

# DR. ELIOT'S COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

propose to discuss the contemporary American conceptions of equality among men as a social and political ideal.

The French revolution was preceded by an extraordinary discussion of the structure of human society, the foundations of government, and the rights of the individual man. A school of social philosophers undertook to reconstruct theoretically human society and the state. Eminent among these writers was J. J. Rousseau, whose most famous contribution to the subject was his treatise on the "Social Contract." In that remarkable treatise, Rousseau thus defines his ideal of equality among men: "If one examines in what consists precisely the best good of all, which ought to be the aim of every system of legislation, one will find that it may be reduced to these two principal objects, liberty and equality; liberty, because individual private dependence is a weakness taken from the body of the state; equality, because liberty cannot exist without it."

Does not this suppose that equality means that every one has the same amount of power or of wealth; but insists that power shall be exercised by virtue of law, or of rank determined by law, and that wealth shall moderate and well distributed, so that no citizen shall be rich enough to oppress another, or poor enough to be obliged to sell himself." He recognizes that "the force of things tends always to destroy equality," but argues thence that the force of legislation ought always to tend to create and maintain it. Rousseau had always in mind his excellent definition of liberty: "Obedience to a law which one has himself prescribed."

**The Theory of Paine.**

From the French philosophers who preceded the French revolution the American leaders of thought who gradually brought about independence in Great Britain and set up this republic, derived some of their theories and phrases; but these theories and phrases were not carried far into their theories or their legislation. Thomas Paine, the merits of whose political philosophy were, and still are, overshadowed by the violence of his language against kings, priests, and quakers, as set forth in his famous pamphlet, entitled "Common Sense," Rousseau's doctrine of equality; but in Paine's mind it was not equality to be asserted against distinctions of rank or power transmitted by birth or hereditary succession prescribed by law. Thus he says, "For all men being originally equals, no one by birth could have a right to set up his own family in preference to all others for ever, and though himself might deserve some decent degree of honors of his contemporaries, yet his descendants, might be far too unworthy to inherit them."

His main object in mentioning a natural equality of men was to contend against the artificial inequalities established in empires, kingdoms, and ranks of nobility. "Common Sense" was written during the siege of Boston, and is essentially an argument for separation from Great Britain. It is clear that in the minds of both the French and American political philosophers of the eighteenth century, the word "equality" was used in a relative and limited sense, and not in an absolute or universal sense.

**Jefferson's Idea.**

The Declaration of Independence adopted July 4, 1776, by the representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, contains a strong affirmation of human equality, and also affirms clearly that the object of government is to give the governed liberty and security: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Later the same document declares that it is the duty of mankind to throw off the government which evinces a desire to rule them under despotism, and to provide new guards for their future liberty. In other words the phrase "all men are created equal," probably due to Jefferson and the Congress, meant that it meant to the social philosophers of France or to Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Paine; and it is plain that the American common people had no theoretical views about the equality of all men at birth which preceded them from holding negroes as slaves. But there the phrase stands in the Declaration of Independence; and by the lapse of a century and a third, during which period, we have had the new experience about both political equality and social equality, it may be interesting what it means to the means of today.

**Conditions in America.**

Americans have never had occasion to consider social equality as the condition of the settled ranks and di-

versities of condition prescribed by law under the feudal system and maintained rigidly by hereditary succession. No title and no office has ever been hereditary in the United States. Furthermore, Americans have never had any experience of any of the artificial divisions of society called "Castes," the privileges or disabilities of which are transmitted by inheritance. Again the absence of an establishment of religion, or an established church, in the United States, has tended to prevent the existence of a privileged and authoritative class of persons distinct from the rest of the community. The clergy of an established authoritative church has always been a standing illustration of equality among men, in whatever sort of state and under whatever religion they have existed; but several generations have passed since such a clergy existed in any part of the United States. Thus it has happened that in the absence of the inequalities familiar to most of the nations, the American people have not concerned themselves much, at least until lately, about the precise meaning of the term equality.

In the first place, human equality does not mean that men are born equal in bodily strength and vitality, mental gifts, or potential capacity of any sort. Any one who has been long concerned with education will inevitably have become convinced that the inequalities among human beings of the same stock as regards physical and spiritual capacities, are infinite. Men and women of the same race, who have grown up on the same soil, in the same climate, and under like governmental conditions, exhibit great diversities in capacity for education, age maturity, attainments, and character. This innate diversity is so great that among millions of people an exact observer would be unable to find any two just alike. Men as a matter of fact are not born equal; no two can have an equal chance in life by any possibility because their means and powers of meeting the exposures, risks and opportunities of life are different. Even under the most favorable circumstances, therefore, children are not born equal in life but unequal and different, and this original inequality is infallibly developed as life goes on; because it is impossible to provide the same environment or the same education for any two children. A just social philosophy will not undertake to fly in the face of these facts of nature.

**In States That Are Free.**

In the next place let us consider the actual facts in regard to social organization in any state which has long been free. Are men equal as a matter of fact in any such free state as regards their occupation, modes of life, scale of living and freedom in that "pursuit of happiness" to which the declaration of independence avers that all men have a right? Under free institutions, there are farmers, mechanics, quarrymen, miners, clerks, traders, shopkeepers, carriers, money-lenders, lawyers, physicians, teachers and ministers, just as there were in feudal society and as there must continue to be under any form of government or social structure. Civilized society can not be maintained on the planet without this division of workers in every generation among these widely diversified occupations; and the occupations are so different in the capacities they call for and in the effects they produce on the workers, that social inequalities inevitably arise from them under the simple principle that "Birds of a feather flock together."

The different tastes and capacities which send men into different callings appear early in life, and are only developed and made more decided by education; and all through the life of each individual they continue to differentiate him from most of his neighbors, while they make his consort more and more with men of similar tastes and capacities.

**Doesn't Produce Equality.**

If we may judge from the experiences of the free commonwealths, freedom has no tendency to produce equality of condition as regards wealth among the different members of the same free state. On the contrary, freedom tends to develop infinite diversities of individual gift and capacity necessarily results in great diversities of condition as regards the possession of property. In consequence of possessing a natural talent for making money, a talent which has been free to exercise and develop, one citizen makes \$500 while another makes \$5; and the first man is just as free as the second to save and accumulate.

The laws, to be sure, tax the first man more heavily than the second and may restrict his power to transmit his property by testament; but if these laws are just and equal they will not prevent the unequal money-making capacity of the two men from taking full effect. Freedom, therefore, means not equality, but inequality of condition among the members of a free society; and this result has been actually obtained under all the free govern-

ments of the world, and nowhere so striking a degree as in the United States.

**Results of Free Education.**

Free education for all children has not been in operation long enough to justify positive assertions as to its probably ultimate results; but in the older parts of the United States, it has been in progress in an elementary form for several generations and has been offered for more than two generations to selected children up to the age of eighteen years. We may then say with confidence concerning public education at the expense of the state that it has no tendency to make children like or equal in any sense; that the great mass of the children are still obliged to begin to earn their livings at about 14 years of age and that the division of the productive members of the community into widely different occupations seems not to be much affected by the state's provision of free schools.

The structure of democratic society will, therefore, remain full of inequalities. Nevertheless, there is an important difference between democratic and feudal society as regards social equality. The layers of feudal society were stiff and unyielding, and it was well nigh impossible for one born in one layer to rise into a higher. The layers of democratic society are fluid and mobile, so that persons of capacity, no matter where born, may easily advance from one occupation to another, or rise from one layer to another in consequence of either natural gift or superior education, or both. This in an immense advantage of democratic society, and this is the chief source of the greater efficiency of the democratic organization.

**Some of the Defects.**

Universal education actively promotes this social fluidity. It makes every child of remarkable capacity fit and ready to seize this opportunity, and furthers him strongly on his upward way. Public education, however, has thus far fulfilled but imperfectly this important function. It has not held the child long enough in school. It has put too many pupils before the grade teacher, making it impossible for her to give individual instruction either to the brightest or the dullest children and almost compelling her to aim at an average product. It has not enlisted in afternoon and evening work, the older children who have been compelled to begin to earn their livelihood. It has thought of education as a process which belongs to childhood, instead of as a process continuous through life.

What is an opportunity for one child is no opportunity at all for another, for he can not seize it or enjoy its fruits. Diversity of opportunity must correspond to the infinite diversity of human capacities. Genius, to be sure, either finds a way or makes it, but common people have to be made ready to meet their fitting opportunities for life, some great, some small, some rare, some common. Democratic society has still to learn how to stimulate young people to prepare consequence of either natural gift or seize them, and on the other hand, how to proffer opportunities to capable and rising persons.

**Some Humanitarian Efforts.**

The improvement of machinery and the diffusion of mechanical power have done away with many of the exhaustion and unimproving forms of human labor on farms, and in force fisheries, mines, quarries, and the mechanic arts. Machinery and machine tools, and the intelligent use of domestic animals have in years still recent elevated very much the occupation of the farmer as regards its productiveness and its mental and moral satisfactions. Progress in the application of science to the useful arts, in practical sanitation, and in the development of good means of communication and transportation tends to diminish the inequalities in the different human occupations, and to make them all more interesting and more alike in their capacity to yield enjoyment and rational satisfaction. Many humanitarian movements of the present day tend to diminish the inequalities among men and families, because they tend to destroy or diminish the evil influences which prevent men from realizing in their own lives the common human joys and satisfactions.

The humanitarian efforts are now directed against intemperance and other destructive vices and against disease, unhealthy modes of living, ignorance and superstition. These are the commonest causes of poverty and misery, partly by their direct effects, and partly by their indirect effects on the character of the sufferers and of their descendants. These philanthropic efforts combat the worst inequalities in human society, and more and more they do it effectively. Many of these philanthropic agencies have been developed by the Jewish and Christian religious organizations, although it is the progress of preventive medicine which has made the best of them possible and effective. It is not religion but applied science, and particularly medical science, which during the past century

has chiefly contributed to the diminution of unnecessary inequalities of conditions among men.

**Relation of the Sexes.**

The relation of the sexes among educated people offers a good illustration of an equality consistent with great diversities. The inequality of men and women in primitive society seems to have depended upon strong differences between the two sexes as regards strength, endurance, and habitual occupation. If men and women were more alike in body and in mind, would they not be more equal, and if equality between them be a good thing, should their common qualities be cultivated and their unlike qualities be discouraged or obliterated? In recent times the admission of women to many new industrial activities, is making women resemble men in earning power and in habitual occupations much more than they ever did before in the history of the world. The morning suburban trains carry nearly as many young women as young men into the cities. The daily work of millions of women is not in the household, but in the factories, the shop, the business office. This industrial freedom doubtless tends toward equality of rights and toward equality in social intercourse. It also qualifies the deference of men to women and women to men, but it has not tendency at all to make men and women resemble each other any more than they did before the industrial equality set in.

In other words, the goal or ideal of democratic society is not equality between the sexes based on and overcoming or obliteration of their profound diversities.

**Aim of Democracy.**

It is quite the same with regard to the diversities or unlikenesses which exist between different individuals of the same sex. Democracy does not seek equality through the discouragement or obliteration of individual diversity. It does not aim at a general average of gifts and powers in humanity. On the contrary democratic society enjoys and actively promotes an immense diversity among its members, and in particular it increases many fold, and with happiest results. The difference between the human individual in youth and the same individual in his prime and in old age.

The American democracy illustrates to perfection one sort of diversity which, though comparatively new in the world, has far-reaching consequences and is probably to last. I refer to diversity in religion. Unity in religion has seemed to many generations of thoughtful people, not only a desirable end in itself, but the only end consistent with the universal acceptance of a one true religion. If religion had been revealed to man authoritatively and completely, there could be but one religion. If an authoritative church on earth had been divinely created and established forever, then there could be but one church. The doctrine of civil and religious liberty having finally won the day against all these assumptions, democracy in the United States has tolerated and protected all forms of religion, and there consequently exists in the United States an indescribable diversity of religious opinions and practices. Not uniformity in religion, but equality for treatment for all religions is the democratic idea. The equality which modern democracy believes in is an essential unity in respect to ideals. It can only be a single essence distilled from human variety.

**Home of Many Races.**

As a further illustration of the variety which may co-exist with freedom and security under democratic institutions, one may take the great diversity in the population of the United States as regards racial origin. The immense area of the United States, the richness of the country and the soil, mines, forests, and waterpowers, and its free institutions have drawn to it multitudes from all parts of the habitable earth. The broad country has been the refuge of the ignorant and the oppressed as well as the paradise of the enterprising, intelligent, and bold. Many people look with concern on this rapid advent of dissimilar races, because they fear that the higher races will be contaminated by the lower. Others imagine a blend of all these races, making in time a new and strong racial stock. We use such words as assimilation and amalgamation to describe the element of absorption of these heterogeneous or amalgamating men imagine that a comprehensive social equality is to result and that his racial equality is to result and that this present condition of diversity.

The different races of mankind have been produced by the exposure to different conditions of life through long ages of groups which may have presented at the start marked diversities. They now possess different powers, desires, capacities and different immunities. Their minds work differently and their dispositions are different. Experience teaches that intermarriage between two races which present marked

diversities ordinarily results in offspring inferior to each parent. Thus no satisfactory blend of a European blend with a far Eastern race has as yet appeared. Inter-marriage between races which strongly resemble each other and have been neighbors for centuries like the Teutonic and Scandinavian peoples of northern Europe, is comparatively safe. And in regard to marriages between individuals of different races, there are many special cases, and many exceptions to the rule, but in general the ideal of a people made up from many different races and living under free institutions should be the perpetuation of racial diversity and not the bringing about of racial blend. The diversities of race need no more be extinguished under free institutions, than the diversities between human individuals. Freedom should encourage diversity not extinguish it.

**Sentiment of Loyalty.**

There is, however, one uniting sentiment which all the diversified races and all the diversified human beings that make up the American people should always feel. It is the sentiment of loyalty to freedom and to the established institutions which secure freedom. In democratic society these numerous royalties which were often centered in superior or idealized persons or small classes of persons, should be replaced by one intense loyalty to the ideals of freedom, security and fellowship. This loyalty to ideals is analogous to the devotion which Hebrew and Christian alike offer to God. It comprehends every field of the national activity and every element of individual and family life. The sentiment of fraternity enters into it but not the desire for equality, for it is great enough and warm enough to comprehend infinite diversities. Material prosperity and splendor, though not luxury seems natural for this ideal government of freedom, but simplicity, beauty, and comfort, still more natural. The force used by such a government should be defensive and protective both within and without its borders; its motto may well be "Each for all, and All for Each."

**Equality Before the Law.**

The most valuable element in a feasible equality is equality before the law, and all agents of the law, and this element is precious just because it tends to make the pursuit of happiness free and secure. The American democracy should make the pursuit of happiness, free and secure for all. It is very far from having accomplished this result. It can do so without seeking to establish among men a monotonous, tiresome and unnatural equality; for happiness is fortunately a state of mind quite independent of condition as regards wealth, of the habitual occupation, and of mental gifts. It is a product of health, serviceableness, loyalty, security, amiability and a good standing among one's fellows. In a democracy all sorts and conditions of men should be equally free and secure in the pursuit of such happiness; but all experience proved that the humble, quiet, wholesome people, whose simple, dutiful lives will not be long remembered have as good a chance as any body has of winning it.

**Will A BIG AUDITORIUM**

**Plans for New High School Provides a Place for Assembly.**

Plans for Columbia's new \$80,000 high school building have been submitted to the board of education by W. B. Ittner, the architect. These plans are under consideration by the board and probably will be adopted. The plans call for a three-story, brick building, trimmed in stone, with a small basement for the boiler room, coal storage and the heating and ventilating apparatus.

An auditorium to seat 785 is planned for a part of the first and second floors. It is to be in the center of the front with an entrance and a nine-foot hall on either side. The lower floor of the auditorium will seat 565 persons.

A gymnasium, 38x75 feet, is to be in the rear of the auditorium. It contains a running track. Shower baths, dressing rooms and lockers for boys and girls are on either side. The left end of the first floor is for the home economics department. A cooking room, store room, fitting room and sewing room will occupy the whole space. In the opposite end of this building is the wood work room, 21x54 feet, with a mechanical drawing room by its side. The second floor is to have ten class rooms. On the third floor are the laboratories, physics and biology, with a lecture room between them. Five other class rooms are on this floor.

The building will face North Eighth street on the ground now occupied by the old school building.

**The Real Scrap.**

Two muscular individuals were hammering at each other in the ring.

"Horrible," ejaculated a tender-hearted spectator.

"Horrible, nothing," said a regular patron. "If you want to see a real scrap get next to them when they divide the purse."—Philadelphia Ledger.

## SQUIRRELS KILL THE BIRDS ON CAMPUS

Nests and Young Devastated in Columbia by Little Animals.

### FEWER ROBINS NOW

Prof. Lipscomb, in a Paper, Tells How Birds Have Disappeared Recently.

Prof. M. L. Lipscomb superintendent of buildings and grounds, has gathered some data concerning squirrels and birds on the campus of the University of Missouri and the lawns of Columbia. In a paper prepared by him he says:

Which shall we have on our lawns and in our groves—birds or squirrels? We cannot have both. This does not refer to the English sparrow, which seems ubiquitous and is able to hold its own against all comers, man included; but to such birds as the robin, bluebird, redbird, or cardinal, the thrushes (of which we have several species) and other song birds, besides birds which are strictly insectivorous.

**Birds Destroy Insects.**

The birds are to be preferred for several reasons—especially for their songs and because they destroy so many insects, thereby protecting the trees, shrubs, flowers and other vegetation. The squirrel, on the other hand, is destructive. A few years ago before the squirrels made their appearance in Columbia and were given protection, the lawns and campus were full of birds nesting in the trees and shrubs, and a few on the ground, but after the squirrels came back the birds abandoned their usual nesting places. A few nested in trees near buildings, and, in some cases, in vines on the buildings. But the buildings afforded only temporary protection to such birds as the robin and cardinal. The squirrels have become so tame that they are building their nests on the buildings also. There is a nest on one of the most public buildings of the University of Missouri. The squirrel climbs a tree nearby and leaps from a projecting limb to the top of the building.

**Only One Robin's Nest.**

While there were dozens of birds' nests on the campus and on private grounds a few years ago, very few are now seen. A close observer and lover of birds said a few days ago that he had seen only one robin's nest this spring, and that was under the eaves of a building between the downspout and wall. The cardinal, although a shy bird, is building its nest in vines on porches, within easy reach of the hand, preferring to trust itself to the protection of man than expose its nest to the depredations of squirrels. Those who are interested in birds have, no doubt, noticed this and also the scarcity of song birds. The oriole seems to defy the squirrels. It attaches its nest to the tip of an outlying small branch which will not support the weight of the squirrel. As soon as it was seen that birds were disappearing from the grounds, the squirrel was at once suspected. The best information was sought. The decision was that birds will not nest or even frequent places where squirrels are allowed to run; that the squirrels eat the eggs and young of the birds and that birds are afraid of squirrels as they are of cats; especially is this true of the fox-squirrel.

**Back to the Woods.**

The Century dictionary, in defining squirrels, says: "Their food is largely vegetable, as nuts, though also animal, as eggs and small birds." Superintendents of parks in some of the large cities have been compelled to get rid of the squirrels for this reason. This being the case, the squirrel should be driven back to the woods where it belongs, and the birds given the protection they deserve, or in a few years more Columbia will be without song birds and insect-destroying birds. The trees will become full of borers and caterpillars and the grounds of grubs and other pests.

**The O'erwise Child.**

Professor Muirhead tells an experience of his in examining some Birmingham children in moral teaching. He asked them to write an essay on the three stages of life. One bright child returned the following: "There are three stages of life. The first is when we are very young, and think of the wicked things which we shall be able to do when we are older; and this is the age of innocence. The second is when we are older, and are able to do the wicked things which we thought about when we were young; and this is the prime of life. The third is when we are dotty and repent the wicked things which we did when we were younger; and this is the dotage."—The Bellman.