. "Beware of the man of one book," said a good authority, in warning his students against the conceit of general learning. But the college man ought to take up into his life, as I think he does take up into his life, a great deal more of the life of other men, the life of the past and of the present. He lives and works under personal inspiration and incentives. In place of the advantage of isolation, which I grant may be at times very great, he has the advantage of intellectual competitions and conflicts, of intellectual partnership and friendships. The world grows more human to him because he is more with men, in closer contact with them. He is for a time a part of a living organism, every other part of which he feels. Horace Greeley used to say in his impatience, and I have no doubt he had abundant reason for saying it— "From college graduates and all other horned cattle, good Lord deliver me." But it is apparent that the conditions had changed when Mr. Dana, who, perhaps more than any man of our time, took Mr. Greeley's place in journalism, urgently advised a liberal education as requisite to practical journalism, insisting especially upon the knowledge of the humanities.

This address, in which I have been able to speak only in the way of suggestion, had its origin in my observation of the great educational waste in the intellectual outcome of the public schools. I refer simply to

the outcome. Impulses are started which are lost: minds are organized in part and then the process of disintegration begins to set in: a course is begun which fails to make any after connection with the world of thought. Something of this waste is inevitable under present conditions. It is impossible, after satisfying what I have clearly admitted to be other functions of the public school, to transfer completely its educational function to other agencies. But something can be done through watchfulness, invention, and influence to reduce the waste. I have tried to remind you of our part in the saving process. A teacher is becoming one of the most permanent factors in a community, and partly for this reason one of the most influential. The profession has much to say, and much to do, in the solution of our social problems. They will not be solved by any one agency. The legislator, the producer whether by capital or labor, the economist, the social and religious teacher, all have their part to perform. The contribution of the public school teacher to society, beyond the intelligent and faithful doing of his work, lies in the following up of his work. What becomes of those who go out from under him? What becomes of the educational impulse and tendency which it has been his greatest ambition and purpose to develop? Let him add to the teaching function that of the social observer. And as he sees the waste of mind going on around him, the very mind upon which he has been at work, let him study the methods of conserving and perpetuating the legitimate power and influence of the school.

Must I pause, as I close, to note the objection that really the safety of society lies in this very waste of which I have been speaking? Must I take up the cry,

repeated in a current number of one of our reviews, that more education only creates more discontent, that the more you educate the more you unfit, and that the growing unfitness of men and women for real life because of education is the last straw which is to break the back of the American Democracy? I will take up the objection and the lament for the moment. Yes, we must face the issue. Democracy, as we know it, is discontent, a part of that divine discontent which leads unceasingly to the betterment of the individual and of the race. There is no limit to it. Unable, if we would, to arrest its course in other fields, we must not draw the line at education. The public safety lies that way. There is the outlet for restless ambition, for social desire, for a part at least of the higher striving. The education which is "of the people" and "by the people" must be more and more "for the people." Democracy, of all governments, allows the least educational waste.

XX

THE SCHOOL OF THE COMMUNITY

ADDRESS AT THE DEDICATION OF THE HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING, NEWTON, MASS., FEBRUARY 22, 1908

I take advantage of this occasion to speak briefly upon a subject which has, I conceive, a social as well as an educational significance—namely, the increasing value of the local factor in the higher education, the distinction of the high school in that it is the school of the community.

The higher education in New England, as afforded through our colleges and universities, has been more representative of schools and families than of communities. It has been thoroughly democratic, but it has not been evenly, though it may have been widely, distributed. The growth of the high school, both of the village and of the city, has proved to be a most timely corrective of this serious weakness in our New England educational system. Other values are of course to be put to the credit of the high school. I shall refer to some of these before I close, but for the most part I wish to speak of the social and educational effect of the high school, viewed as the school of the community, upon the higher education.

Secondary education in New England is going on chiefly under three types. First, we have the old endowed schools like Phillips Andover, and Phillips Exeter, schools which have the advantage of noble traditions. These schools, and others of this type, were

founded not only in consecration, but in a far reaching sagacity. They were intended to be more than fitting schools, and have for that reason perhaps become the better fitting schools. They have a wide constituency; some of them have a national reputation. They draw in part mature students. Though not self-governing, they represent the largest degree of independence on the part of the students compatible with good order and legitimate authority. They are the New England counterpart of the great secondary schools of England, not a reproduction, but a distinct outgrowth of New England conditions and character.

Then we have as a more recent contribution to the secondary school development of New England, the school which is the outgrowth of the rare personality of some man born to be a master, able to impress himself and his ideas not only upon his pupils, but also upon his associates, and so able to found a school in perpetuity. And it should be added that most of the schools of this type have come in under the auspices, though not, I believe, under the direction of the church, which has shown remarkable insight and skill in the art of secondary education. Examples of this type are the Groton School, and St. Paul's at Concord, N. H. These schools are characterized by their power to educate through their ideals, both social and moral. The pupils are under complete control for all the direct and indirect uses and influences of a school. The training of the home goes over into the school, but the master occupies a larger place than the parent. He brings the pupil under a carefully devised system of control and inspiration, the object of which is to deliver a well bred and well trained scholar at the door of the college. The

constituency of this type is largely from outside New England, but the type is a distinct and interesting contribution to the secondary school development of New England.

And then we have as the third type of secondary school education, the high school, by distinction the school of the community. Many schools of this type have their great traditions, their characteristics, that is, as well as age—like the Boston Latin School, the Roxbury High, and others in this immediate vicinage. Some of them, too, have received in their formation or in their history the stamp of some great master, and the impression then received has become an ideal. But as schools of the community they must soon or late take the fortune of the community. The essential variation between them is determined by locality. We cannot stop with any classification which takes account simply of good teaching and poor teaching, of large equipment or scant equipment. We must go deeper. We have secondary schools which represent the new social wealth of the suburban community, others which represent the new physical wealth, the wealth of the raw material, especially in our manufacturing communities, and others which are recovering the almost lost moral wealth of our old rural communities. The high school of any community is altogether dependent upon the sense of citizenship in that community. The head of every family stands in a two-fold relation to the school, as a parent and as a citizen. As a parent he has the option, if he has the means to gratify it, of sending his children out of the community for their secondary education. As a citizen he has no right to allow the secondary school to remain in such a condition that he is obliged

to send his children elsewhere. When he has fulfilled his duty as a citizen in making the secondary school of his community a proper place for the education of his children, then he may exercise the surplus right of a parent in sending his children wheresoever he will.

But this is not a homily on the duties of citizenship,—I am to speak definitely of the effect which the high school, viewed as the school of the community, is actually producing upon the higher education.

The effect is distinctly manifest at these three points:

First. It is introducing a new and valuable constituency into our colleges and universities. Ten years ago Professor Palmer of Harvard wrote in his treatise on "The New Education"—"Although Harvard draws rather more than one-third of her students from outside New England, the whole number of students who have come to her from the high schools of these states during a period of the last ten years, is but sixty-six. Fitting for college is becoming an alarmingly technical matter, and is falling largely into the hands of private tutors and academies." Of course no such proportion as this to which Professor Palmer refers, held good within New England. But whatever may have been the relative number of students entering Harvard ten years ago from the high schools of New England, I am sure that the proportion now must be much greater.

The two active causes which send students to college are opportunity and incentive. Opportunity represents those who could not otherwise go. Incentive represents those who would not otherwise go. The high school, as the school of the community, stands in an increasing degree for both opportunity and incentive. It is distributing these active causes over a wider and wider

area. It is putting them at work in all localities, avoiding waste, and ensuring contact.

In some cases the high school acts as an incentive simply by taking the place of some other incentive. Those who are reached in this way I do not reckon among the new constituency. The new constituency consists of those to whom the high school stands for opportunity, and the only opportunity. Our colleges are becoming, therefore, through the agency of the high school, more and more representative of the entire population. They have always been democratic: they are now becoming thoroughly representative. Through the gateway of the locality the sons of every race, and religion, and occupation, find their natural path to the college.

And I would emphasize the value, as I have emphasized the newness, of this constituency which the high school is creating. If we are to maintain the necessary proportion of rare and great men we must keep all the ways open back into the remotest regions of human effort, where nature, it may be, is doing her most virile work. Who knows where to look—how far back, or how far down—for the next statesman, or soldier, or discoverer, or poet? No more can you tell where to look for the next scholar. Scholarship, in its own interest, like everything else, must keep the way open to the unknown sources of genius. I commend to you the word of Professor Marshall, in many ways the broadest and most far sighted of our political economists:

"The laws which govern the birth of genius," he says, "are inscrutable. It is probable that the percentage of children of the working classes, who are endowed with natural abilities of the highest order is not so great as

that of the children of people who have attained or have inherited a higher position in society. But since the manual labor classes are four or five times as numerous as all other classes put together, it is not unlikely that more than half of the best natural genius that is born into the country belongs to them: and of this a great part is fruitless for want of opportunity. There is no extravagance more prejudicial to the growth of national wealth than that wasteful negligence which allows genius that happens to be born of lowly parentage to expend itself in lowly work. No change would conduce so much to a rapid increase of material wealth, as an improvement in our schools, and especially those of the middle grade, combined with an extensive system of scholarships, which should enable the clever son of a working man to rise gradually from school to school till he had the best theoretical and practical education which the age can give."

A second effect produced by the high school, the school of the community, has been the broadening of the scope of the higher education, at least of the college curriculum. The old-time relation of the college to the secondary school was that of an accepted domination. The secondary school was assumed to exist not only for the college, but to perpetuate the traditional academic system. What the college said ought to be taught was taught, and without question. The subject matter of the new education found its way into the college partly from above, through the investigations carried on in the universities, and partly from below, through the growing demands of the high schools, which could not ignore the educational conditions out of which they were born. The first concession which the higher education

made to these demands was the establishment of the scientific school side by side with the college. These schools when established were on a lower grade than the colleges. The endowment of them in some cases—I am sure of the fact in regard to the scientific school connected with Dartmouth—stipulated that connection should always be made with the public school system of New England. This meant that the requirements for admission should be adjusted to the actual teaching of the public schools. Gradually the high school, as it found a larger place in the public school system, was able to advance its preparation beyond the requirements of the scientific schools. It offered new material for which the colleges made provision, unwisely, as it seems to me, but naturally, in a course leading to an intermediate degree, a degree between the scientific and the classical. And the last result of the expansion of the high school has been a corresponding widening of the door of entrance, at least at Harvard. The new system of admission to Harvard virtually makes allowance for all subjects which are well taught in the high schools. It has always been the contention of President Eliot—I think it a just contention—that no courses can be framed for our high schools, with the intention of fitting for "life," which can on the whole do that work so well, as the very courses which fit for college: and further that it is unfair to introduce short and disconnected courses, which must throw a scholar off the line, or bring him to a pause, provided he afterward wishes to take a college course.

The contention has now been justified by the proposed widening of the terms of admission to Harvard. Thus through the natural growth and expansion of

the high school, as representing the educational wants of all classes in a given community, the college has absorbed into its life, in an orderly and legitimate manner, the wealth which lies in the new education.

A third possible effect of the high school upon the higher education is to be deprecated. I refer to the tendency to place the graduates of the high school at once under professional training. The high school has been so far advanced that it meets the requirements of some professional schools. But if the graduate of the high school can be admitted to the professional school, it by no means follows that he can afford to take the privilege. The professional school may care only for technical qualifications. The man himself has other interests at stake. He has before him the privilege of being an educated man, as well as of being a technically trained man. The question is not, can he satisfy his profession, but can he satisfy himself, and those larger requirements of society which are not bounded by one's profession or business. I know the reply—"One cannot afford the time; the process is too long. The high school delivers to the college at nineteen, the college to the professional school at twenty-three, the professional school into the world at twenty-six, or later if one is to be a specialist. That is more time than one can afford." With the privilege of making an exception, I must deny the premise. As Horace Greeley replied to the man who demanded a job of him, on the ground that he must live—"That," said Mr. Greeley, "remains to be proven."

Why should one take less time to enter upon those callings which are preceded by what is known as an education, than to enter upon the callings which are pre-

ceded by an apprenticeship? "Mark Twain" has stated the present business situation in the aphorism—"No occupation without an apprenticeship; no pay to the apprentice." In what business may one expect to find himself thoroughly established, with full influence or authority in the firm or corporation, with a generous income, and possessed of a home, while as yet he is within the twenties? Is it in banking, or in manufacturing, or in railroading, or in general trade? How much farther along is the man of business at thirty, unless he has inherited capital, or is of exceptional capacity, than the lawyer or doctor at that age? The open fact is that society is growing more complicated, its demands are more exacting, and consequently personal advancement is slower. Just as surely as the rate of interest is declining so surely are we all coming under the law of diminishing returns; which means that for the same result we must do harder work, or secure a better equipment; which in turn means that we must take longer time. I see no reason therefore why a man who proposes to enter upon his life work by way of an education should complain of the time required in preparation: and especially in view of the fact that the working time of life has been so greatly extended. If society calls a man later to his tasks it allows him to remain longer at them. The age of retirement has been advanced. What the young man in his impatience seems to be losing reappears in the unspent force of later years.

But the exception which I make to my own argument is this: it is quite possible that a year of time may be saved previous to the high school course. Studies may be carried back, as you have carried back Latin, or studies may be taught with a greater economy in the

earlier stages. Of this I am not altogether sure, but if it be possible, I see no further concession which need be made on the score of time. And in any event, there seems to me to be no sufficient reason for the present complaint. We have made no gain for education or for those things for which education stands, if we have simply advanced the high school at the cost of any part of the higher education.

But I have had quite enough to say of the high school in its relation to other parts of the educational system. I have spoken of it as the school of the community. I return to that conception, to set forth before I close some of those values which belong to it in this regard.

The high school is the educational goal of the ordinary municipality. Beyond that the local passes over into the general. But within these limitations, as the school of the community, in what goodly company it is placed. Its allies and fellow workers are the library, the museum, the club for improvement or recreation, the church, the government, the home. Here, on the upper range, is the great social organism moving in ceaseless activity, while below, the great material organism, gathering up all the daily tasks of the community, moves on in steady and supporting power. This is the marvel of our modern civilization. And the more we study it the more we see that the vitalizing and unifying force is the public school.

But there are two special values upon which I must at least touch, as showing the peculiar service which the high school renders to the community.

It is a direct stimulus. The life which it sends back day by day into the home is a fertilizing and fructifying life. The home grows with the advancing boy or girl.

We are none of us above this influence. It puts us into contact with ideas, which if not altogether new, have the freshness of a new setting, and the force of a new ambition or purpose. The growing mind is the best stimulus there is in a community. In spite of its crudities, and conceits, and distractions, it is the most quickening and gladdening force which finds its way into our homes.

And beyond the stimulus which the high school carries over into the daily life of the community, I put its power to give that educational impulse which will outlast its own training. Nothing is more pathetic in the working of our educational system than the sight of so much arrested education, pupils dropping out at every stage in the course. When does the educational impulse take possession, and come in to stay? With some early, with others late, with some not at all. But it is fair to say that the course which reaches through the high school is long enough to settle the question. By that time the mind is well open to the world of nature, or of men, or of books. Some access must have been gained into the great outer or equally great inner world, into which one may pass and in which he may afterward make his home. I reckon among the most refined and cultivated minds within my knowledge, many who have never passed in technical training beyond the secondary school. But the educational impulse has gone on. It has taught them how to read, to study, to think, to speak, to act. Travel has been to them more than a pastime, music and art more than recreation, and work more than drudgery. There is a deeper fellowship than that which bears an academic name. It is that kinship of mind which cherishes in common the divine impulse

to think and to feel in the spirit of the intellectual life.

It is therefore with sincerity and in honor that I offer you my congratulations upon the completion and dedication of this building for the uses of the Newton High School. The school fulfills its two-fold function, as I have tried to show you, as the advanced school of the community, and as a constant and growing factor in the higher education. Through this school you come as a community into the closest possible social unity, and also into vital relations with the educational forces of the land. I congratulate you upon the home which you have made for the school, but more, I think, upon the fact that the school has earned it and is worthy of it. I read in this building, in its walls, in its equipment, in its adornment, your tribute, as citizens, to the recognized authority and repute of the school of this community.

XXI

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY

Address at the Dedication of the Gale Public Library, Laconia, N. H., June 9, 1893

"We go to our shelves," Pascal says, "to take down a book expecting to find an author, and lo, to our joy we find a man." This is the everlasting surprise and joy of the book. We are slow to believe that books are human. But books are human, some of them as human as any men we ever know—"books" as Emerson says "which take rank in our lives with parents and lovers and passionate experiences." A boy may forget his early teachers. No boy forgets his first books, no boy, at least of my generation, has forgotten his Arabian Nights, his Robinson Crusoe, his Pilgrim's Progress, his Plutarch. I wish I knew their modern equivalents, or in fact whether or not there are any. And as for those of us grown to the stature of men, in the midst of what we call the realities of life, we know how completely we surrender ourselves on occasion to the realities of fiction. Some years ago I crossed the Atlantic in company with a well known scholar, who was withal a charming friend, and, as I should add in the circumstances, a good sailor. Day after day he grew more absorbed, less and less companionable. His mind was not in his conversation. On the last day of the voyage the book came to light which told the secret of his behavior. He had been carrying on his heart the sorrows of the Princess of Thule.

I have had this much to say at the beginning about the human element in books, because, as I pass from the book to the library, I want to carry over with me as much as I can truthfully carry of this essential idea. It cannot be said with truth that a book enters a library through the single test of its humanity. A library must shelter a good deal which is not, in any profound and vital sense, literature. But it is after all the same subtle essence which makes the rare book which must pervade the library. It must be, I believe that it is, the atmosphere of truth, of reality, of helpfulness, of friendship, of inspiration, which we breathe as we enter the modern library.

Let me take up the idea, the conception of the Public Library, and try to translate it into the terms of invitation and appeal which it is beginning to make to the modern mind. My time is too short to speak of libraries in their scholastic uses. I speak simply of the public library as it adjusts itself to some of our mental needs, and as it helps to control some of the wayward tendencies of our ambitions and tastes. The library is entering vitally into the process of education, and it is offering itself generously for the higher uses of all of our better communities. We cannot think of the library in its educational uses without thinking at once of the laboratory: and it must be confessed that at a very essential point the comparison is to the advantage of the laboratory. The laboratory has been without doubt the great stimulating and awakening force in modern education. It has led the way into nature, as the library has not yet led the way into literature or into life. And in this activity it has touched the sources of moral action. It has created a mental enthusiasm which has overcome lower

excitements, and it has steadied the intellectual purpose toward patient and enduring work. It has carried the mind on from the simple verification of the laws of nature, on to the repetition of its processes and mothods, on to the discovery of new and subtle agencies and forces. The fascination of science has relieved the tediousness of search and the drudgery of detail. As Longfellow sang of Nature, as the "nurse" of Agassiz—

> "And whenever the way seemed long
> Or his heart began to fail,
> She would sing a more wonderful song
> Or tell a more wonderful tale."

I do not know that we can claim that the modern library has yet wrought for literature what the laboratory has wrought for science. But within narrower limits it has produced a like result. It has, for example, revolutionized the study of history. It has changed its classification as a subject of modern training. By subject matter history belongs within the old discipline and culture; but the change in the method of its study has transferred it to the new education. We classify history today with the sciences, not with the classics, because we study history as we study science. We are learning to verify, to compare, to investigate, to reproduce, and in so doing we are creating a new habit of mind, of which the characteristics are accuracy of method, breadth and fairness of judgment, and the love of truth. I cannot overestimate the moral effect of the kind of training which has been made possible through the educational use of the modern library. The school which employs this training can never produce the par-

tisan or the bigot. The natural product of the method is the sane, generous, but certain and positive thinker, and leader.

Nor must we fail to note an incidental value of the modern library. Education is obliged to lay stress at times upon secondary qualities simply to meet the demands of society. Such a quality in urgent demand today is facility. The world cannot wait for the slow, unready, or unpracticed man. A man among men must have facility, if he would do his full work, or gain his full influence among them. But the risk here, as you see, is almost as great as the demand. The tendency is toward mere alertness, nimbleness of action, the quick seizing of opportunity. Modern education is making use of the library to correct this tendency. The library is the chief means through which it seeks to create the man "full and ready," ready because full. It says to young men in their impatience to be at work—"You must have resources if you would have facility. The real question is not what you are doing at thirty but what you can be at fifty."

I cannot put too much emphasis upon the new delaying and hindering forces in modern education. Going through college means today going through the library and through the laboratory. Of course the great teacher or master is now as always the supreme factor in education, but the great teacher never shows his greatness more clearly than through his power to understand and to use the sufficient means to reach the sufficient end. If this were a school occasion I should like to dwell upon the purely educational uses of the modern library. The library is a very essential part of the curriculum of liberal study. It is a workshop, dedicated in

every part to honorable uses, a place where every student ought to know that he is at home. This free and happy use of the library is the mark of the transition from old methods of education to the new. I asked an Eton boy some years ago where the library was. "Upon my word," he said after a moment's thought, "I don't know."

But I am quite as much concerned with certain later influences of the modern library as I am with its purely educational uses. When it has done its work in the making of our mental habits and in the furnishing of our minds, we do not part company with the idea. It follows us into all our pursuits as an invitation or as a protest. When we cease to be students, and have not become scholars, we need most of all to cherish the idea for which the library stands in our modern civilization.

I think that you will agree with me when I say that the dominant ambition of our time is the lust of possession. Not since the days of conquest has the passion been so urgent or so nearly universal. Everybody thinks of possession in large terms, whether it be in respect to his own affairs, or to corporate interests, or to national expansion. We are all smitten with what Mr. Harmsworth of the London press told us recently was the disease of our newspapers, the disease of size. Our ambitions and desires run to bulk. It is the same thing everywhere, whether you make the reckoning in dollars, or in numbers, or in land, or in power.

It is quite evident that we cannot suppress the desire for possession. No one thinks of a possible return to mediævalism. The finer modernism does not seek for spiritual mastery through renunciation. It seeks rather to temper desire with insight and discrimination, to put

quality before quantity, to prevent satiety through satisfaction. I believe that the great task before modern Christianity, before modern education, before modern politics, is the training of desires. If we trust to the popular taste to tell us what we want, we have no option, if we wish to excel, except to want more of the same thing which others want. There is no longer any difference between men except the difference of degree. But the eternal distinction between one man and another lies in the grade of their desires. If their desires are the same they are essentially the same. The man who wants the better thing, who wants it enough to strive for it, is the better man. How shall we get this better man? Not in any one way or by any one method, but much can be done by trying to satisfy the desire for possession through the possession of things at once noble, attractive, and tangible. The library makes its appeal directly to the sense of ownership. It stands outside the values of the street, but it has its entirely appreciable value. The library is infinitely more than a chest of tools, even for the most skilled intellectual workman. Very few educated men will ever use a library in this way. I have asked from time to time of those qualified to judge, what proportion of men in our colleges were there under the impulse and for the ends of pure scholarship. The invariable answer has been from five to ten per cent. But within the vast remainder who are not scholars by first intention there may be, there is, a very genuine appreciation of high culture. The capacity is there and the taste has been measurably developed. I know of no reason why a good lawyer, or engineer, or banker should not find satisfaction in his library, *his* library, I say, which he has bought book

by book, upon which he has expended personal judgment, which he owns from the inside. I know of no reason why he should not take a certain satisfaction, and find a certain advantage, above that of the scholar who uses his library to win his living or to earn a name. Yes, books are more than tools. Willingly as the great discoverers and interpreters in the intellectual world lend themselves and their work to our uses, they give themselves more joyfully to our companionship. They allow themselves to become ours by the inalienable rights of ownership. I believe in the saving value which lies in the possession of books. The public library which stands open for consultation, and the public library which sends out its volumes broadcast over the community, have their evident values. I set forth the moral value of the owned library, the library into which a man puts not only his money but himself, which is the reflection of his desires and ambitions, which shows the marks of familiar intercourse, which is an evident investment in non productive but imperishable wealth. I deprecate the decline of the private library. There is no substitute for it. The hour in the club has its own relief and profit, but it has no result so unique and lasting as the hour in the library. Modern life means men, men, men, all the day long. When the day is done, it is the same routine set to a different movement. The book, which is really more human than the men we meet, which does not give us the answer of the street, which is not the echo of our thought, the book which interprets us, challenges our spirits, commands our consciences, the book which broadens our judgments and enlarges our mental horizon, the book which reaches our hearts and makes a man once more a child—that is the enlivening, chastening,

deepening power which ought to have free access to our homes, and become a part of our personal holdings.

But I should altogether miss the most direct, though limited function of the modern library, if I did not note its appeal to the creative spirit. It is a reminder to us all of the place of authorship in the national life. Here and there it is more, it is a distinct invitation and appeal. Happy the man who hears the invitation and is able to accept it, happy in his own lot, happy in the joy he gives his fellows.

Nothing is on the whole so gratifying or inspiriting in the intellectual life of this country as the return to literature as a profession. No men amongst us are quite so welcome, there are none for whom we have been waiting with such eagerness, as the men of the incoming generation who are revealing to us our undeveloped wealth in literary resources, who are interpreting to us types of character which we have seen but have not known, who are showing us ideals which thrive in the bare and hard realities of our social life and who are making us believe in them, who are touching us again with pathos and humor, and who are rekindling on our dull hearths the fires of enthusiasm and faith. It would be vain to say that we have been satisfied with the material advance in which we have gloried. We have not really believed the comfortable words of our prophets, who have told us that the genius which declared itself in organization and enterprise could, if it had a mind to, turn to literature. Neither have we been altogether satisfied with our wonderful educational advance, more marked even than our industrial advance. Education is not literature. Text books are not poems. The school room is not the library. It is good to see the nation at

school. It is good to see the scholar rising to distinction amongst us. But in all this revival of education, in all this revival of learning, we are not content, we shall not be content, till we see and feel once more, and in full measure, the revival of literature.

But the place of a library in a community cannot be defined by its special uses. Far beyond any results which can be formulated lies that intangible but potent effect upon a community which the years are sure to reveal. Nothing adds more to the self respect of a town or city than a great library. Strangers as they visit Laconia will take away with them their impressions of your city shaped in no little degree by the sight of this new and attractive structure. You will refer to it with an honorable pride. Better than all this, you will grow into it, and up to it. A public library levels up. It changes in time the talk of people. It creates an atmosphere. Its effect is more subtle, but more positive and more stimulating, than travel. Travel stores the mind with agreeable memories. Reading quickens the mind to thought. A well travelled man can tell others what he has seen. A well read man can talk over the same books with his neighbor, and get the play of mind which comes out of the give and take of conversation.

The incoming of good companionable books year after year is like the incoming of a succession of good families. You come to know them by name, by personal qualities, by influence; for, as I said at the beginning, books are intensely human. I do not know of anything which can come into our New England towns to repair the waste of the old family life of these towns more effectively than a good public library. I do not know of anything which can assimilate the new with the old,

and bring our population of differing speech and customs into more homogeneous unity than a good public library. For we must remember that many of those who are of foreign birth represent peoples which hold a great place in literature. Nor must we overlook the fact that among those who come to us from other lands may be some true interpreters of the greater writers of their races. It is no infrequent thing to find in the immigrations which are filling our western states those who bring with them, even in their comparative poverty, the love of literature and the love of art to which we can hardly furnish an equal. I should not wish to be put to the test beside many an immigrant to whom Dante speaks in the mother tongue, or Goethe, or who carries Robert Burns or Tom Moore in his heart.

I congratulate you that in the midst of your industries, beside your churches and schools, within sight of the great tide of travel which flows through your city, you have been endowed with this building which is to declare its purpose to all who enter your gates. I congratulate you that the gift is from within and not from without. I congratulate you upon the distinction that your library bears a local name. I congratulate you upon those traditions of your ancient town which this building is to perpetuate in the name of its donor, and no less upon the hopes and promises of your new city which it will help you to realize and accomplish.

XXII

MODERN EDUCATION CAPABLE OF IDEALISM

Address at the Inauguration of President King at Oberlin, Ohio, May 14, 1903

I assume that I have your assent to these two propositions: first, it is the business of education to accept, when it may not create, the material of knowledge; second, it is the business of the higher education to idealize whatever material of knowledge it accepts.

No greater calamity, it seems to me, can befall an age, apart from a moral lapse, than to have its intellectual training detached from the mind of the age. Wherever men are thinking most vigorously, there those who are to follow after must be trained to think, otherwise there will be in due time intellectual revolt with its consequent delays and wastes.

But more knowledge, whether it be old or new, is not the end of education, but rather knowledge penetrated by insight and alive with motive. A fact is something which has been done, something which has found a place in the world of reality. There may be that in the creation of a fact which declares its whole power. There are deeds from which nothing can be taken, and to which nothing can be added. But most facts, especially those which have not been accomplished by the hand of man, await questioning. When an answer comes back we speak of discovery. When the full answer comes back we announce a theory, a principle, a law. The under-

standing of facts, whether personal or impersonal, of man's doing, that is, or of nature's doing, the relating of facts to one another, the discovery of the moral incentive in facts, make up in part the idealizing process which belongs to the higher education.

Modern education differs from the education which has come to us by long inheritance in the vast amount of subject-matter which it has put into our hands, awaiting the idealizing process. The new subject-matter is in large degree the raw material of knowledge, not having passed through the alchemy of time, devoid of sentiment, and lacking in those associations which make up the moral increment of knowledge. It represents literatures which have not reached the final form, sciences which run straight to application rather than to philosophical conclusion, and theories of society and government which are too serious and urgent to be held in academic discussion. Manifestly the chief task of the schools has thus far been that of readjustment, first making a sufficient place for the new subject matter, and then properly relating it to the old.

If you will review the educational work of the decades just passed, you will see how definitely, how completely I may say, adjustment has been our business. The process has been carried on partly in strife and contention, partly by inquiry, and partly through that understanding which comes only from the actual handling of unfamiliar knowledge. For so large an undertaking the process has been rapid. Let me remind you that it was on the first of October, 1859, that Mr. Darwin sent out his abstract, as he termed it, on the "Origin of Species," accompanying the volume with the modest prophecy that "when the views entertained in

this volume, or when analogous views are generally admitted, we can dimly foresee that there will be a considerable revolution in natural history."

The process of adjustment is nearly over, so nearly over that we may now, I think, address ourselves to a severer but nobler task, that of idealizing our new knowledge and the methods of its acquisition. And the essential condition, let me say, of undertaking the task is that we approach it in the right state of mind. The traditional mind is not altogether in the right state. It is too ready to draw offhand distinctions between culture and utility, too ready to ignore the ethical possibility of the new education. What we need just now in the educational world more than anything else is an ethical revival at the heart of education. We shall not have it until we realize more clearly the need of it.

If we should make a careful assessment of the present moral values in the subject-matter of education, we should be surprised, I think, to see how large has been the diversion or decline of these values. I refer, of course, to subjects and to the mode of their treatment. The old discipline, which held the Hebrew literature with its elemental righteousness, so much of science as could be classified under natural theology, and a philosophy which vexed itself with the problems of human destiny, was a discipline prosecuted under the very sanction of religion. But when the transfer was made in literature to the classics, and when the sciences began to be applied, and when the end of philosophy changed in part with the change of data, the subject-matter of the higher education ceased to be religiously ethical. We have been singularly unconscious of the change. Under changes in form we have kept the same senti-

ment. Culture has become with us a kind of morality. So long as the old discipline kept its associations and its methods and gave us consistent results, we asked few questions about the moral content of teaching, and therefore made no comparison of values. In fact we have silently abandoned the idea that the chief ethical value of college instruction lies in the curriculum. The reservations which we make in behalf of certain distinctly ethical or semi-religious subjects, are too few to bear the weight of the moral obligation which the higher education ought to assume.

Where then shall we look for the recovery and advancement of education to its highest ethical power? Chiefly, I believe, to our capacity for carrying on the idealizing process through which we accustom ourselves to think reverently of all knowledge, to insist upon all intellectual work as a moral discipline, and to hold all intellectual attainments and achievements as tributary to the social good.

I believe that the finest, partly because it is the really distinctive product of academic life, is the knowing mind. The moral danger from it is inappreciable. Pride, conceit, arrogance, if they ever attend knowledge, are intruders and transients. They are not companions or guests. Knowledge leads to awe, and awe to faith, or to that kind of doubt which is as humble as faith. It is the unknowing mind with its triviality, its uncertainties, its double vision, from which we have most to fear. And if we get the knowing in place of the unknowing mind, it is not of so much account how we get it, as that we get it. For this reason I deprecate any academic discrimination against useful knowledge. If utility can create the knowing mind, we want its aid.

I would accept at any time the moral result of serious thinking on the inferior subject in place of less serious thinking upon the greater subject.

The mental gymnastics of the old dialectic had no ethical value. The subject-matter of discourse might be God himself, but that did not necessarily make the discourse religious or moral. It was the play of the mind, not its serious business. No one, I am sure, can overlook the immense moral gain which has taken place through the transfer of thought in so large degree from speculation to sober inquiry. Very much of the change is due of course to the incoming of such a vast amount of new subject-matter within reach of the human mind. It was natural that men should now begin to search where before they had tried to conjecture, and that they should attempt to prove or disprove what before they had affirmed. The change of method soon became, as I have said, morally significant. After the first excitements and confusions attendant upon the change the idealizing process set in. A type of mind was developed which instinctively put first the love of truth.

Next to the reverence for knowledge, which is akin to the love of truth, I should insist, in our idealizing process, upon the morality of that more active discipline which characterizes modern education. The old education, as we well know, was based morally on the will trained to obedience. It was not a passive training. It is never passive to obey. But it was not an active discipline in the sense in which modern training is carried on. And, in so far as the material of training lay in the past, the mind was set upon interpretation more than upon creative or productive work. The receptive faculties were by no means exclusively developed, for there

was always a fine appeal to the imagination and to the sensibilities, but the prescription of subjects put education largely into the hands of the master.

Modern education lays the stress upon the discovery of the individual to himself, preferably by himself. It does not remove the period of intellectual compulsion, but it reduces that period to the limits of early training. It addresses itself necessarily to the will, but it changes the appeal as soon as practicable from obedience to choice. Its first effort is to awaken, its second and constant effort to create the sense of responsibility. Education is made co-operative. It is made as quickly as possible the consenting, choosing action of the mind. Modern education rests upon the individuality of the individual, not upon his necessary likeness to others. It assumes that the mind of each individual if properly awakened, and left free to act, will separate itself from other minds for the satisfaction of its own desires, and for the development of its own powers. The logical outcome of this conception is not the compulsory course of study, continued beyond the necessary elements of knowledge in the farther interest of discipline or of culture, but the elective course of study in the interest of self-development and personal attainment in knowledge. It takes the risks of intellectual freedom for the sake of the greater possibilities of intellectual freedom.

Now the ethical quality which resides in freedom is responsibility, and the intellectual expression of responsibility is choice. Will the one thus choosing become morally a strong man? Not necessarily. It is not safe to argue from intellectual obedience, even to a creed, that the further result will be complete moral character. You may have the immoral scholar, as you may have the

immoral believer. But the morality of the intellect is not the least among the guarantees of general morality. And the intellect trained by responsibility ought to be as strong morally as the intellect trained by obedience. There is, I think, a certain elevation which comes to one who has found and proven himself, which can hardly be reached in any other way—a kind of scorn for that incapacity for nobler things which leads one to do the meaner thing. I have seen college men on their way to littleness and shame so often recovered and saved by the intellectual awakening through some subject of personal choice, a subject without any moral significance in itself, that I cannot doubt the ethical value of the method. I am not concerned with the moral supremacy of either method. It is quite too early to determine this point. What we need to do is to recognize the moral element in the method, which for other ends, we have adopted. We can make modern training a morality if we will. The elements of moral power are present and active. The full recognition of them is a great means to their development.

Beyond the reverence for knowledge which is akin to the love of truth, and the recognition of the moral power which is latent in an active intellectual discipline, I would see our modern education permeated with the sense of the social obligation. The essential nobility of the old education lay in the open fact that it was for somebody. There was no concealment of this purpose. It was graven on all the foundations of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and on many of those laid in the nineteenth century. It was blazoned on their seals. It was illustrated in the life of devotion which characterized so large a proportion of the earlier graduates.

They sought the most direct avenues of approach to the heart of humanity.

There can be no other kind of nobility worthy of the purpose of any great school of learning. A training which lacks these motives, or which fails to keep this aim in full view, cannot be touched with ideality. But modern education meets the difficulty that it must fit men for an immensely widening application of the principle. Under the old education the great services were delegated. Elect souls were set apart for high and exceptional duties. It was the age of the prophet, the missionary, the reformer, and the occasional man of public career. Today it is not possible for one educated man to find a place where he can be free from the social obligation. It has become the task of modern education to train the average man for duties which are sufficiently imperative and exacting for the exceptional man. The opportunity of the more devoted callings of other times is matched in every department of life. The decision of a great judge, the example of a great employer, the insight of a great teacher, the self-sacrifice of a great investigator, all rank among the powers which make for righteousness. The "hard sayings" of our generation which those only who can hear them are able to receive, are concerned with integrity, justice, courage, charity and sacrifice. Sacrifice, I say, and to the degree of christian consecration.

The highest place in our land, if to position be added permanency, is a seat on the bench of the Supreme Court. When a man puts by the offer of this position that he may serve an alien and dependent people in the interest of the common humanity, I rank this surrender to duty among the consecrated examples of the foreign

missionary service. And if our foreign policy as a nation shall develop a like spirit among those who aspire to, or who accept political office, we shall bring back again that old fundamental unity which made of one spiritual kin the servants of the church and of the state.

It was in view of these demands that I said a little while ago that the greatest present need in the educational world was that of an ethical revival at the heart of education. The idealizing process of which I have spoken must somehow culminate in righteousness. And if it be asked again, Is modern education capable of such idealism? I say, yes, provided the question be accepted not as a question, but as a challenge.

XXIII

NEW IDEALS BEFORE THE YOUTH OF THE COUNTRY

ADDRESS BEFORE THE HAMPTON COUNTY TEACHERS' CONVENTION, SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

We are witnessing one of the most interesting and one of the most impressive of those social and moral phenomena which from time to time arrest our attention, namely, a change in ideals in the midst of the activities of our generation. It is like the change of front in the midst of battle. The ideals which were most influential and most persuasive among the men who have virtually done their work are no longer influential and persuasive among the men who are beginning their work: or as it may be more exactly said, the former ideals have ceased to be ideals. They exist, but not as ideals. They have hardened into conventional forms of activity. But no generation can be satisfied with itself, or with its work, without ideals, certainly not those who are entering a generation. It is the prerogative of youth to see visions; and no generation can become so conventionalized and commonplace that somebody will not exercise the right and thereby incite his fellows.

One phase of this change in ideals has been brought out sharply by so sagacious an observer as the editorial writer in "Life," under date of October 4th of the present year. I quote his words:

"The sentiment, so strong in the generation that began to vote thirty years ago, that the chief end of a

young man is to get some money, seems to have suffered some abatement of strength in current years. It is a sentiment to the clamor of which no reasoning man is altogether deaf, but really it seems not to be so generally the moving sentiment of the young Americans of today as of the generations that followed the Civil War and closed out the nineteenth century. It has been complained of us Americans that we are much too exclusively bent on material acquisition, and that our whole apparatus seemed to be devoted and subordinated to money-making. These new young men have room for something else in their heads.

"Not only is the extreme of selfish materialism disenchanting as they see it and read about it, but other sorts of endeavor are attractive by contrast. Without doubt, President Roosevelt's remarkable public career has had great influence on the generation following his own."

I think that it would be unjust to speak of the past generation as simply a money making and money loving generation. I take issue with the term often used to characterize that time—the commercial spirit. That term should not be, it should not be assumed to be, a term of reproach. The spirit of commerce is an honorable spirit, the spirit of far reaching enterprise, the spirit of reciprocity. The spirit which we mean to condemn is the spirit of greed, which may exist anywhere. And this, as I have just said, was not the spirit of the past generation. Let me take a moment to bring back the spirit which characterized that generation at the beginning, and which furnished the motive power for the remarkable material results which followed. The generation which fought the Civil War was under the constant and intense action of high moral ideals. The

discussions upon slavery, which led up to the War, greatly aroused the young men of the country. The debates in Congress were studied in the schools and colleges. Some of the more notable speeches like those of Seward, and Sumner, and later of Lincoln, were reproduced in part in declamation and debate. When the call to War came, the latent feeling which had been gathering for so many years suddenly crystallized into action. Then followed the years of struggle and sacrifice in which every home in the country bore its share.

It was impossible, in the nature of events, that another moral crisis of equal significance should follow immediately upon the conclusion of the Civil War. Had there been another crisis, the moral feeling of the nation could not have been maintained at the same tension. Fortunately in many ways, the moral crisis through which the nation had passed, creating its own ideals, was followed by a period of startling material development. Almost immediately the scientific spirit took possession of the worn and burdened minds of men as a reviving force. Men in this country began in the late sixties and early seventies to think about the theory of "Evolution," and to discuss the questions which it involved. Meanwhile discoveries in physical science were awakening and stimulating public attention. The country itself was open for enterprises of greater dimensions than had before been undertaken or proposed. New portions of the country whose values had been unsuspected were exploited, transcontinental lines of railroad were planned and undertaken, inventions, which gave a new meaning to the ordinary industries, came in rapid succession before the public, and a vast army of immigrants ready to match with their hands the schemes of

inventors and promoters, poured into the country year by year. The whole situation during the decade of the seventies was a challenge to the young men of that decade, to do pioneer work in the development of the material resources of the country. They undertook their task in the spirit of the pioneer, not the same as that of the reformer, but of itself a very high spirit. Money making was not the first impulse. The great fortunes which were accumulated at that time were not made in the love of money, but in the joy of enterprise, initiative, and newly awakened power. Many fortunes which were won were lost, and the losers kept at their task without complaint. It was good for men to be at work, and nearly all men of any capacity felt how good it was. The ideals of the time were not exactly moral ideals when compared with those of the previous generation, but they were ideals. Life in the thought of young men of that day was neither a grievous nor a sordid thing. Their ideals held them to free and generous, and, for the most part, to honorable activity.

I give this interpretation of the more spiritual forces which were at work at the beginning of the period of material development, because I believe they were the sources of its power. I repeat, in another form, what I said at the beginning, that no generation undertakes a great work of any sort except under the power of some ideal. Ideals vary greatly, but ideals there must be, if there are to be any great and far reaching results. The money making spirit never gave rise to those conditions out of which great fortunes were made. The springs then, as always, were among the hills. But out of this material development there came the opportunity for easier and more remunerative results. Then the money

making spirit laid hold of men showing its influence in definite forms—first, in opening the way to social and political power and, secondly, in opening the way to luxury. Some men made money to use it for political or other organized forms of power, and some made money that they, or their families, might spend it. The social competition which began with the money making period has continued up to the present time with more or less disastrous results. But whether the result of money making, detached from the earlier spirit of adventure and enterprise requiring its own sacrifices, has found its large expression in great fortunes, or in political power, or in social preferment with its accompanying luxury, the result warrants the conclusion of the editorial writer in "Life." The conclusion of the whole matter as shown in some of the characteristic representatives of this later period is not attractive to young men. To quote again from the article to which I have referred:

"It is not surprising that likely young men, when they contemplate such shapes as now stand for the biggest commercial success and observe the general contempt that many of them inspire, and inquire into the reasons for that contempt, and find them pretty sound, should exclaim: 'Gracious heavens! We don't want to be things like these!'"

I do not say that the spirit of initiative or of enterprise, or of high purpose, is no longer to be found in the business world; far from it. There are men who illustrate that spirit today as clearly as any of their predecessors. But it is evident that, to the minds of many young men, the ideals which gave us our present prosperity are not now so far controlling it as to make the

results of it attractive. The persons in whom prosperity has culminated are not morally stimulating or encouraging. Many of them are discontented with the results of their own achievements. In fact, just at present, discontent seems to be the prevailing characteristic of the very rich, showing itself in various forms of restlessness. The discontent of the rich is in some respects a more serious criticism upon the present social order than the discontent of the poor. The discontent of the poor shows itself in a struggle for the betterment of social conditions. The discontent of the rich shows the folly of relying upon outward conditions for contentment; and as this kind of discontent becomes manifest in so many public ways, it reacts upon the minds of the young, who are seeking satisfaction in ideals. Hence, the search for other ideals than those which seem to be no longer able to control the search after wealth. Money making may have some very satisfying ends before it, but the amount of money made is not one of them. There is no longer any doubt that a very considerable part of the high minded and reflective youth of the country is in search of ideals which may give personal satisfaction and an inspiring career. It is the most encouraging fact in our present educational development. It is the fact of which at present those of us who are in any way concerned with education ought to take cognizance, partly that we ourselves may be of good cheer in our work, and partly that through our own recognition of it we may be able to interpret it rightly to others.

Among these new, and as yet unformed ideals, I recognize those which look toward the way in which things should be done rather than to the material results which

follow from the doing of them. The most noticeable expression of this tendency lies in the growing passion for reform. A good many men in our cities, and throughout the country, seem to be determined that certain things shall be done in the right way—that business shall be conducted honestly, that government shall be conducted fairly, that blundering incompetency and dishonest sharpness shall alike be driven out of business and out of politics. Something of this passion for reform will pass away as its object is accomplished. The time may be nearer at hand than we think when our cities will be ruled honestly and efficiently, and when our great enterprises, at least those of a semi-public nature, will be conducted in the interest of the public. What is the permanent principle which lies at the heart of this craving for honesty in method? What will remain of a constructive sort when the more insistent demands for reform have been satisfied? Honesty in method, truthfulness in detail, reality in the whole expression of any great purpose—these make up the spirit of art. All art, which has any enduring power, which is really art, rests upon truth. Unconsciously perhaps, but really, we are beginning to develop, as a people, the true artistic spirit. We become unsatisfied, then dissatisfied, then disgusted with sham, whether in the form of unjust government, or of dishonesty in business, or of showy and meretricious architecture, or of insincere and hollow social forms, or of superficiality in any of its more enticing aspects. It is a good sign when people feel that offences against morals are offences against taste. The growth in moral sense shows itself in sensitiveness toward the violation of good form. What we first feel as being inappropriate, or for any

reason improper, we feel still more, if we continue to think about it, as in itself wrong. A "gang" of corrupt politicians gets possession of a city. Only a few have occasion to see their corrupt practices, but every intelligent and refined citizen feels the incongruity of the situation. The city is something great and fair, something to be honored and loved. It is the home of men and women and little children. It is the place of honorable business. It represents the hospitality of industry, of education, of religion, of art. No one can think of a thing so fair as being soiled and defiled by low and corrupt men without disgust which may deepen into wrath. What is true of the city is true in a measure of every great business enterprise which concerns the public, especially if it has any charitable intent. What is true of politics and business is true of everything which gets a corporate existence. Corporations may be born without souls, but if they do not acquire souls, we do not trust them, or long tolerate them.

I believe that we are gradually emerging from the materialistic into the artistic way of looking at things. The artistic spirit has begun to express itself, as I have said, in a certain discontent with riches. All mere accumulations are seen to be unsatisfying. By and by, the same spirit will begin to show itself in those who are struggling after merely material rewards of their labor. Some little time ago, in speaking before a body representing the interests of labor, I remarked:

"The wage is not, and never can be, the sufficient reward of labor. This is just as true of the salary as of the wage. The difference at present lies in the fact that the person on a low salary is apt to take more satisfaction in his work than the person on a high wage—the

school teacher on $800 or $1,000 a year in distinction from the mechanic on $4 or $6 a day. The present ambition of the higher wage earner seems to incline more to the pecuniary rewards of his work than to the work itself. Doubtless this tendency is due in no slight degree to the fact that the wage earner is brought into constant and immediate contact with the money making class. He sees that the value of the industry is measured chiefly by its profits. Sometimes the profits are flaunted in his face. At all times the thing in evidence to him is money. I deprecate this constant comparison between the capitalist and the laborer. The comparison were far better taken between the workman and other men whose chief reward is not money. The old time professions still live and maintain their position through a certain detachment from pecuniary rewards. The exceptional doctor may receive large fees, but his profession forbids him to make a dollar out of any discovery which he may make in medicine. The exceptional minister may receive a large salary, but his profession puts the premium upon self-denying work. Even the law is more distinctively represented by the moderate salary of the average judge than by the retainer of the counsel for a wealthy corporation. The skilled workman, the artisan, belongs with these men, not with the money makers. In allowing himself to be commercialized he enters upon a cheap and unsatisfying competition. His work is an art, and he has the possible rewards of an artist. Under mediævalism the guild and the university were not far apart. I should like to see the relation restored and extended."

I know of no way in which we can develop more surely the artistic spirit in school than by insisting upon

the art of doing things well. Almost anything done as well as it can be done gives the moral effect of art. In the report of the Yale Faculty upon athletics, football is defended and upheld very largely on the ground that it represents more than almost anything else the thing which is well done in college. There lies its educational, and to a degree, its moral effect. For the same reason, we are deriving much aid from our manual schools. Some scholars are there learning, as they would not learn elsewhere, the art of doing things well. If we can inculcate this spirit in our schools, we shall reap the high reward of our work in the love for work itself, whatever the occupation may be, implanting it in the mind, which will protect it ever after from the inordinate craze for merely material results.

Among the new and as yet unformed ideals, we recognize further those which look toward personal development as a means to contentment and satisfaction. As I am now speaking not of ideals in theory, but of ideals which are becoming facts, I call your attention to the evidence that this particular class of ideals is receiving public recognition elsewhere as well as here. Arthur Benson writing in the "Academy" interprets education to Englishmen as follows:

"Instead of thinking it is a process," he says, "which ought to end in making men and women more simple, more content, more happy, we have a vague idea that it will enable us to retain our commercial superiority and to keep ahead of America and Germany. The success, in my belief, of German education is attested not by their commercial prosperity, but by the fact that Germans are genuinely devoted to intellectual and artistic pleasures."

Commenting on this statement, the "New York Sun," after criticising one phase of Mr. Benson's definition, says:

"On the other hand, that education which looks solely to preparation for earning money is certainly not education at all in the true sense of the term. This is fully understood by educators in this country. It is also understood by many hard headed fathers. The demand of men who have got rich without education, and who send their sons to college, seems to be for an education which shall combine the practical with the ideal. The man who wakes up in the middle of life to find that he cannot enjoy anything but his bath and his dinner (and frequently, because of indigestion, not even the latter), who learns that the world is full of truth and beauty that he cannot penetrate, does not really wish that his son shall tread the same path that he has trodden."

There is no antagonism between utility as an end of education and personal culture when one is properly related to the other. It does not follow that because a thing is useful it is therefore not beautiful and a source of joy. Nature seldom developes beauty through waste of power. But any education which fails to react upon the mind itself is partial and insufficient. One of the most useful persons whom I have ever known, whose life had been a life of devoted service in other lands, when asked what was the general advantage to her of a college education, replied,—"It enables me to enjoy my own mind. It gives me resources upon which I can draw in times of loneliness, even of isolation." I believe that more and more persons of understanding are coming to see the futility of simply doing things without some consequent enrichment of their own lives.

Here again there is a growing discontent on the part of many whose lives are full of activity. The power to do, although the result be a high achievement, is not a completely satisfying power. The sense of personal growth and enlargement, the closer appreciation of the work of others, as well as of one's own work, the larger and more vitalized knowledge, all or some one of these things, becomes essential to people of maturity. Here again by simple reaction, we are coming around to the strictly educational ideal.

More attention is being given to the enrichment of courses in our technical schools looking toward personal culture. The movement started two or three years ago toward shortening the college course had for one object the introduction of the college course as a prerequisite to professional study. There is always danger of a certain amount of snobbishness in the use of the term liberal education, meaning thereby an education which is not set toward some direct end of utility. But the idea itself is one of universal importance and applies quite as much to secondary education, or even to elementary education, as to colleges and universities. The idea is that of making the individual of most value to himself. It takes account of what he is as well as of what he does. It represents the kind of education which insists all the while upon the appreciation of work as well as upon the work itself. It insists that it is more to the individual and to society that we should have broad, sane, well developed, and well tempered people, than that these same people by any lack in these qualities should thereby become more perfect machines. The same principle holds in respect to people of small opportunity as in respect to people of large opportunity. It

is always pitiful to see persons, who have abundant means for seeing the best things in the world, entirely unintelligent and unappreciative travellers, persons who simply move about, who never become travelled people. In like manner, it is quite possible for persons of small means to be unable to acquaint themselves with the best things which are near at hand, for want of even the most elementary self development. Everything in this country is tending toward a larger opportunity for leisure. The eight hour law for labor is setting the standard for work. What are people to do with their leisure? Our schools are to answer, in good part, this question. I believe that it is possible for us, through the ideals we encourage, to make this enlarging opportunity rich in the personal experience of a great many persons who are now in our schools. In fact, I can see, that side by side with the more careful and more strenuous training for work which is going on, we must see to it that there is an equally careful and helpful training toward the use of leisure on the part of these same workers. We no longer have before us the alternative of work and play, but the coming alternative of work and opportunity, opportunity for personal growth, enlargement, and increase of value, both to the individual and to society.

Among these new, and as yet unformed ideals, I recognize still more clearly those which are set directly toward the high ends of service. The past decades have been conspicuous for gifts of money. Most of these gifts have been of great value, as an expression of good judgment and perhaps of some sacrifice on the part of the giver, and also as meeting public wants, from the most urgent necessities of charity to the highest

demands of education. These same decades have not been equally lavish in the direct gifts of personal power. State and church alike have lacked for unselfish men. There are signs of a change in this record. The men who are most conspicuous in their influence today are the men who are giving themselves directly to the service of society, and of the country, and of the world. President Roosevelt has been referred to in one of the quotations which I have given as a man who is doing much, through his personal activities, to change the ideals of American youth. I should put beside him, at this particular point which we are now discussing, Mr. Root and Mr. Taft, both men who have left the opportunities of lucrative professions to give themselves to the most arduous and perplexing problems now before the country. I believe that their course of action will prove to be so influential in shaping the careers of many of the high minded young men of this country that we shall not hereafter lack for real public servants. These examples in high place are matched by men in less conspicuous, but in most responsible, positions in the state and throughout the cities.

The advances which have been made through modern science are due in great measure to the ardent, unselfish and even sacrificing devotion of individual scientists to their tasks. I have had occasion to say, more than once, that the profession which has made the greatest advance during the past generation is the profession of medicine, due in part to its opportunity, but still more to the courage, and daring, and sacrifice, of some members of that profession.

After having had an experience both instructive and profitable as to what can be accomplished indirectly

through wealth, we are coming to set a still higher value upon the things which can be accomplished through personal service. And the opportunities which invite service of a personal sort are increasing, and are becoming more inviting. I can see nothing quite so attractive to a young man of today as the opportunity to give himself, if he be thoroughly furnished and equipped for his work, to some high task of a personal sort; these tasks are so great and so inspiring. A new valuation has been put, during the past years, upon the more personal callings—upon teaching in its enormous range of opportunity, upon politics, upon the ministry including the missionary service, upon business itself, so much more sensitive than ever before on its human side. When Peter Cooper went to New York, a poor young man, he resolved to make a fortune and to devote that fortune to the young men and women of the city. That ideal was continually before him in every detail in the work of his factory. Some men can work to the best advantage toward a remote end. There are men who are illustrating this principle today in all the greater businesses of the country. But the ideals of service which are appealing most effectively at the present time are those which, in some form, give a man immediate contact with his fellows, or with the organized forces of society. All about us, men are rising up who are saying to us, by their example, that there is no joy like the joy of personal devotion and personal sacrifice in the interest of our common humanity.

In calling your attention by this rapid sketch to the change in ideals which is going on in our generation, I have not wished to overestimate the fact or its significance. There is nothing revolutionary about the

change. Apparently things are going on without change in the personal ambitions and plans of men. But underneath the social surface, down where the normal instincts are at work, the change is going on. The old ideals are ceasing to act as ideals. They have hardened into forms, that is, into the mere way of doing things. The new ideals are slowly forming, but they are beginning to assert their claims. They are getting a hearing among those whose ears are keener to hear the still voices than the tumult of the street. They are beginning to show their men, men of the true artistic temper, some able to do the rough, hard work of reform in the interest of truth, some able to do the fine constructive work of truth in thought and expression: men also of high contentment in their possession of the desirable and enjoyable riches of knowledge, taste, and personal culture: and men also capable of service, great in their capacity for service and joyous in their opportunity.

In the formation of these new and struggling ideals we can do much to give them a place in the generation upon whose sensitive material, at its most sensitive time, we are now acting. Our work and its results are at least twenty years apart. The men and women that are to be cannot really declare themselves till long after we have said our last word. It may be asked, Will the ideals, which we now discern and for which we strive, be the practical ideals of those days of action which are yet to come? Dismiss all doubts on this matter. The great artists in the broad and high sense in which I have used the term, builders in truth and reality, looking to the quality of their work: the great characters rich in themselves above all possessions of other men:

and the great servants of men, able to serve, daring to serve, glad to serve—these are they for whom the nation waits. It will not miss them when they come. I count it the special honor of our profession that we may be permitted to introduce so many of them to their future, and to the future of the country.

XXIV

THE STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY GREATNESS

Lecture before the Faculty and Cadets of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

When the present series of lectures was inaugurated, to be given in part by men not of your profession, it was not of course expected that those coming to you from the outside would intrude upon the subjects of your daily routine. Nor was it expected, I assume, that they would speak to you merely in the way of relief or diversion. There are subjects enough of common interest and common concern to intelligent men, however diverse their technical training may be. In fact the training which separates us one from another, rests altogether upon a common discipline, and a common fund of information, and a common intellectual sense and judgment. I take my subject, therefore, from the territory which belongs to us all.

I am sure that you will agree with me when I say that the most necessary complement to professional training of any sort is a proper knowledge of human nature. The man of ideas, of books, of problems, may or may not be the master of men. Here lies the difference between many men who are otherwise of equal power. The art of knowing men, of so knowing them as to be able to handle them, to be able to get the human part as well as the machine part of any man into full action, to bring out in emergencies that last reserve of power

which only a master can reach and command,—this is an art, and a very great art, which can be learned only in the school of experience. It cannot be very much anticipated. But there is another side of this knowledge of human nature which is within earlier reach. Singularly enough it is not so difficult to reach men who are above us, as it is to reach men who are below us. The extraordinary man is more accessible, for certain uses at least, than the ordinary man. In other words it is possible for us to begin to know and to measure great men before we are able to understand human nature at large well enough to utilize it, or fully command it. A great man is like a problem. He falls within those principles and laws and tests with which we are familiar. It is no more impertinent to attempt to analyze such a man than it is to attack a problem in mathematics. And though I cannot promise that the study will yield the same result, I can and do affirm that the process is a legitimate part of all true education. And believing this, I think that I can render you no better service than to speak to you about the understanding of great men, especially those of our own time, as the proper introduction to the knowledge of human nature. The right approach to the knowledge of man is through the knowledge of men, otherwise our knowledge is always academic and doctrinaire.

Further than this I believe that it is the peculiar duty of the trained, the educated man of every sort, to make himself competent to pass judgment upon men in the various departments of public life, not official life only, but public life; judgment which shall be discriminating, appreciative, authoritative it may be, corrective at least of all partial, prejudiced or uninformed opinions,

whether popular or professional. The cultivation of judgment of this kind seems to me to be one of the higher functions of education. I can hardly hope to give you more than an illustration of my meaning, but I will try to do this by discussing with you some of the more modern types of greatness. I shall not have very much to say about individual men, but we will examine together some of the types of greatness which are now forming, or coming to the front, to see how far they conform to those tests which time has established.

Some years ago, as I was walking with a friend, he put to me the abrupt question, "Who is your great man, your great man of today?" My answer is immaterial, but upon returning the question to him, he replied at once, "I think that I should say Pasteur." Now my friend was altogether a literary man, with no leaning whatever toward the natural sciences, although a man of cosmopolitan habit of mind. When therefore he referred without hesitation to the great French naturalist (of whom Mr. Huxley said that his experiments were worth to France the cost of the Franco-Prussian war), as his type of modern greatness, his answer seemed to me to be very significant. It seemed to me to indicate not only the incoming, but the recognition of the incoming of a new type of greatness, a type so distinct and honorable that we must make room for it.

I was still more impressed with the necessity of enlarging our notions of what belongs within the range of contemporary greatness, as I had occasion to pass judgment on the list of famous Americans, candidates for the Hall of Fame. It was easy enough to fill out the required number from among the old fashioned favorites,—authors, statesmen, soldiers: but here were

new men of equal value, if not of equal renown, to be taken into account—inventors, explorers, philanthropists, men of affairs. No age can afford to be provincial in its judgment. The boundaries of greatness are enlarging, and he who would know the modern world must first of all know the men who are making it.

These illustrations are sufficient to suggest the fact that while greatness has its invariable qualities, what I shall call its constants, through which it lays hold upon all ages, it has also its variations, sufficient to produce types, through which it may be more strictly identified with a given age. A great man may be great enough to owe nothing to his surroundings. Such a phenomenon occasionally appears. His own time may not recognize him. It may be difficult for after times to place him among his contemporaries. Such has been the fortune of Shakespeare. To each succeeding age he is modern, the companion of all thinking men, and of all heroic souls.

But greatness for the most part is something which can be localized. Usually it is wrought out openly and plainly before the eyes of men. Without explaining the process, they can see here and there one of their own number actually becoming great, by taking up into himself the material which is common to them all, but which they cannot assimilate or control. He sees the things which lie unnoted, perhaps undiscovered, at their feet. He rules with the ease of power among the forces which they feel, but which they cannot master. He is supremely, almost divinely beneficent, under the very conditions and before the very difficulties to which they succumb in a complaining or despairing weakness. I think that that which enhances the greatness of a great

man is the fact that he is seen and felt to be great in the same circumstances in which other men consciously fall short, or abide in the commonplace.

If then greatness can, as a rule, be localized, if great men do take on appreciable growths, and gradually separate themselves from those with whom they have so much in common, it is well for us to look on and watch the process, whenever we have the opportunity. We cannot afford to ignore or underestimate contemporary greatness. There we see greatness in the making. We see of course the early crudity, the frequent mistakes, it may be the temporary failure, but we also see what we can see no where else, how it is that men are born into the *world,* how they get out of the provincial into the universal, how they actually "achieve" greatness. As I pass therefore to speak more definitely of some modern types of greatness, I shall try to point out, not by name but by quality, who is the great man of today.

By common consent, the foremost quality of greatness is originality. Certainly no man can reach the highest order of greatness without it. I do not propose to stumble over the definition of originality, but I would like to say for our present purpose, that to my mind it does not consist in thinking away from men, but rather in thinking toward truth, toward fact, toward reality. To differ with others does not make one original. It makes one simply odd. Oddity is mere divergence of opinion, a falling out to the right hand or the left. Originality is that difference of the one from the many which can be measured on a straight line toward the truth. The original man is the man ahead of the rest of us, not the man moving at a tangent. The original mind is the mind nearest the truth, and yet original-

ity is not remoteness from men; it is simply nearness to reality. It declares itself with unmistakable genuineness in the investigator who forces his way through traditions and theories into the presence of facts which have been waiting his coming; in the poet who lives at the heart of the common humanity: in the prophet whose conscience clarifies his mental vision: in any master of men who can divine motives, interpret events, and organize for results according to his insight. "That virtue of originality," Ruskin used to say in his grand impatience, "which men so strive after is not newness, as they vainly think, it is only genuineness. It all depends on the single glorious faculty of getting to the spring of things and working out from that. It is the coolness and clearness and deliciousness of the water fresh from the fountain head, opposed to the thick, hot, unrefreshing drainage from other men's meadows."

I should put without hesitancy as the next essential of greatness, authority, the compelling force, the force which somehow puts the original idea of purpose into the event. Authority is not expressed in mere assertiveness, and it has no certain equivalent in influence. Influence does not always force a conclusion. Authority is that power, it is the only power, which deals with those hesitant and unwilling forces, which are so often necessary to progress. Authority does not always declare itself in leadership. There are times when leadership is impossible. Men will not be led, they will not respond to the summons, or even to the challenge to duty. At such times the authoritative element often appears to clearest and finest advantage. The man who possesses it remains the master of himself, if not of his time. He refuses to surrender or compromise his pur-

pose, he refuses to lower himself to the commonplace, he resists the depressing, deadening influences about him, and finally accomplishes in men who come after him, what he could not accomplish through his contemporaries. I recall the use which George Adam Smith makes of the great figure of Isaiah, "a man shall be as an hiding place from the tempest, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land;" that as a rock set in the desert stays the drift of the sand till the seeds blown by the same wind catch at its base and spring into verdure; so a great man may set his back against the drift of the commonplace, and stay its deadly sweep, till the new life of the age has time to take root and a new civilization springs up at his feet. That, it seems to me, is a fit illustration of authority. The authoritative man is as clear cut a figure when he compels a halt in the dull, heavy, deadening tramp of a race or of an age, as when he heads the march to freedom.

I think that you will agree with me, though you will want considerable latitude in the application of the term, when I say that one other essential quality of greatness is beneficence. We shall certainly agree that no merely destructive person, whether in war, politics, or literature, can be termed great. The only question which we should wish to investigate before passing judgment on any one of destructive method would be, was his method necessary or legitimate, was he the rebel, the skeptic, the iconoclast in the interest of freedom or truth. I will not follow the temptation to illustrate at this point, but content myself rather with reaffirming the beneficent quality as indispensable to greatness. Give the term what range you will, allow the widest interpretation, be tolerant of motives and methods,

but never surrender this ingredient or factor of greatness: do not make greatness a synonym of force, not even in the shape of intellectualism. As Emerson says of Napoleon, who, under the most favorable conditions, tried the experiment of divorcing intellectual power from conscience, "He did all that in him lay to live and thrive without moral principle. It was the nature of things, the eternal law of man and of the world which balked and ruined him: and the result in a million of experiments will be the same."

These then are the constants of greatness—originality, authority, beneficence. They rule through all the ages. We cannot have greatness without them. Men as they come up in each generation on their way to greatness must pass these tests. They tell us whether men are really great or not. It is not necessary, as I have intimated, that these constants of greatness should exist in equal proportion in a given case. Naturally one quality will predominate. But each lends something to the others. They may be transposed: one may be cause, the other effect. Beneficence may stimulate originality, or it may be the outgrowth and result of the originating intellectual impulse. Authority in its highest exercise implies both originality and beneficence.

What now shall we say is the opportunity which our times afford for the exercise of these qualities which make for greatness? Is greatness, as we see it in the making, being developed under originality, or by authority, or through beneficence? Are the great men of our time great because they are original, or because they are authoritative, or because they are beneficent?

In what direction and under what form shall we look for originality? Other ages have passed through our

experience, namely the sense of intellectual confusion consequent upon the sudden arrest of accepted principles and methods of thought. Ours is not the first age to meet the stout challenge of doubt in the interest of the greater truth. And the change, which we are now seeing that such a conflict effects in the expression of originality, is in no wise unusual. Poetry, for example, demands the great certainties. It is the child of faith, not of doubt, not even of inquiry. It does not question: it interprets. We have not lacked for great poets, but they have been mostly an inheritance—Tennyson with his larger hope, Lowell with his passion for public righteousness. Neither one of these, nor all of our time, with the possible exception of Browning, can be said to be the product of the time. If I were asked to name a poet born out of the intellectual conditions which are fast passing, and still a poet, I should unhesitatingly name Matthew Arnold, the poet of doubt, and yet a poet in spite of his doubt, retreating continually into the remaining certainties of faith; if a poet born out of conditions just now dominant, I should name Rudyard Kipling, the poet of force; force in man, or in things.

From the nature of the case we must turn from poetry to science to find the present incentive to originality. Science, especially natural science, has made two contributions to the originality of our age. It has given a new, a most fascinating, and an increasingly beneficent field for research and inquiry. When my friend referred to Pasteur as his present exemplification of greatness, he had in mind, I think, quite as much the beneficence as the originality of the work of the great experimenter. His exploration of that "third realm of nature" as the world in which he toiled has been

styled, that populous territory lying between the animate and inanimate creation, gives us the nearest approach which we have yet gained to the mystery of life and death.

But if the beneficence of science is yet to be more fully established, nothing is wanting to show its intellectual impulse. No one can overestimate the effect of this opening of new territory upon an age which had begun to lament its limitations and barrenness. The power to invade unknown realms of nature with theory and experiment, and to explore as well as discover, has given to our time something of the adventurous spirit of the age which ushered in the modern epoch. Indeed we are much more closely related to that age of adventure and discovery than to any preceding age of subtle metaphysics, or of religious mysticism. We literally feel the enlargement of the earth and of the world. The proportion of the new to the old is increasing, and though the stage of wonder and bewilderment has nearly passed, we are still living in the pleasurable excitement of expectation.

I have been very much interested in the contrast between the optimism of the scientist, and the pessimism of the literary man which Dr. Minot of Harvard drew, in his address at Baltimore before the American Society of Naturalists. "The best," he says, "that we gain from the pursuit of research is, I believe, our characteristic optimism. We are engaged in achieving results, and results of the most permanent quality. A business man may achieve a fortune, but time will dissipate it. A statesman may be the savior of a nation, but how long do nations live? Knowledge has no country, belongs to no class, but is the might of mankind, and it is

mightier for what each of us has done. We have brought our stones, and they are built into the edifice, and into its grandeur. My stone is a small one. It will be certainly forgotten that it is mine, nevertheless it will remain in place.

"How different is the pessimism toward which literary men are seen to tend: Harvard University lost James Russell Lowell in 1892, and Asa Grey in 1888. The letters of both of these eminent men have been published. Lowell's letters grow sad and discouraged, and he gives way more and more to the pessimistic spirit. Grey is optimistic to the end. The difference was partly due to natural temperament, but chiefly, I think, to the influence of their respective professions. The subject material of the literary man is familiar human nature and familiar human surroundings, and his task is to express the thoughts and dreams which these suggest. He must compete with the whole past, with all the genius that has been. There is nothing new under the sun, he exclaims. But to us it is a problem contradicted by our own experience."

I cannot accept this conclusion, let me say in passing. There is a mistake here, as it seems to me, in confounding the pathos of literature with pessimism. Literature is the interpretation of human life. But the progress of human life, even on its most heroic plane as it moves to divinest ends, is pathetic. The optimism of science is based on the calculation of certainties. Science takes no backward step unless it be to retrieve an error. There are none of those strange fluctuations in its career, which attend the enthusiasm of men sometimes guided to right ends, sometimes misguided, often issuing in corresponding depressions. The attitude of science

is continually expectant. The imagination of the poet, the faith of the seer, have nothing to offer in the way of newness at all comparable with the discoveries of the scientist. Science therefore free from the fluctuation incident to human progress, untouched by the pathos of human life, continually watching for more fact, must be optimistic up to the last limit of certainty. There the optimism of science fails. But it is just there that the optimism of literature, as expressing the hope and faith of humanity begins. Up to that point, it may be the pathos which is mistaken for pessimism, then, the calm or exultant assurance of faith. Just where the scientist ceases to tread with firm and certain step, the poet takes wing.

Acknowledging, within its limits, the optimism of science, I add that the contribution of science to the originality of our time is most marked in the creation of the scientific spirit. Having first startled, then angered the established mind of the age, it soon began to stimulate and vivify. The present fact is that the scientific spirit has set everybody to thinking. Some were not prepared for it, some will get no further than confusion, some will stick in some kind of denial or unbelief; the few will lead the way into the clearer thought and into the higher and more certain faith, and the multitude will follow. The tendency is toward originality, not merely as expressed in investigation, but in high reasoning and in the assertion of principles and ideas which will take rule. The age may yet culminate in song. When the certainties shall have come round again with a deeper meaning, and the spiritual shall have regained the supremacy, not by reaction, but by advance and prog-

ress, we may find amongst us those who can give us the vision of the new earth and the new heaven.

But if our times promise originality rather than illustrate its highest workings, more than this, I think, can be said for that expression of greatness which I have termed authority. I believe that our age will go into history as one of the masterful ages, not merely in the show of power but in the reality of it. Even on the material plane, results have been achieved which bear the stamp of the authoritative mind. As has been pointed out by others, the millionaire is no longer the man of painful thrift and miserly savings, but the man of calculation, of broad plans, and equally bold ventures, not usually reckless if sometimes unscrupulous. A term has arisen in our day covering a vast deal of enterprise very largely speculative, but which also covers enterprises that have become events. I refer to the term promoter or projector. A few years ago a picture was hung in the New York Chamber of Commerce, representing a meeting of the promoters of the Atlantic Cable at the home of Cyrus W. Field in Gramercy Park. Each of the group there represented had achieved high success in business or professional life—Peter Cooper, Marshall O. Roberts, David Dudley Field, Moses Taylor, Professor Samuel Morse, and Cyrus W. Field, the brain, heart, and right hand of the daring project. Measure the work of this great promoter by any possible test which can be applied to the authoritative element in greatness and what is lacking? Not faith nor courage, not patience, not power over the unwilling and defiant forces of nature, not persuasion over the reluctant and unassured hearts of men, not the discipline of defeat, not the greater discipline of

success. The undertaking there commemorated was characteristic. It illustrates the tremendous compelling force which has marked the generation. Enterprises which seemed great in their inception seem greater in their accomplishment. They bear the test of competition with the vaster movements and combinations to which they have given rise.

But there are far nobler forces than those hidden in nature or exposed in the markets of the world, which the master minds of the generation have dominated and controlled. At the risk of over much illustration, I want to bring out the higher phases of this element of authority. Few ages have witnessed such uprisings of strong popular instincts as we have had occasion to witness. One instinct has been the passion for national unity. Who among the older of those present does not recall the enthusiasm which attended the struggle for the unification of Italy. But all the moves in the long and dangerous game leading up to that result were made in one brain. For ten years Cavour planned, and kept silent, planned and negotiated, planned and fought, till victory made Italy one and free, according to its birthright and inheritance.

Then came his successor in another field, illustrating still more clearly the compelling force of greatness, Bismark, the iron hearted. Bismark had the German conservatism to work in and through, not the Italian sentiment and passion. His own patriotism was of a different order from that of Cavour, more calculating, in a sense more mechanical in its methods and more objective in its aims. At first it seemed to have been concerned with the rectification of boundaries. "Prussia," he says, "has an unfortunate, impossible configura-

tion: it wants a stomach on the side of Cassel and Nassau, it has a dislocated shoulder on the side of Hanover; it is in the air, and this painful situation compels it to turn without rest in the orbit of the holy alliance. Prussia must round itself and complete its unity." To accomplish his end both prejudices and scruples were to be overcome, alliances were to be broken and made, the secondary states of Germany were to be awed, and above all the German heart was to be fired with the passion for empire. We know the result. The authoritative element was supreme. The unification of Germany is without question the boldest example of authority in modern times, albeit the act itself fairly called out the witticism, that as "the Apostle of the Reformation taught the doctrine of justification by faith, the Apostle of the Empire taught the doctrine of justification by success."

Take now another popular instinct, deeper by far than the craving for unity, and far more difficult to awaken and guide, the instinct of justice, of which we have the one unapproachable example in the guidance of the American people by Abraham Lincoln through the Civil War. It had been no uncommon thing for a people to fight for freedom. We had fought for freedom, but not till then, to make others free. Then came the test of justice. Would the nation fight for national righteousness? Would it sacrifice property, life, possibly existence, that justice might reign without let or hindrance? In answer to this question it may be said that the whole nation rose to greatness, but that greatness was embodied in one man more than in the whole. The thoughts of Lincoln were moral axioms. As the nation grew more earnest it did not reach the depth of

his seriousness. The national conscience never carried the burden of justice which weighted his soul.

In this moral fact lay the secret of Lincoln's authority. How calm, how tender, how almost pathetic it was, but how imperious and commanding! Who could withstand such reasoning as his, which summoned the whole nature into the service of the argument? I recall the remark of a veteran politician, who told me that Mr. Lincoln was the only political orator who could change votes. On occasion of a speech at Manchester (New Hampshire) more than two hundred men, to his personal knowledge, left the hall converted to Mr. Lincoln's political faith. Such was the steady and growing compulsion with which he held the conscience of the nation till its task and his task was done. True, we did not know at the time that we were under authority. Now we see it all, and understand that no less an authority than his, and of no other kind, could have wrought out the issue.

Since writing this paragraph, I have read Mr. Emerson's estimate of Lincoln in the address made at the funeral service held in his own town, Concord, on the 19th of April, 1865.

"He—Lincoln—is the true history of the American people in his time. Step by step he walked before them: slow with their slowness, quickening his march by theirs, the true representative of the people: an entire public man: father of his country, the pulse of twenty millions throbbing in his heart, the thoughts of their minds articulate in his tongue."

I repeat my statement that under any analysis of greatness which recognizes authority, our age will rank as one of the masterful ages. Examples of this com-

pelling force are too many to waken surprise. It has been the method of the age. No result has been achieved in the subjugation of nature, or in the consolidation of states, or in the massing of men under the spur of sentiment or conscience, which has not borne witness to it.

In passing now to consider the beneficent element in contemporary greatness, we are at once impressed with the fact that the other elements of greatness have tended to beneficence. Originality in the form of research and investigation has left an appreciable result of physical and social good. Authority has been the instrument of public gain far more than of personal aggrandizement. No political movement of our time has culminated in the fame of one man, like Napoleon, but all have reached their end in the advancement of a nation or a race.

But we are now concerned not so much with that beneficence which is the result of other forms of greatness, as with that beneficence which is in itself a motive and an incentive to greatness. The greatness of many great men can be traced directly to beneficent motives. Without it they would never have risen above the commonplace. Neither the originating nor the authoritative element would have been sufficient. Such was the origin of the greatness of Howard, and of some of the earlier philanthropists. Such the origin of the greatness of the majority, not all, of the anti-slavery agitators and reformers.

Is the spirit of beneficence still at work with sufficient intensity and constancy to produce greatness? I wish it were possible to give a clear and unhesitating answer. A great deal depends upon the power of the causes which appeal to us in the name of humanity, to

excite the imagination. The imagination is quite as necessary an agent in beneficent action as the emotions. The realistic often fails to make an impression in any proportion to the reality. It is the wrong or the need, over which the imagination can brood, which compels to sacrifice and heroism. There can never come again to this age such a call as that which came to Mills and his young comrades from unknown heathen lands. There is no more mystery about any land or race on the face of the earth. The world lies open to our view, exposed in its want and evil. Can the imagination come to the aid of the heart, vivify the familiar knowledge, idealize the hard, dull life of worn and weary peoples and prophesy the new creature restored to the image of God?

In the old cemetery where the founder of my college lies, there runs the epitaph on his tomb—

> "By the Gospel He Subdued the Ferocity
> of the Savage
> And to the Civilized He Opened New Paths of Science.
> Traveller,
> Go, If You Can and Deserve
> The Sublime Reward of Such Merit."

I like to go from time to time to that quiet spot and read that challenge from another century. It seems to say to me, "Go, if you can, man of the twentieth century, and match the heroism of the men who set up liberty, learning, and religion on these shores and sent out their light into all the world." And yet it is hard for one age to accept the challenge of another. Each age must meet its own conflicts and opportunities. The heroism of the pioneers of liberty must find new tasks.

The spirit of consecration, of self surrender, of devotion to ends above self cannot today remain unsatisfied. It will create its own opportunity. It will take possession of objects which might otherwise be lowered or perverted, and lift them to the plane of duty.

I like to think of the incentives of beneficent greatness which are centering today in the idea of patriotism. When one sees the amount of power in our country which is on its way to fortune, the amount of physical, mental, and even moral power which is seeking material wealth, one has no question about the result in power; but he asks with serious question, what will be the type. I like to turn from the uncertainty of the issue, in all this tumultuous outgoing of power, to the certain result when men have consecrated themselves in definite and lasting ways to their country, content to make its fortune their fortune, its greatness their greatness. I say to you in all sincerity that a noble relief upon the background of materialism is to be found in the self surrender of men who have given their life, their fortune, and their honor to the service of their country in the army and in the navy. It is a chivalrous thing to do amid the splendid allurements of material prosperity. But it has its reward.

Your own profession, gentlemen, is one of the best illustrations of the fact that the beneficent motive has its future opportunity, and also that if the opportunity be taken, the result is greatness.

These are the tests to which the greatness of our time as of all time must submit itself—originality, authority, beneficence. These are the tests which we must learn to apply to men who lay claim to greatness. These are the tests which we must apply to ourselves under the

stress of our ambitions and desires. It is not necessary that we should satisfy all these tests equally, but no one of them can be ignored, and as we lessen one we must enlarge the others.

It may not be amiss for me to remind you as I close that the discussion of the hour has turned upon the idea of greatness in distinction from that of genius. "Genius," John Foster says, "lights its own fires." There is an independent and incalculable element in it which forbids classification. We cannot arrange genius in types. It illustrates nothing except itself. It enters an age, but leaves no open door behind it. Genius is without companionship, save in the universal heart, and is above the effect of enmities. We are moved by it, enlightened, stimulated, but it can tell us little or nothing of itself, and it cannot help us to interpret ourselves or our times.

Greatness is appreciable. It can be understood and utilized. There are gradations which lead up step by step from the common to the great. We may not be able to take them, but we can see them. Great men were not always great. They had a beginning and a growth and a consummation of power. Genius is the same from the beginning to the end. We cannot trace its sources nor define its limits.

The effect of genius lasts from age to age, but we are moved by contemporary greatness as we are not moved by the greatness of other times. I do not forget, as I say this, the mythical element which time contributes to great deeds and great men. It seems to put them beyond the reach of criticism. But with this advantage, they do not greatly affect us. Unconsciously it may be, but with hardly an exception, we make allowance for the

effect of time, and turn to those of like passions with ourselves. In eliminating faults, we eliminate life. Our contemporaries may suffer from underestimation, but they walk amongst us in flesh and blood.

I deprecate the merely critical attitude of the schools, or of educated men, toward contemporary greatness. Criticism, if it is intelligent and honest, is wholesome to those who give and to those who receive, but its office at best is secondary. The thoughtful man should be sympathetic, appreciative, discerning. A great man, despite his faults, is the greatest possession of an age, next to a principle or a truth. Through him one interprets the collective life of his time; through him he reads the history of the age. Through him he gets his proper approach to human nature. The great danger which besets us in our estimation of human nature is that of indifference or of contempt. The average man may not interest us. But if we are to do with men in the way of utilizing or controlling them, we must know them; and the first condition of knowledge is interest, then respect, then faith. I have tried to show you what seems to me to be the true way into our common humanity. The greater man, whom we can know, honor, and trust, not the lesser man, whom we have not yet learned to know and measure, should be our guide.

AA 000 340 311 0

CENTRAL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
University of California, San Diego

DATE DUE

JUN 17 1978
JUN 20 1978
JUN 20 1978

CI 39

UCSD Libr.